THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

ENEMIES IN THE AISLES:

THE POLITICS OF MARKET ENCOUNTER ON ISRAEL'S SETTLER FRONTIER

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

AND

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

BY

JEREMY A. SIEGMAN

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

JUNE 2018

Table of contents

Acknowledgments

This project would not have been possible without the support, generosity and input of so many people and institutions. My first thank you goes to the Palestinian workers from the store, especially Yaser and his wife, Abu Omar and Um Omar, and Yusuf, who opened up their homes and lives to me, showed me immense generosity and good faith in extremely trying circumstances, and became dear friends. The opportunity for my loved ones and I to get to know them and their children has been a special one; they have changed us with their stories and I hope that in addition to its other aims, this ethnography provides a window into what they endure. They seek the basic rights to economic security, freedom of movement and more that other Palestinians pursue in more organized ways—rights that I and so many of my readers are complicit in denying Palestinians through tax dollars that support Israeli occupation and related policies. It has also been incredibly special to have the opportunity to work with Husam al-Abed, whose research assistance and knowledge greatly enriched the final phase of my research; I am lucky to count Husam as a friend and comrade, and am inspired by his tireless commitment to defending Palestinian human rights and the future of his family and friends in Jerusalem. I also thank his family and friends around East Jerusalem and the West Bank for hosting me, and our other interviewees for making time to answer my questions. I thank and salute Muhammad the stocker for his candor, wit, and fearlessness; as he knows, I still hope to make that visit with him to Tarqumiyya checkpoint. There are too many other workers to count who were extremely generous in talking to me about my research, inviting me and sometimes my partner into their homes and to family functions, inviting me on nights out in Abu Dis, Jericho and Bethlehem, and more. I also thank the various Jewish-Israelis, from the settlement in question and elsewhere, who took the time to speak with me, and whose insights were extremely helpful for my analysis.

Also in Israel/Palestine, I am grateful for assistance in finding contacts, carrying out the research and other matters, to: Fayrouz Sharqawi and Grassroots Jerusalem; the Palestinian local councils in Abu Dis and elsewhere; the youth activists of Abu Dis for their fearlessness, hospitality and willingness to share with me; Bassam Bahr for his assistance; Penny Mitchell and Ghada al-Madbouh at the Palestinian American Research Center (PARC); Mandy Turner and the Kenyon Institute/CBRL for space to study and write despite not being British, and for the chance to connect with Seth Anziska, Tareq Baconi, Yara Hawari and other wonderful colleagues; Alice Raulo and Hanna Baumann for "story of the day" and good company during difficult times; Ahmad, Mahmoud and the whole Muna family at the Educational Bookshop on Salah al-Din Street for being an intellectual home for me and so many others; staff from Kav LaOved/Workers' Hotline and Workers' Action Center-MA'AN; and Tamar Elor, Dan Rabinowitz and Adi Ophir for generously discussing my research with me. Special thanks go out to Salim Tamari at the Institute for Palestine Studies for his endless insight and generosity; Sam Bahour, Raja Khalidi, Omar Tesdell for generous and informative chats in Ramallah and Jerusalem; and Khaled Fur'ani for his warmth, insight, and the generous invitation to meet his students at Mada al-Carmel.

Notwithstanding my illuminating conversations with these Palestinian scholars, I acknowledge that their and other Palestinian scholars' research activities are severely constrained in Israel/Palestine. Their modes of inquiry, livelihoods and safety are compromised by the very forms of Israeli occupation and settler colonialism about which I write, as outlined by the Right to Education campaign at Birzeit University and similar campaigns.[1] While the focus of my project in Israeli settlements made it a bit more challenging to more fully immerse in Palestinian

[1] See http://right2edu.birzeit.edu/.

intellectual life, especially in Ramallah, this challenge was also structural. Indeed, my engagement with my Palestinian colleagues, and with the illuminating things they have to say about Palestinian life and Israeli forms of power, has been limited by Israeli suppression of Palestinian academic life and academic freedom. It has been limited, too, by my own failures, and those of the institutions with which I am affiliated, to adequately work against the structures that marginalize these colleagues. These failures to protect Palestinians' academic freedom must urgently be remedied.

I thank Yacoub Diab, my excellent tutor, for without him I would still be walking around the West Bank speaking Egyptian dialect; and I thank Dr. Nehad Heliel, Paul Wulfsberg, Heba and Mona and others at Middlebury's program in Alexandria, Egypt, as well as the incomparable Dr. Munther Younes and various Arabic instructors at Cornell University, who, through their excellent Arabic instruction, opened up a new world for me without which these connections and knowledge would not have been possible.

Other Israel/Palestine colleagues have been generative interlocutors. I thank Kareem Rabie for modeling how to be a generous colleague and for his valuable insights on settler colonialism and capitalism; Paul Kohlbry for his political-economic and ethnographic insights, for swapping papers, and for helpful connections; Kali Rubaii for engaging with my work and expanding my thinking through panels and frank chats; Michal Ran-Rubin and Jonah Rubin for their companionship, mentorship and valuable insight during both fieldwork and write-up in Chicago; Eilat Maoz for sharing her extensive knowledge, brilliance, and connections to wonderful people, as well as for generously commenting on my work in Chicago; as well as Hadas Weiss, Tom Pessah, Yuli Rzaev, Simone Popperl, Ethan Morton-Jerome, Yaqub Hilal and

Alex Shams, for their insight and comradery. Lori Allen, Amahl Bishara and Tom Abowd have been generous mentors and offered helpful insights.

I am grateful for the following grants and fellowships that funded this project: the Harry Frank Guggenheim Dissertation Fellowship; the National Science Foundation Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant (DDRIG) – Cultural Anthropology; the Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) Fellowship; the Wenner Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research Dissertation Fieldwork Grant; and grants from the University of Chicago Human Rights Program, Chicago Center for Jewish Studies, and the Anthropology Department's Lichtstern Pre-field Research Grant.

My mentors and colleagues at the University of Chicago in the Departments of Anthropology and Political Science have been wonderful interlocutors. I am grateful to have had eight years to spend with them. My appreciation goes out to William Mazzarella for the pleasure of thinking about critical theory and politics together; for his incredible dedication to me and his other students during and after fieldwork; for his curiosity; and for his consistently thought-provoking and encouraging feedback. I sincerely thank Lisa Wedeen for her steadfast commitment to me, my project and my interdisciplinary training, even in what has been a devastating period for her own interlocutors from Syria; and for teaching and modeling conceptual rigor, sophisticated writing and elegant ways of bringing together ethnography, social theory, political theory, and strong argumentation. It has also been a privilege to engage with the substance of both of these scholars' work, especially on questions of ideology, desire and publicity—an engagement I hope will continue into the future. Hussein Agrama has helped me shape the questions I ask and my sense of why I ask them, troubled my and others' categories over and over, and this project is the better for it. He has also helped me situate the contemporary

moment in Israel/Palestine in longer historical trajectories, raising provocative questions about the constrained political horizons of the present. Julie Chu has been an insightful mentor and an extremely helpful reader of many drafts, helping me think more deeply about my choices about field sites and anthropological literatures with which to engage. I am grateful for her curiosity and consistency in moving the project along. I thank Rebecca L. Stein for her generosity in being a part of this committee, for sharing her expertise on Israel/Palestine and the difficulties of doing research there, for her critical and helpful questions throughout, and her broader mentorship which has meant a great deal to me. Lisa Wedeen, Hussein Agrama, Joe Masco and other faculty in Political Science and Anthropology helped make my joint degree possible at the academic level, while Don Dunbar, B. Patrick Hall and others from the Social Sciences Division were indispensable and supportive. Joe Masco, Justin Richland, Darryl Li, Judith Farquhar, Susan Gal, and others on the Anthropology faculty helped shape my project and generously commented on various proposals and chapters.

Also at Chicago, I thank my wonderful anthropology cohort and my writing mates for generously reading and commenting on many drafts: Cameron Hu, Eric M. Hirsch, Meghan L. Morris, Nate Ela, Andrea L. Ford, Matthew Furlong, Ali Feser, Maira Hayat and Nicholas Carby-Denning, as well as, beyond Chicago, Vivian Lu. Joseph Weiss, Kristen Simmons, Haeden Stewart and Eilat Maoz helped shape my thinking on setter colonialism during our productive reading together in 2013. I also thank Alex Blanchette, Molly Cunningham, Adam Sargent and any others in the Chicago Anthropology community for their insight and comradery. Steven Klein and Daniel Nichanian kindly offered illuminating input and perspective on political theory questions. Audiences at the UChicago Knowledge/Value and U.S. Locations workshops,

the 2014, 2015 and 2017 meetings of the American Anthropological Association, and Yale's Order, Conflict and Violence workshop have all provided helpful feedback, among others.

I am endlessly grateful to my parents, David and Joanne, for their love and support. And I thank Miriam for believing in me, inspiring me, coming to visit, and being an incredible partner.

Introduction

Enemies in the Aisles is a study of Israeli-Palestinian market encounters in Israeli businesses in the occupied West Bank and Jerusalem. It shows how these market encounters partially depoliticize Israeli-Palestinian encounters and thus normalize Israeli settler colonization, but also how political antagonisms crop up in the marketplace to render this normalization partial and precarious. It thus speaks to broad questions about the relations between the market and the political, between (neo-)liberalism and settler colonialism. And it offers a fine-grained account of the complex intersections of market- and ethno-nationally based hierarchies and antagonisms, in relation to broader contemporary conditions of racialized exploitation, dispossession and militarism.

Enemies ethnographically focuses on supermarkets in Israeli settlements in the occupied West Bank. At these stores, most customers are Jewish-Israeli settlers governed by Israeli civilian law, while many to most of the stockers, cleaning staff and other entry-level workers are Palestinian men living under Israeli occupation in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. In the context of Israel's increasingly militarized confinement of West Bank Palestinians to enclaves since the 1990s, concomitant reductions of Palestinian labor migration from the occupied territories to Israel and of Israeli shopping in Palestinian urban areas (Farsakh 2005; Tamari 2013), and thus an overall decline in everyday Israeli-Palestinian contact (Benvenisti 1984; Weizman 2007), these supermarkets have become what are increasingly rare spaces of ostensibly civilian encounter between Israelis and Palestinians in the West Bank.

The supermarkets and other Israeli businesses in settlements have thus become key sites for Israeli and international discourses about markets, peace and Arab-ness. Jewish-Israeli consumers, business-owners and journalists of many stripes, on both sides of the Green Line,

have hailed these businesses as sites of coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians. This characterization is closely linked to a nostalgic Israeli discourse about Israelis having had "good relations" in the past with their low-wage Palestinian employees, or with shop-keepers from whom they bought hummus and other goods in Palestinian areas of the Occupied Territories in the 1970s and 80s (Tamari 2013), before the first Palestinian *intifada*. This nostalgic discourse points to the less overtly violent tenor of those times (a characterization which bears some truth, but which I complicate in Chapter Three) while trafficking in a longstanding Israeli and Western essentialization of an unchanging, authentic, and politically quiescent form of Arab-ness, as well as an essentialization of the open-air Middle Eastern market [*suq* in Arabic], and the Israeli adaptation thereof [*shuk* in Hebrew], as authentic communal spaces and sites for these essentialized form of Arab-ness (Said 1978; Stein 2008).[2] A close cousin of these discourses, sometimes inseparable from them, is a more pointed policy discourse promoted by Israeli CEOs and diplomats: the notion that Israeli-Palestinian economic relations in general, and market contact in settlement businesses today in particular, are a form or model of Israeli-Palestinian coexistence or peace. These discourses repurpose the neoliberal "economic peace" framework of the Israeli-Palestinian peace process in 1990s, promoted at the time by neoliberal policymakers in the U.S. and Israeli governments, think tanks such as the RAND Corporation, the nascent Palestinian Authority and Israeli business leaders. At the time, "economic peace" was envisioned as facilitating *political* peace and a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.[3] But the

[2] The store I on which I focused, as well as other similar ones, incorporates some of the aesthetics of open-air markets and artisanal authenticity into its kitschy displays alongside harsh fluorescent lighting and the primary colors of the supermarkets' branding aesthetics.

[3] This policy framework of economic peace found expression in plans for special economic zones at would-be border areas between Israel and the Occupied Territories, where Israeli and international capital could exploit Palestinian labor. See Lagerquist 2003. A plan for such a zone in the Jordan Valley, entitled "Valley of Peace," which would include Jordanian cooperation, is still promoted by Israeli leaders.

Netanyahu governments, settlers and corporations promoting economic peace in recent years do so with a twist; they speak of economic peace without much attention to political peace, in a political environment of increasingly blunt Israeli moves towards permanent annexation of the West Bank (cf. Anziska 2017). That is, economic peace discourse appears here as a neoliberal discourse aiding in the further entrenchment of a *de facto,* non-democratic one-state reality in Israel/Palestine (cf. Azoulay and Ophir 2012). But what do ideologies of market coexistence and economic peace look like in everyday practice, as Jewish Israelis actually encounter Palestinian workers in conditions of severe power differential, ongoing dispossession and military violence?

Through a detailed ethnography of Israeli-Palestinian market encounters, my research offers a nuanced account of the relation among neoliberalism, market practices, and the entrenchment of Israeli settler colonization, complicating scholarly accounts that have emphasized the efficacy of neoliberal governance in general and its smooth structural alignment with Israeli colonization in particular.

Specifically, I argue that on an everyday level, Israeli-Palestinian market encounters instill a precarious normalization of Israeli settler colonization. They do so by fostering Israeli-Palestinian interactions, as well as forms of public address and a broader social atmosphere, in which all participants act to some degree as if Israeli settler presence and dominance is normal and taken for granted, and in which realities of occupation and conflict are pushed to the background, even if most Israelis and all Palestinians are aware that these dynamics are live elsewhere.[4] In what follows, I often refer to the production of this atmosphere as a social process

[4] The notion of normalization is distinct from that of legitimacy. The legitimacy of Israeli dominance, and relatedly the normative beliefs that Israelis and Palestinians have about that dominance, are not particularly helpful concepts here, since we can assume that most (though not all) Israelis in this largely rightwing settlement consider this settlement and its forms of power over Palestinians legitimate; we can also assume that the vast majority of Palestinians who are denied rights by the Israeli regime find most aspects of that regime illegitimate. My interest is in the extent to which interactions and social

of normalizing Israeli settler presence and dominance. I use the term normalization here in a way that is complementary to, but distinct from, its usage in much Arab, Palestinian and pro-Palestinian political discourse. There, it is used as a broad classification for a whole kind of political institution or practice, such Arab peace negotiations with Israel, which, when labeled as forms of normalization, are typically to be boycotted. In this political paradigm of anti-normalization (Tamari 2013), the detailed forms and limits of many practices, such as the social character of Palestinian workers' interactions with their Israeli employers in settlement businesses, are not of interest in themselves, unless they support arguments to boycott those businesses.[5] Like these activist anti-normalization efforts, I am also interested in the naturalization of Israeli domination. But I take this interest in the more detailed, open-ended direction of an inquiry into the everyday forms—and limits—of how Israelis' employment of Palestinians, particularly in service jobs, contributes to social practices, atmospheres and spaces that normalize Israeli settler dominance in everyday life, creating the scenes that can then be rendered by journalists as forms of coexistence. My first chapter examines how service work itself, with its dictates for workers to defer to customers, combines with the pressures that military occupation places on Palestinians to produce effects of Palestinians seeming to defer to, and even affirm, Jewish-Israeli settler presence and dominance itself. My second chapter shows how the supermarkets' partially civilianized forms of security also contribute to this

atmospheres take root in which Israeli presence and dominance comes to be treated as normal or taken for granted.

[5] For example, the Palestinian-led boycott of the Sodastream company was for a very general reason – that it had a factory located in the occupied West Bank where it profited from cheap Palestinian labor. Boycott supporters gave some attention to the details of labor abuses on the factory floor, which was meant as a simple factual refutation of the company's claims that it was an "island of peace" between Israelis and Palestinians. The validity of the initial argument for boycott – that the factory is on occupied land – did not depend on the details of Israeli-Palestinian labor and social relations in the first place. See Westbrook 2013.

normalization.

On the other hand, I point to everyday dynamics that undermine the status of the supermarket as a space of apolitical encounters between Israelis and Palestinians—a space where Israeli dominance can be taken for granted. Specifically, I point to the ways in which Israeli security practices generate tensions and mutual suspicions, as well as bringing displays and escalations of violence into the store. These forms of security feed what I characterize as dynamics of settler-indigenous antagonism, in which Israelis and Palestinians relate to one another as various iterations of enemies—occupier and occupied, security guard and security threat, settler and native, and sometimes Jew and Arab. Further, ongoing violent confrontations outside the store, such as the 2014 Gaza assault, feed direct, heated exchanges and debates between Israeli and Palestinian workers inside the store—exchanges I conceptualize as an antagonistic public sphere. And Palestinian forms of address amongst one another constitute what I conceptualize as a Palestinian frontier counterpublic, cutting against the dominant Jewish-Israeli public of the store, and thus against the status of this slice of West Bank space as Israeli. These forms of political antagonism point to the limits of market depoliticization – and the shortcomings of an analytical overemphasis on it – even though, crucially, they do not constitute agonistic democracy and are not best characterized as forms of indigenous resistance. That is, I do not highlight practices that can be characterized as emancipatory; rather, I highlight what is at times the tense, unresolved quality of settler hegemony—a quality which may constitute a condition for various forms of political change, including emancipatory forms of change, but does not necessarily lead to change in itself.

This subtle way of thinking about forms of politics stages a fresh conversation between anthropologies and political theories of the following: market depoliticization, publics and public

spheres, the politics of agonism and antagonism, and settler colonialism. Specifically, I elaborate forms of politics that constitute limits to the neoliberal depoliticization on which many anthropologists and political theorists have focused—again, without being emancipatory per se. Doing so suggests an orientation away from a recent anthropological emphasis on governance, control, and the constraints on various forms of politics. And it entails reconsidering theories of the public sphere, of publics and counterpublics, and of agonism and antagonism through the provocative context of an ethnocratic (Yiftachel 1999) settler colonial frontier where certain populations are constitutively excluded from political inclusion. Here I draw on political theorist Chantal Mouffe's notion of the political as existential antagonism between enemies, which she distinguishes from agonistic public spheres. For Mouffe, agonistic public spheres are those in which, however vigorously participants disagree about "substantive political alternatives," they nonetheless sign on to a shared democratic project and accept one another's existence (n.d.). Clearly, settler-indigenous relations in the occupied West Bank resonate with Mouffe's sense of existential antagonism, in which violence is a real possibility, rather than with her notion of agonistic and democratic public spheres. Yet these antagonistic encounters in supermarkets in the West Bank *do* suggest some sort of public sphere; for in these supermarkets, participants critically debate issues of overlapping concern and negotiate power relations, doing so partly in a reflexive relationship to broader national publics and other broader publics. I thus suggest the term *antagonistic public sphere* as an intermittent form of relation between Israelis and Palestinian workers—a sphere that crops up where and when they engage in certain ways. The significance of this public sphere, and of other forms of antagonism at the supermarkets, is not to constitute democracy; it is simply to limit the normalization of a dominant settler colonial order. Even as these forms of antagonism constitute limits to aspects of this dominant order, they do not

constitute indigenous resistance per se, nor advance indigenous sovereignty, even though they include some indigenous political practices such as small-scale forms of counterpublicity and refusal (cf. Simpson 2014). My focus on settler-indigenous antagonisms that limit the normalization of settler power is certainly no substitute for studies of indigenous sovereignty that more directly challenges settler states (Smith and Simpson 2014); but it nonetheless complements a broader scholarly reorientation of which the latter kind of studies are a part. I speak of a reorientation in studies of settler-indigenous relations, away from a focus on cultural alterity and towards a focus on settler-indigenous *political* relations in the present, albeit as they are constituted through socio-cultural practices.

Through its ethnographic focus on ordinary service economies, *Enemies* also builds on and contributes to accounts of settler colonialism and ongoing military occupation in contemporary Israel/Palestine. My focus on everyday market encounters, which are largely though not entirely civilian affairs, complements accounts that have habitually emphasized Israeli military power, logics of rule and their alignment with political-economic structures of exploitation in the occupied territories (Farsakh 2005; Algazi 2006; Clarno 2017). Within conversations on settler colonialism in Palestine, I also bring novel attention to settler ideology (Weiss 2011) and settlers' everyday relations with Palestinians, which have generally been studied separately from this settler colonialism framework, under other frameworks such as analyses of Israeli society or of Jewish-Arab relations (Klein 2014). I also take the Israeli corporation as a site not only of structural but of cultural analysis—as a powerful aspect of the Israeli presence in the West Bank that doubtlessly advances the colonization project, but also sometimes constitutes a locus of public sphere activity and ideological tension.

Enemies thus builds on recent conceptualizations of Israel's "liberal-settler state"

(Robinson 2013) and its two faces – liberal-democratic for some, settler colonial for others (Abu El Haj 2010; Rana 2010). It inquiries into the forms and limits of what we might call Israel's neoliberal-settler project, a term that signals the complex ways in which neoliberal ideologies and ordinary market practices articulate with the projects of military occupation and indigenous dispossession. I show how these complex articulations manifest at a supermarket on occupied land—a nominally "free" market encounter within a broader context of militarized state coercion and ongoing land dispossession. My ethnography follows the ambiguities and vacillations between this nominal freedom of the marketplace and the racialized coercion with which it is bound up; and between moments in which the political antagonisms related to this coercion recede from everyday market practice, and moments in which these antagonisms emerge.

A "Super-Israel" Branch in a West Bank Settlement: Illuminating Intersecting Forms of Power in the Israeli Settler Colonial Project and its Analogues

Super-Israel is my pseudonym for the discount supermarket where I focused my inquiry. A branch of a national Israeli supermarket chain, this store was located in a settlement industrial zone outside Jerusalem. Playing on the common Israeli use of "super-" as a pre-fix for retail stores, the pseudonym suggests the ways in which my inquiry explores Israeli settler colonization and settler nationalism in their "supermarket" form, as occupation, militarism and settler supremacy intermingle with the marketing of commodities in a consumer-oriented environment.[6]

[6] "Super-Israel" should not be understood as trying to evoke the notion of Israel, as a place or national project, being "great." Nor should it be understood as trying to evoke a sense of this site as especially Israeli, thus super-Israeli. Nor does it have to do with the size of Israel. The term "super" here is about the Israeli settler project as manifest in a supermarket. Of course, part of the idea of a supermarket is that it is bigger than a corner store, in Israel as in many other places, and the relative largeness of this store is important to its interactive richness, but again, it is not the main point of the name. I should not that just as Israelis would call a store like this "the super" ("I'm going to the super,") Palestinian workers there had a similar usage, calling it "the suber [*as-suber*]" (there is no "p" sound in Arabic). Yet in speaking amongst themselves, they did sometimes diverge from Israelis' name for the area in which the store was located, casually referring to it by its Arabic name. Such references indexed that this area is part of a

As I explore in Chapter Four, this intermingling takes place in part through the official forms of public address in the store. The public-address system plays elevator music (usually Western pop hits or smooth jazz, and on Fridays, elevator versions of traditional Sabbath songs) and promotes product discounts, intermingled with announcements for donation drives for Israeli troops on the front in Gaza. The store's public thus has multiple aspects that are in tension with one another: it addresses an almost generic consumer public (if Hebrew weren't so attached to Jewish-Israeli-ness in this context) and also a specifically, bluntly Jewish-Israeli public, in which Palestinians are constitutive outsiders and even enemies.

This Super-Israel is large, with some 150 workers, making it one of the largest such stores in the settlement, and relatively on par with many stores of its size in industrial and peripheral areas of Jerusalem, on both sides of the Green Line. It carries a large array of Israeli and international products, at prices low enough to cater to the working class and lower-middle Israelis who make up much of the settlement's population. The low prices also attract a number of West Bank Palestinian customers, who can only access the industrial zone because of their work permits for nearby businesses. Most of them are factory workers coming in on break to buy deli meat, cheese and rolls from the deli and bakery counters. Others buy full loads of groceries for their families, for selection is smaller and prices typically higher, in the smaller groceries in nearby Palestinian towns, especially when it comes to specialty products such as baby formula. A handful of East Jerusalem Palestinians, who can come and go freely, also come to buy products cheaply here, that they then resell in their local corner stores, in underdeveloped urban neighborhoods that are mostly not serviced by new commercial developments such as this.

Palestinian geography in the Jerusalem region, and was expropriated from Palestinians a few decades ago during the surge in Israeli settlement building in the 1980s (cf. Weizman 2007).

The displays at the service counters and at the vegetable aisles give some sense of the kind of nostalgia and fetishization of small-scale open-air markets that I mentioned above: the vegetable aisle has kitschy striped awnings over some of the shelves;[7] and the deli has a whole artisan-style display sponsored by the Israeli cheese company Gad, with some fake bulbs of garlic and onion hanging down from above, next to cardboard cutouts of wooden barrels; Asad, a Jerusalemite at the deli, has written his name in a black Sharpie on one of the garlic bulbs.[8] As we will see in Chapter One, Israeli flags adorn the front of the store, mixed in with flags bearing Super-Israel's logo.

In addition to the rich forms of social interaction at this store, its location—in a settlement in the occupied West Bank, but near Jerusalem—also contributes to its ethnographic generativity. Specifically, the store's range of Palestinian workers in up-close contact with largely marginalized Jewish-Israelis gives us a uniquely concentrated view of multiple gradations of Israeli political and economic power as exercised over different segments of the Palestinian population.

West Bank Palestinians were the largest group of workers at the store, and they were almost all men except for a very small number of women who were cashiers. Even though West Bank Palestinian men had been many of the construction workers who built the store in the early

[7] See Chapter Three for the ways that some Israeli customers related to Palestinian workers in the vegetable aisle.

[8] This aesthetic of an authentic outdoor market within contemporary mega-stores is also expressed in the holding of market events, often called "doing a market" [*osim shuk*], in Israeli shopping malls which are mostly inside the Green Line. Here, one finds few Palestinians, but mostly *mizrahi* Jewish-Israelis (Jewish-Israelis of Middle Eastern descent, with some of the largest groups having been expelled from Morocco and Iraq in the 1950s) selling food from those countries, as well as more properly Palestinian foods such as hummus and falafel. The Arab-ness of these Jews has also been essentialized while being denigrated by the Ashkenazi Jewish establishment that led the Zionist project in its early decades, which is why I say that "Arab-ness" more broadly is part of dominant Israeli attitudes towards markets, and not only Palestinian Arab-ness.

2000s, some told me that when they had asked for permanent jobs at the store, the management had told them that its policy was not to hire West Bank Palestinians. Yet, the Palestinians said, the store quickly ran into trouble in recruiting and keeping the working-class Jewish-Israelis, who made up much of this settlement's population, in the store's entry-level jobs.[9] While nearly all the managers were *mizrahi* Jewish-Israelis (Israeli Jews of Middle Eastern descent), West Bank Palestinians now filled most of these entry-level jobs at the store: stockers (the most common job), warehouse workers, deli servers, cleaning workers, baggers, and half to two thirds of the cashiers (the other third to a half were Jewish-Israeli women).[10] With the exception of cashiers, these were jobs that, as Palestinians put it to me in interviews, Jewish-Israelis did not want to do, and often did not have to do in the West Bank, given their access to better (albeit not sufficient) educational and work opportunities, including Israeli government and security jobs. For their part, West Bank Palestinians lived in a Palestinian economy suffocated by Israeli occupation "de-development" (Roy 1999) where wages were low and unemployment was high; they were desperate to get one of these jobs for themselves or their sons.

Indeed, over decades, settler and capitalist land expropriation had left these men, whose families were traditionally peasants [*fellah*], mostly landless and increasingly dependent on wage labor in the Israeli economy (Tamari 1981; Farsakh 2005; Arafeh et al 2015). Most of the men and their immediate families had come to the semi-urbanized towns just outside Jerusalem

[9] These Jewish-Israelis were disproportionately *mizrahi* (Israeli Jews of Middle Easter descent) and immigrants from the former Soviet Union, both of whom are marginalized within Israeli society vis-à-vis the Ashkenazi Jews (Jews of European descent) who initiated and led the Zionist project in its early years; at the same time, these marginalized populations had access to a wide range of social rights, training and jobs that were mostly not available to West Bank Palestinians, and exercised significant power over them in the store as customers and managers with a whole state security apparatus backing up their power.

[10] One connecting thread between Jewish/Palestinian and intra-Jewish socio-economic hierarchies is a racialized devaluation of Arab-ness—whether Jews from Arab countries or Palestinian Arabs—which can be traced to longstanding Zionist institutions and discourses. See Abu El-Haj 2012. On intersections of ethnic and gender hierarchy in Israel, see Lavie 2014.

decades ago looking for work, or were originally from these towns, which were part of Jerusalem's social and economic fabric—Abu Dis, Eizeriyya, Sawahra, 'Anata, Shuafat Refugee Camp, and slightly further afield, Hizma—even as some of the men's parents and cousins remained in their hometowns around the West Bank. In the 1990s and early 2000s, Israel's intensification of movement restrictions on the Occupied Territories, culminating in the building of the separation barrier beginning in 2002, cut these Jerusalem area towns off not only from even more of their own land, but from the trade networks and jobs in Jerusalem on which their residents had relied. This Israeli policy of closure further devastated the West Bank and Gaza Strip economies, in which Palestinian labor migration to Israel had become a significant portion of GDP (Roy 1999).

One worker with whom I quickly became close, Abu Omar, now lived in Eizeriyya, perhaps a hundred meters from the separation wall. When he got a permit to visit Jerusalem, whose Old City used to be a five-minute drive from his home, he showed me the now-dormant wholesale market in the Al-Tur neighborhood where his family used to buy produce for their shop in Eizeriyya, before the wall cut their family shop off from its supplier and its customers inside the city, dramatically worsening Abu Omar's financial situation and pushing him to look for work in the settlement. These shifts also left him perpetually broke and even in debt.

Abu Omar also took me on frequent visits to his home village, also just outside the separation barrier but a bit further north, between Jerusalem and Ramallah; on a visit there for a family wedding, he, his brother and nephew drove me to a hilltop where we looked down at lush hills and olive orchards with Israel's separation barrier snaking through them. Here the barrier took the form of an electric fence with parallel dirt security roads patrolled by military jeeps. In this vein of ongoing land loss, some of the Bedouin among these workers at Super-Israel were

experiencing ongoing Israeli attempts to forcibly relocate them, and not for the first time, in order to make way for the establishment of this very settlement. Going back to the settlement's establishment in the 1970s and its dramatic growth in the 1980s, the state of Israel had also expropriated lands from the towns of many of the other Palestinian workers.

A key aspect of West Bank Palestinians' vulnerability here was the fact that they needed permits to work in the settlement. As other scholars have noted, these permits are issued by the Civil Administration, the body within the Israeli military that administers the everyday affairs of the occupation (Farsakh 2005; Kelly 2009; Berda 2017; Azoulay and Ophir 2012). The permits are subject to security clearance by the *shabak* (the Israel Security Agency or Shin Bet), and can be withheld or revoked for a wide range of reasons categorized as "security": first and foremost, if workers have affiliation with Palestinian political factions, especially those that are banned by Israel. Even arrests long in the past, or arrests by close family members can keep one from getting a permit. Permits can also be withheld or revoked to pressure workers into being informants for the *shabak*. Workers had many stories of being arrested, interrogated, and entrapped in this manner (see Chapter Two). Jerusalemite Palestinians, who were permanent residents of Israel and did not need work permits, were still living in a *de facto* police state, and thus still subject to pressure from Israeli authorities to collaborate.

The Civil Administration also revoked permits for those who transgressed minor rules of the occupation in Area C. A few months into my time at the store, a Bedouin Palestinian named Abu Ahmad, who had worked there for many years, lost his permit because his brother built a playground without a permit, and the *shabak* used this as a pretext to visit the brother and try to pressure him into becoming a collaborator; when he refused, both he and Abu Ahmad lost their

permits.[11] Thus settlement jobs were the workers' only chance to work in the Israeli economy, given the added difficulty of getting permits to enter Israel (Farsakh 2005); even though many workers expressed that working in settlements was not ideal for them for various reasons (see Chapter One), they felt compelled to economically. Not surprisingly, the immense leverage of the employers and the state meant that unionization and unionism were extremely rare for Palestinians in settlement workplaces. As we will see, workers considered such activities a recipe for losing their job or permit, and often laughed off the idea of filing complaints for the routine workplace discrimination they faced.

Paradoxically, even as they faced this governmental repression, workers at companies with public profiles such as Super-Israel still held nominal, limited labor rights such as making minimum wage, sick days and severance pay (in certain conditions). They could theoretically go to Israeli courts to enforce these rights, due to an Israeli court decision in 2007, even though in practice, doing so was so risky that they almost never did.[12]

Within this category of West Bank Palestinians, Bedouin Palestinians were not only the ones most actively losing their land, in the form of demolition of their encampments, land expropriation and forced relocation that was imminent during my fieldwork. Within the store, the Bedouin were mostly relegated to the bottom of the scales of pay and dignity. They were mostly cleaning workers who did not receive any of the small promotions that some other Palestinians got.

[11] On these restrictions and their implications, see the workplace debate between Muhammad and the sales rep from Tel Aviv in the penultimate section of Chapter Three.
[12] Going to Israeli courts seemed more likely to happen in dramatic, nothing-to-lose cases where Israeli employers abruptly closed down a factory, stole the wages from many workers at once, etc. On Palestinian labor rights issues and litigation in Israeli courts, see Kadman 2012.

Moving up the ladder at the store, there were Palestinians from occupied East Jerusalem, or Jerusalemites [Ar. *maqdisiin*]. Jerusalemites are mostly permanent residents (not citizens) of Israel. They have nominal civil rights that are somewhat more enforceable than those of West Bank Palestinians; but they are not allowed to vote in Israeli national elections, experience very high poverty rates, and live under a variation of occupation that is enforced by the Israel Police and Border Police, not the military. Jerusalemites do not require special permits to work anywhere in Israel or settlements. But at Super-Israel, they still mostly remained in entry-level positions. Their added privileges were minimal. They often worked for outside companies that paid slightly better than the supermarket itself. Within the store's hierarchies, they were somewhat more likely than West Bankers to be department managers, who might make slightly more than minimum wage and have some extra authority over assigning shifts. But I did not see any advance higher than this. Moving even further up the ladder, the ten or so Palestinian *citizens* of Israel who worked at this store had these small perks as well.

To sum up, all these groups faced overlapping but graduated forms of discrimination and insecurity in the Israeli labor market, directly shaped by their graduated political statuses under the Israeli regime.

In describing these political conditions of employment in interviews, Jerusalemites and West Bank Palestinians consistently relayed that a key consequence for them, for some the "rule number one," was that they must "stay quiet" and "not talk politics" at work, so as not to risk their jobs or their permits. Yet even if they mostly avoided engaging directly, they were still part of the antagonistic social dynamics that were often initiated by Israelis. Throughout the dissertation I attend to various Palestinian practices that could further such dynamics and tensions. These range from forms of refusal (cf. Simpson 2014) that indirectly indexed Israeli

interlocutors' status as antagonists to a Palestinian soundscape and counterpublic that existed in a dissonant relation to the dominant Israeli public.

Offering a condensed look at Israelis' interface with these differentially governed groups of Palestinians, this ethnography builds on the revival of interest in settler colonialism as a framework for Palestine Studies (Salamanca et al 2012). A key advantage of this framework, per Salamanca et al, is that it pushes back on the fragmentation that Israel has imposed on the differently governed Palestinian populations in the West Bank, Jerusalem, Israel proper (or 1948 Palestine), and the Palestinian diaspora. It does so by situating the West Bank occupation (on which many studies focus exclusively) as part of a broader settler-colonial project. I also aim to enrich this body of literature through my attention to the dissonances between the nominally liberal and bluntly coercive aspects of Israel's relation to Palestinian laborers from differentially governed areas of the West Bank and Jerusalem (cf. Abu El-Haj 2010; Robinson 2013).

Indeed, while most Palestinian workers in the Jerusalem region live under some variant of Israeli occupation, an inquiry into how Israeli power is normalized must attend to the complex co-presence of multiple configurations of political and economic power here that in many other countries have existed at different historical periods or affected different populations. For example, here, at least two different elements of settler colonization that are sometimes referred to as distinct stages – violent mass dispossession and the management of remaining native presence – overlap historically (Wolfe 1999). There are also possible analogies of Israel/Palestine to the situations of migrant labor in the U.S. and elsewhere, where non-citizen laborers face intense forms of state coercion and exclusion, and a mix of intimacy, dramatic hierarchy and dependency vis-à-vis employers from the dominant polity (Kadman 2012; cf.

Bornstein 2002). And here, these exploited, non-citizen laborers are also indigenous people facing ongoing dispossession (cf. Wolfe 2006).

From a slightly different angle, we might think of Palestinian workers as inhabiting multiple places on a continuum of exploitation, from contexts of overt coercion to contexts of nominally free labor: the active land dispossession (especially for Bedouin) that recalls Marxian notions of primitive accumulation or accumulation by dispossession; *apartheid*-style deployments of movement restrictions, permits and other forms of state coercion against a population to enforce where they can work and live, bound up with the broader discriminatory elements of capitalist labor markets; a Jim Crow-style dissonance between systematic workplace discrimination and nominal forms of equality and freedom;[13] and all the precarity and instability (for workers) of "free" labor that pertain in many capitalist economies around the world, such as a lack of control over work hours, a lack of benefits, the prevalence of stolen wages, and much more.

Thus, though my text mostly engages with the concept of settler colonialism and the relevant comparisons and literatures, my argument also points to the broader coupling of baldly coercive and nominally free forms of political relations. Furthermore, while my ethnography does not explicitly flesh out structural comparisons between Israel's neoliberal-settler project and the terminology and history of apartheid as used elsewhere, I expect readers will find resonances between these various forms of domination and ways of enriching comparisons between them. In contemporary critical theories and geographies that engage Israel/Palestine, such resonances are often evoked by highlighting the most extreme manifestations of an Israeli politics of militarized infrastructure, violence, movement restriction and abandonment, especially in Gaza (Gregory

[13] For discussions that pursue analogies between Israel and South African apartheid, see Pappé 2015; Clarno 2017; Eid and Clarno 2017.

2004; Weizman 2006; Lentin 2009). For its part, *Enemies in the Aisles* evokes more ordinary, even intimate forms of encounter between Israelis and Palestinians, in which violence hovers over and saturates everyday life, and enactments of supremacy and domination take on banal, sometimes playful, and often ambiguous forms. *Enemies* offers this granular, ethnographic texture to enrich analogies between Israel/Palestine and other sites of domination.

The Limits of Market Depoliticization: the Politics of Antagonistic and Dissonant Encounter on a Settler Frontier

This granular ethnographic approach can help us complicate existing accounts that have emphasized broad structures and logics of Israeli colonization and the way they align with neoliberal political economy (Algazi 2006; Clarno 2017).[14]Simultaneously, my approach points to the practical limits of market depoliticization in everyday life, and the analytical limits of some anthropologists' and political theorists' emphasis on this depoliticization as a feature of life in neoliberal conditions.

The everyday workings of market ideologies, and the socio-cultural dimensions of markets in general, have not been an especially prominent theme in recent critical studies of Israeli occupation, though some anthropologists have explored these dimensions in the context of Israeli-Palestinian relations inside the Green Line (Stein 2008; Rabinowitz 1997; Monterescu 2009, 2015).[15] There are at least three scholarly tendencies that have helped make a focus on

[14] An exemplary passage in Clarno's fascinating *Neoliberal Apartheid* frames this alignment as having a perfect quality: "Intersecting perfectly with the settler colonial logic that predisposed Israel to treat the Palestinians as a surplus population, neoliberal restructuring has intensified the exclusionary dynamics of racial capitalism" (2017: 40).

[15] Rebecca L. Stein's *Itineraries in Conflict: Israelis, Palestinians and the Political Lives of Tourism* (2008) includes some ethnography of Israeli-Palestinian market encounters in Palestinian service establishments inside the Green Line. Her discussion of themes of depoliticizing Israeli-Palestinian encounters and notions of market coexistence has been generative for this project, and crucial to my sense

market cultures and ideologies in the West Bank so rare: a) the dominance, in critical Palestine Studies, of Marxian political economy as a method, as well as the longstanding dominance in Middle East Studies of diplomatic history; b) a tendency, especially among critical Israeli scholars, to focus on broad sociological structures and social categories by which one can classify and analyze "Israeli society"; and c) more recently, a large-scale application, also by critical Israeli scholars, of Foucault's work that tends to focus broadly on Israeli logics of governance in the Occupied Territories and beyond (Gordon 2008; Azoulay and Ophir 2012). None of these paradigms has given much attention to ideology or culture as something beyond a trait of particular sociological groups, an explanation for a particular outcome, or something that is referenced as a smoothly working mechanism, rather than explained in detail.

To be sure, some critical Palestine scholars have attended to market cultures and ideologies, often at the margins of work that is more focused on political economy or geography. Palestinian political economists Raja Khalidi and Sobhi Samour (2011) have argued that the neoliberal framework of the 1990s peace process and the more recent efforts at fostering a neoliberal Palestinian proto-state under ongoing occupation have served to erase colonial dynamics, efface the authoritarianism and inequality fostered by the PA, and co-opt the language of Palestinian liberation. Summing up these and related processes, Toufic Haddad has coined the

---

of the historical background for what market coexistence means today. If Stein focuses on more left-leaning, mostly Ashkenazi Israelis from Tel Aviv and the Galilee who were key constituents of the Israeli parties promoting economic peace during the Oslo years, I attend to a very different Israeli population at a very different moment: largely rightwing, mostly non-Ashkenazi Israelis in the Jerusalem-area settlements. For this population, and for the rightwing Israeli governments it mostly votes for, market coexistence is largely decoupled from commitments to political peace with Palestinians, pointing to a politics of normalization within a broader political moment of indefinite Israeli occupation, annexation and blunt, overwhelming domination. Other anthropologies of Israeli market practice inside the Green Line have bracketed "Israeli market society" (Carmeli and Applbaum 2004) off from conceptual and sometimes empirical engagement with Palestinians and questions of colonialism. For a critique of this bracketing, albeit from a more structural sociological angle, see Shafir and Peled 2002.

dark term "Palestine, Ltd." (2015; cf. Comaroff and Comaroff 2009). Lisa Taraki (2008), Kareem Rabie (2013) and Helga Tawil-Souri (2015) all explore the impact of neoliberalism through partially ethnographic approaches and with some focus on socio-cultural practices and discourses, as does Clarno (2017). But these studies often assume the functional alignment of capitalism with Israeli settler colonization and occupation; they mostly do not attend to market practices and ideologies at an everyday, granular level; and, like other definitive ethnographies of Palestinian life (Allen 2008, 2013; Bishara 2012, 2015), do not attend to market ideologies among Jewish-Israelis.

Israeli critical geographers have come closer to my focus here, arguing that suburban, market-oriented elements of Israeli settlement development and architecture help to make occupation invisible to Israelis. But this literature mostly does not flesh out the everyday texture and limits of such ideological procedures, assuming the efficacy of such procedures rather than demonstrating it. Nor does this literature touch on market components in much detail, beyond some attention to real estate advertising in settlements (Newman 2006; Weizman 2007), and with the exception of Weiss's work (2011). Moreover, these studies do not give much ethnographic attention to Palestinian labor in settlements, despite the widespread presence of Palestinians in most settlements, which would seem to be a crucial factor if we want to understand how settler life is normalized.[16]

Anthropologies and political theories of market depoliticization in other contexts might seem a welcome language for understanding how the market helps normalize Israeli projects of

[16] Perhaps the framework of how settlements make "military occupation" invisible is too constraining, making the widespread presence of Palestinian workers in settlements seem unimportant (since they themselves are not artifacts of occupation itself, and are not always governed through overt violence) when in fact this presence as a social fact is crucial to the ways that settler life and settler dominance are or are not normalized. Certainly the topic of Palestinian workers seemed relevant to the settlers I interviewed when they described their lives.

settler-colonization and occupation. In general, these literatures show how market logics, especially in the context of market-oriented technocracy or "technopolitics," turn political questions into technical ones (Ferguson 1994; Mitchell 2002; Çalişkan and Callon 2009), thus eroding spaces of deliberative democracy and the public realm itself (Brown 2005; 2015), and, in Foucauldian fashion, deepening state power over subjects.

Anthropologists' increased emphasis on Foucauldian forms of power – on the constraints on, or even non-existence of, subjects' political agency – is in part due to very legitimate ethical and methodological problems with notions of agency and resistance. For example, highlighting the micro-political practices of dominated peoples (Scott 1987, 1990) risks constructing them as having autonomous realms of agency and resistance in ways that misrepresent their situation (Mitchell 1991).[17]

But this conceptual emphasis on forms of governance and control raises empirical and conceptual questions of its own. What kinds of political dynamics might constitute limits to the constraining, depoliticizing conditions of neoliberal governance? How can we conceptualize such a politics beyond the well-known form of democratic deliberation, and beyond simply noting that projects of governance are contested? Can this conceptualization better convey the complexity of the limit between depoliticization and the political, without implying an entirely clear or consistent line between them? *Enemies* proposes a politics of antagonistic and dissonant encounter as one way of articulating such a limit to market depoliticization in neoliberal conditions. My ethnography hopefully conveys that I do not see this limit as a straightforward line, but rather as an ambiguous limit-space, where social scenes can quickly cycle between

[17] I address this point further in Chapter Three, where I dwell more on practices such as political debates at the supermarket, which are political but are not best characterized as forms of subaltern agency or resistance.

apolitical and political modes of practice. I specifically focus on antagonism not as a structural situation of conflict (surely we can say this about the West Bank, but this statement in itself would not add much to our picture of the territory), but rather as a fluid social dynamic, replete with interactions, affects and forms of address that constitute a low-intensity struggle over the taken-for-grantedness (Hall 1988) of a dominant settler colonial order, amidst ongoing land dispossession and military occupation.

Crucially, my notion of political antagonism as a set of informal encounters or dynamics can be present even where organized resistance movements, including those for indigenous sovereignty, are suppressed or otherwise not especially activated amongst a given population. Indeed, there is no significant horizon of indigenous sovereignty or organized resistance for Palestinian workers at Super-Israel, even if the political encounters in which they participate are animated by *reference to* political movements, especially Islamist ones (see Chapters Three and Four). Distinguishing between political encounters, political practices and organized emancipatory movements may be helpful in further accounting for the politics of a generally demobilized and cynical Palestinian population in the West Bank (cf. Allen 2013). Among this broader population, Palestinians who work in the settlements are especially demobilized, in that they must be politically unaffiliated in order to have these jobs in the first place; yet they are still part of these important, albeit often fleeting, political *encounters* and *dynamics*.

For my claims about contemporary service economies and retail spaces as sites of informal political (here, settler-colonial) encounter, I converse with four literatures that I find promising for ethnographically theorizing the political in this way, all in conversation with the anthropological and political-theoretical literature on neoliberal depoliticization: political theories of antagonism and agonistic public spheres; anthropologies and social theories of

publicity and affect; anthropologies and theories of settler colonialism; and anthropologies and geographies of security and counterinsurgency.

First, I converse with and recast political theories of agonistic public spheres (Mouffe 1999, 2005) for an ethnographic inquiry into particular practices of publicity (Wedeen 2008) which are, however, not part of a democratic project. Indeed, my notion of an *antagonistic public sphere* implies a paradoxical combination of a) the political as a public sphere - usually conceived as deliberative and democratic practices among co-citizens, or by Habermas (1990), in an early bourgeois context, as a space that ideally transcends hierarchies and differences between participants; and b) the political as an existential relation of antagonism between political enemies. As noted above, I draw on and reconfigure Chantal Mouffe's distinction between existential antagonisms and agonistic public spheres. In the latter, participants sign on to a shared project, in which they may vigorously disagree about political alternatives—indeed, this vigorous disagreement is crucial to radical democracy for Mouffe—but agree not to challenge one another's very existence. At Super-Israel, as noted above, participants share a kind of public sphere at certain times, such as when Israeli sales representatives debate Palestinian stockers about the Gaza war. Yet this iteration of a public sphere is inherently antagonistic in Mouffe's sense. Moreover, at Super-Israel, there is no shared political project between Israelis and West Bank Palestinians, and certainly not a democratic one. Regarding the occupied West Bank more broadly, while there are pockets of joint Israeli-Palestinian resistance to occupation, and some political discourses that promote one democratic state that would include the West Bank, these discourses do not significantly structure the imaginable political horizons of most Israelis or Palestinians at present.[18] The issue is not merely that this public sphere entails disagreement or

[18] On intellectuals promoting a one state and/or democratic solution in recent years, see Hussein 2015.

political difference; most public spheres do to some extent. It is rather that in this public sphere, the disagreements are inseparable from an identification with, reenactment of, and the potential eruption of, violent struggle between colonizer and colonized—from elements of what Mouffe would call antagonism.[19]

Thus, I leave Mouffe's normative project to other political contexts, and reconfigure her categories to elaborate an account of an *antagonistic*, not an agonistic, *public sphere*. This antagonism corresponds to a mundane struggle over what Mouffe or Gramsci would call hegemony, or what I prefer to call the taken-for-granted-ness (Hall 1988) of Israeli settler-colonization. This form of the political is not the same thing as war or as violence. What is crucial is that everyday activities in Israeli-Palestinian market encounters are ambiguously structured by their relationship to the possibility of violence erupting, and by their connection via mass media to ongoing violence around the country. Indeed, political engagements at the supermarket often took place through reference to, or reenactment of, the Israeli war with Hamas and other Islamist militant groups in Gaza in 2014, or more local "lone wolf" Palestinian attacks, some of them not far from the store in Jerusalem and the West Bank. Palestinian workers even performed parts of the store as imagined geographies of Palestinian-ness and violent confrontation over colonization, especially through references to Gaza. These performances could locate Super-Israel as an extension of the more confrontational frontier outside it even when violence was not fully actualized at Super-Israel, which it mostly was not, and even though there were not organized struggles within the store.

[19] Other critical theorists of the public sphere also separate it out from violent antagonism. See Alexander Kluge's comment, cited as the epigraph in Miriam Hansen's foreword to *Public Sphere and Experience: Toward an Analysis of the Bourgeois and Proletarian Public Sphere:* "the public sphere is the site where struggles are decided by means other than war" (Hansen 1993). The thrust of Kluge's claim implies a distinction similar to Mouffe's, between realms of agonism and antagonism.

I also draw on anthropological and social-theoretical writings on the affective resonance and sensory politics of public address (Warner 2002; Larkin 2014; Mazzarella 2013, 2017). Mazzarella in particular highlights the contingent, unpredictable nature of affective resonance: its power is crucial to harnessing mass publics to projects of authority (e.g. populist leadership, mass marketing, and hybrids of the two), but can also undermine the stable significations that such projects of authority require (2013; 2017). This argument is helpful in making sense of the potential volatility of public address and sensory experience at Super-Israel—the ways it could both support and destabilize the project of normalizing settler dominance.

In relation to these discussions of affective politics, scholars' attention to multiple sensory orders—especially those of sound and listening (Hirschkind 2006; Larkin 2014)—has helped expand our sense of public life beyond the elements of rational discourse that are often privileged in discussions of the public sphere. Building on such work, in Chapter Four I focus on how ambient orders of sound and music constitute yet another register of political tension in the store, beyond direct spoken exchanges.[20] There I sketch a Palestinian *frontier counterpublic* at Super-Israel, consisting especially of the sounds of Muslim prayer and Islamist and other political songs. And I develop the notion of an often fleeting, unpredictable *politics of dissonance* between a settler public and indigenous counterpublic—a dissonance that is sensory, spatial and political.

Settler colonialism and indigenous politics

Because the antagonisms I discuss are primarily between settler and indigenous ethno-national groups (even if these antagonisms articulate with classed ones as well), *Enemies* draws

[20] Of course, these direct, spoken exchanges have their own affective and embodied components, as Chapter Three demonstrates.

on and contributes to recent anthropologies and political theories of settler colonialism and indigenous sovereignty beyond Israel/Palestine. These literatures have become a crucial site for thinking about the political in anthropology and the humanities. Earlier critiques of anthropology already called into question a focus on bounded indigenous cultures (e.g. Gupta and Ferguson 1997, Marcus and Clifford 2010). These studies now move away from the post-modernist impulses that structured some of those earlier critiques, as well as from an increasingly prominent focus on radical alterity between indigenous and modern/Western epistemologies and ontologies, which some call the "ontological turn" (e.g. Viveiros de Castro 1998). The settler colonialism and indigenous sovereignty literatures also explicitly reject the potential implication of the term "post-colonialism," that colonialism merely a legacy of the past (Massad 2006). They generally note that in settler colonies, "past is present," and invasion is thus an existing "structure" and not a past "event," because in these contexts, colonizers come to stay (Wolfe 2006; Simpson 2014). A key part of such literatures has been a focus on indigenous *sovereignty* and social movements which "refuse" or otherwise challenge settler sovereignty and governance in the present (Simpson and Smith 2014; Simpson 2014; Coulthard 2014). *Enemies* draws on the antagonistic spirit and anti-colonial orientations of these conversations to think present-day settler-colonial antagonisms even in a context where a horizon of indigenous sovereignty is not especially present. It also draws attention to *market* encounters and some related forms of public address, which have remained at the periphery of recent studies of settler colonialism and contact zones.[21]

As noted above, although I focus political *dynamics* between settlers and indigenous people, which are not reducible to forms of indigenous agency, I am still interested in the

[21] As exceptions see Cattelino 2008, Fisher 2015, and in a slightly different genre of colonial studies (albeit about a settler colony), Comaroff and Comarrof 1991, 1997).

indigenous practices that are part of those dynamics. I thus explore improvised Palestinian refusals of settlers' terms of engagement, in conversation with the more ambitious and organized indigenous refusals of settler sovereignty that indigenous anthropologist Audra Simpson theorizes in *Mohawk Interruptus* (2014).

Security, between military occupation and mall cops

Finally, I engage with literatures on security in anthropology, critical international relations, human geography and Palestine Studies. As part of my ethnographic focus on the ambiguities and vacillations between market normalization and antagonistic political encounter, Chapter Two highlights the ambiguity and vacillations between two forms of Israeli security at Super-Israel: On the one hand, there is a civilianizing, normalizing tendency, well expressed by the ostensibly civilian character of the store's private guards. This tendency helps fashion the experience of the market as a space of apolitical market encounter. Yet this first form blurs with the more militarized forms of security pertaining to military occupation. As part of this blurring, civilian managers and even customers at times act as extensions of Israel's militarized security apparatus, e.g. by helping surveil workers. This military/civilian blurring at times destabilizes the normalization of settler dominance.

This argument draws on anthropology and critical international relations literatures on a global blurring between military and civilian forms of power, for example the militarization of municipal policing and everyday urban landscapes, or the reconstitution of international military intervention as a form of policing (Duffield 2001; Lutz 2002; Jauregui 2010; Bachmann et al 2009). Indeed, settler colonialism offers a distinct version of the military/civilian blur: in Israel/Palestine, military conquest, which is technically temporary, is supposed to end and give

way to civilian settler life over time; yet it has become permanent, and militarism remains endemic in settler society, as my ethnography shows.

As part of my broader move away from Foucauldian notions of governance in order to elaborate an anthropology of the political as intermittent, antagonistic encounter, I push back here on a recent anthropology/science studies literature focusing on security. This literature approaches security as a series of proliferating apparatuses of governance, control and population management, constituted by expert knowledge and state apparatuses (Lakoff 2008; Masco 2014; O'Neill 2015); security as depoliticization (Hall 2012); and "logics" of security as laid out in counterinsurgency manuals, for example (Kelly et al 2010). My ethnography of a security apparatus's complex relationship to differently racialized populations focuses on the affective charge (Masco 2014) and everyday instability of security in everyday life (cf. Goldstein 2012), including the blur between its normalizing and de-normalizing tendencies.

A second way the security piece fits into my broader argument is to push analogies between Israel and other sites of extreme domination – in this case, sites of counterinsurgency in the War on Terror – to go beyond a narrow focus on military violence and infrastructure (Ophir and Azoulay 2012), and to show the tense, ambiguous relationship between military and civilian forms of security as well as the ensuing forms of everyday tension and antagonism. This can enrich these comparisons (Weizman 2007, Gregory 2004, Shalhoub-Kevorkian 2015) and potentially broaden them to other places where military and civilian forms of security intertwine vis-à-vis racialized laboring populations, which goes far beyond the obvious battle sites of the War on Terror, such as Iraq and Afghanistan.

Ethnographic method and access

A supermarket might seem too trivial or too easy a site for questions as serious and broad as mine are. Indeed, it is pre-organized and bounded as a field-site—by modern corporate logics that are designed to draw attention, in ways that might distract from other social and political questions. Yet, as I implied above, these are particularly interesting supermarkets, for they are rare and rich sites of Israeli-Palestinian interaction. Moreover, precisely because the supermarkets and other settlement business have drawn attention from public discourses, they are generative sites for exploring broader orientations of Israeli power.

My task is to exploit the supermarket's legible iconicity for a critique of these forms of power—not just to let the store's legibility, or the richness of exchanges within it, be interesting or pleasurable to read, but to highlight their political stakes at every turn. This critical exploitation of the store's legibility is one reason for my choice of the pithy pseudonym Super-Israel, which suggests an inquiry into the Israeli settler colonial project in banal, (super-)market form. My use of the name Super-Israel plays on the ways this supermarket commands attention from an Israeli public through bold forms of branding and aesthetics that play fast and loose with Israeli nationalism. "Super-Israel" playfully mimics this boldness as a form of drawing readers into the strange world of this frontier supermarket, hopefully to better understand the forms of racialized exploitation, settler-colonialism and antagonistic politics within it.

***

Studies of everyday, ostensibly civilian contact between Israelis and Palestinians have been rare in the West Bank, in part because this contact itself is somewhat rare. Mirroring in some ways the separation between the populations has been a separation in studies of them, where most focus on either Israelis *or* Palestinians. For their part, scholars critical of the occupation have either focused on how Palestinians "get by" occupation (Allen 2008; Bishara

2015) or on Israeli structures of governance and political economy, but not on Israeli populations or everyday life. Some have suggested that studies of Israel/Palestine are plagued by a "methodological nationalism" that merely reproduces the categories of Zionism or Palestinian nationalism; they have argued instead for "relational studies" of Israelis and Palestinians (Lockman 1996; Stein and Swedenburg 2005; Stein 2008). For his part, Daniel Monterescu (2009; 2015) has offered a rich ethnographic picture of encounter and co-constitution between Israeli and Palestinian communities inside the Green Line, in Jaffa, offering a full-throated and multi-faceted critique of methodological nationalism, which, for him, involves an erroneous projection of national political categories, including dualities of "immigrant and native," onto the complexities of urban life in what he calls mixed cities (2015: 7). While my findings overlap in some ways with his, and both account offer rare attention to the complexity of everyday Israeli-Palestinian encounters, my findings and emphasis also predictably differ given the structural differences between Israeli-Palestinian relations in what is now the single municipality of Tel Aviv-Jaffa, where most Palestinians have Israeli citizenship, and in the occupied West Bank, where they mostly live under military rule. In a settlement supermarket in the West Bank, there is surely some of the indeterminacy and complexity that Monterescu gets at, but there is no broader sphere of urban mixing because residential segregation is institutionalized and nearly total in the West Bank, with the exception of informal population shifts in East Jerusalem (Yacobi and Pullan 2014). Moreover, while I share Monterescu's interest in accounting for the complexity of Israeli-Palestinian contact, I also find the framework of settler colonialism, and the understanding of many Israeli practices in relation to a broad settler colonial project, as indispensable for understanding political circumstances in Israel/Palestine, and for incorporating political analysis into social theory. Needless to say, ethnography can and should offer a more

nuanced account of categories such as settler and native than some theories have (e.g. Wolfe 2006, Veracini 201), but I prefer this nuancing to moving away from the categories more definitively.

Moreover, settler colonialism can offer its own, resolutely political response to issues of "methodological nationalism." The scholarly lineage of the notion of settler colonialism is linked to the Palestinian national struggle (and purposefully so), and comes out of an earlier period in which this struggle had Leftist and anti-colonial orientations (Salamanca et al 2012) with their own critical purchase on categories such as the nation-state. The broad, intersectional, anti-colonial and anti-capitalist orientation that underlines the revival of settler colonialism as a concept in Palestine Studies is not the same thing as a nationalist orientation, even if the two often overlap. In sum, *Enemies* offers a novel attempt to link two projects often thought to be incompatible: granular attention to everyday Israeli-Palestinian relations and their complexity, and an account of settler colonialism that specifically centers tensions and antagonisms between settler and indigenous populations.

***

Part of what makes a site like Super-Israel a unique one is the major difficulty that many would face in gaining sustained access there, to the settlement in which it is located, or even to Israel/Palestine itself. This is especially the case for West Bank Palestinians, who cannot access such settlements without a work permit. But a range of Palestinians and those associated with them might find it difficult to do research in a settlement, given how homogenously Jewish-Israeli it otherwise is, and how Israeli police systematically discriminate against Palestinians.[22]

[22] Groups who have reported difficulty or harassment in accessing Israel/Palestine as a whole include Muslims, LGBTQ+ populations, Arabs, and other people of color, often including Jews of color, unless the person in question is otherwise made legible as part of, or a supporter of, the Israeli project (e.g. being part of a mainstream Jewish community, part of an Israel advocacy program, etc.).

Meanwhile, there are social limitations (of a much less serious order) on Jewish-Israelis being able to build rapport with Palestinians.

In this context, a distinct set of privileges and capacities as a part outsider and part insider allowed me uniquely rich access to Super-Israel *and* the Palestinian worlds within and adjacent to it. Of course, this access was by no means total, and my goal was also not a comprehensive ethnography of either group, which has been done many times.

On the Israeli side, I strategically used my privileges as an Ashkenazi Jew (a Jew of European descent) and an Israeli ID holder to gain access as a worker to an Israeli-controlled contact zone.[23] I was largely accepted and given leeway by the settlers as a particularly privileged category of settler in Israel, an American Jew or more commonly simply an American.[24] At the same time, there was profound—and telling—confusion among the Israelis about how I could be a young Jew but also speak Arabic and hang out so much with Palestinians. "So is one of your parents Muslim, or…?" one *mizrahi* Israeli woman asked me, and she performed surprise when I said both were Jewish. And Israeli managers were shocked and worried when they found out I regularly went to the neighboring Palestinian town to visit Abu Omar and other workers. They also did not know I was living in a Palestinian neighborhood of

[23] I had arrived in Jerusalem a few years earlier to do anti-occupation work and Interior Ministry staff forced me to take the ID when they saw that I had a parent who had been born in Israel and left as a child.
[24] There were stark power differentials between me and the Palestinian workers even insofar as I was American. Workers at Super-Israel understood that I was not *only* American—that I also had an Israeli ID—and a minority of residents of this settlement were also both American and Israeli. Moreover, in my initial conversations with some workers about the Gaza war, they expressed critiques of U.S. support for Israel (cf. Bishara 2010). When I asked one of these workers if he wanted me to bring anything back for him during a brief trip back to the U.S., he said "Obama's head!" [*ra'as Obama*], which became a running joke with other workers. (I should note that I presumed the joke to mostly be about Obama as a commander in chief more or less supporting Israel's bombardment, and not about his blackness.) Still, the category of 'American' retained a certain open-endedness in my interactions with the workers; this status helped, along with knowledge of Arabic (not from the Israeli military), my political views, and other factors, to create possibilities for relationships that were different than their relationships with other Jewish-Israelis.

East Jerusalem.

To be sure, building relationships with Palestinians in this setting was more challenging. After building ties with nearby Palestinian leaders and workers and discussing the research with them, I began work at Super-Israel and immediately began explaining to Palestinian workers there that I was an American Jew, using an Israeli citizenship that had been forced upon me to write critically about occupation and settlement. After a few weeks, trust began to develop, I began visiting workers at home, and I eventually grew close with some.

Oddly, I felt this relative trust and closeness develop when various Palestinian workers began telling me, on visits to their homes, that they had initially felt suspicious that I was there to "collect information about them" for the boss or for the Israeli authorities, but that they had then seen that I was "good." Later on, one Palestinian worker introduced me to a new Palestinian hire as "not one of them [the Israelis]," which felt like the crucial distinction for our rapport—a distinction that referring to me primarily as "American" had initially gestured at. Still, this suspicion of me, which lingered for other Palestinians, was as ethnographically important as my good rapport with their colleagues, for it attuned me to the deep tensions that pervaded Super-Israel.

A self-reflexive use of ethnographic immersion was crucial to my inquiry, as I let a fractured social space wash over me over a long period, seeing how it rendered me and what kinds of relationships it made possible, or not, over time. This reflexivity arises in somewhat varied ways in each chapter. The aforementioned questions of suspicion are crucial to my findings about a blur between military and civilian forms of security in Chapter Two. Beyond this, the opening anecdote of Chapter One indicates how important it was methodologically that I developed trust with some Palestinians to the degree I could supplement my direct observations

with multiple accounts from different workers about the continuum of things that were difficult for them at store. Having these accounts helped me better interpret Palestinians' direct exchanges with Israelis. In Chapters Three and Four, Palestinian workers' initial suspicions about me, and about Jewish-Israelis more generally, helps shape my account of the ambiguity, riskiness and exhilaration of Palestinian forms of address at the store, marked by questions about the extent Israelis were listening, understanding and/or eavesdropping. At the same time, the interlude between chapters three and four discusses how despite initial suspicions, some Palestinian workers at the store, even those I did not especially become close with outside of it, partially attempted to incorporate me into their social worlds, e.g. serious overtures to get me to convert to Islam. This closeness pointed me to the ways that religious categories often took precedence over political ones for these men, or at least were strong factors in mediating what mattered politically; this was crucial to understanding the Palestinian counterpublic at the store, and Israeli-Palestinian encounters there more broadly.

***

Still, in order to maintain the critical edge of exploiting Super-Israel's iconicity, I needed to shift my location to some degree (Gupta and Ferguson 1997). I did so in the last eight months of my research by scaling up beyond Super-Israel to focus on further interviews and immersion with a range of Palestinian workers.[25]

[25] As I shared my research with more Palestinian activists and scholars, most voiced support for it, but some expressed misgivings about me working in an illegal settlement. I had not previously heard these misgivings, but it was partly out of respect to them that I stopped working at the store soon after. Some of those conversations suggested that some activists would have preferred an approach to this topic that more clearly centered structures of dispossession and exploitation themselves—an approach I considered to better suited to others, especially Farsakh (2005; cf. Clarno 2017). Thus, while my interviews and immersion in workers' lives bring these broader structures of occupation and dispossession into my text at various points, the study nonetheless remains primarily as it was designed—as a focused ethnography.

During this period I made continued visits to the five to ten workers with whom I had become closer, usually spending much of Friday night and Saturday (days off from Israeli establishments) with either of my two closest friends from among the workers, Abu Omar and Yaser. We shared meals with their families, attended family functions and traveled to the areas where they grew up – villages outside Ramallah and the city of Hebron respectively. My closeness with these and other workers mitigated some of the distrust that others had for me, and made what remained of it less of a methodological barrier. Extensive time spent with these men also added texture to my sense of the broader, intersecting structures of occupation and economic insecurity in which the workers lived, especially since the closure of the Occupied Territories from Israel in the 1990s.

I also kept visiting activists in the nearby Palestinian towns, especially in Abu Dis, and worked with one who helped me interview local Bedouins who were fighting an Israeli plan to destroy Bedouin villages and forcibly relocate their inhabitants nearby.

Forms of Palestinian protest, Israeli military violence, and ongoing settler-colonial land expropriation hung in the background of the workers' lives. They spoke about these matters with me sometimes outside work, but they had to "stay quiet" about them at work and stay away from organized politics, even as they themselves were facing military raids or the imminent threat of home demolition and forced relocation.

For example, Abu Omar's home, like those of many workers, had been raided by Israeli forces and was regularly flooded with teargas from nearby clashes between local youth and Israeli forces. One of his young sons, Hamada, seemed to hang around the clashes as most local youth did, and that son also liked militant songs and toy guns (which his parents forbade him from having, lest they be mistaken by Israeli troops for a real one during their frequent village

raids). These conditions of poverty and violence put heavy economic, social and psychological pressure on the family; for example, Um Omar, who was diabetic and not receiving good medical care for her diabetes, sometimes said that even telling the story of the raid raised her blood pressure and made her feel worse. And Hamada often asked Abu Omar for money to buy snacks or go to the internet café, but Abu Omar was often so close to broke that he said no, or asked me for some change for his son, relaying this situation to me as an utterly humiliating one. Thus it was not surprising that Hamada struggled in school and had issues managing his anger, which I saw more and more as the initial boundaries between me and the family came down. When I later attended local demonstrations, the young son seemed excited. Abu Omar modestly praised my involvement but took for granted that no one in his family would be participating. Indeed, like many other workers, he was very cynical about Palestinian protest, the Palestinian Authority, the Palestinian national movement, and labor organizing or even filing labor complaints—a finding that resonates with Lori Allen's work on political cynicism among Palestinians in recent years (2013). He was much more focused on recovering his lost economic security and dignity than on such national issues.

Another worker about my age, Mahmoud, talked about political matters even less, at least at work; but he and his family were in a long-term, very expensive legal battle to save their family compound on the outskirts of Hebron, where Mahmoud and his brothers were building on to their father's house, from demolition. The Israeli Civil Administration had ordered the demolition because the home was in Area C, under full Israeli control; it was part of a clearly Palestinian part of the city, but not far from where settlements were encroaching on it, and from roads patrolled by the occupation, as I found out when we got pulled over and briefly interrogated as I drove to drop him off one day. The Bedouin workers at the store, some of whom

were under imminent threat of home demolitions and forced relocation to make way for this very settlement, were even quieter about these matters at the store; it was only when I later visited their encampment with a local activist that I realized workers at the store were actively losing their land.

Taken together, these partial glimpses of the violence of occupation outside the store stand in stark (although not total) contrast to the forms of Israeli-Palestinian encounter within it. The workers thus related to Israelis, Israeli institutions and Israeli-ness in a wide range of ways—a multiple relationality shot through with ambiguity. Super-Israel's commodities, from cheese to baby formula, were a good example of this ambiguity. In some ways, workers were intimately involved with them; they had integrated their Hebrew brand names and the associated jargon into their own contact zone vernacular which mixed Hebrew into Arabic, sometimes bringing home such terms to their families. Workers found certain Israeli commodities disgusting (e.g. the Emek brand of yellow sandwich cheese) or ridiculous (who would put grape leaves – a traditional Palestinian food – in a can?) but very much enjoyed others, such as Milki puddings, during coffee breaks.

They often brought groceries home in Super-Israel's distinctive orange plastic bags, which I occasionally noticed fluttering around Palestinian areas near settlements with Super-Israel branches. Because goods such as baby formula were sold cheaper at Super-Israel than in small Palestinian grocery stores, some workers even quietly resold these goods to Palestinian grocers to make a bit of supplementary cash, because (among other reasons) their permits were tied to specific jobs and did not allow them to find second jobs in the settlements, much as they tried. Meanwhile, local activists were mounting local campaigns to boycott Israeli products like these during the Gaza War. Like most workers, Abu Omar and his wife, Um Omar, rarely talked

about these forms of politics. When they did, their approach was ambiguous: each occasionally expressed mild approval of international and local boycotts of Israel; but they were resigned to, and used to, getting certain cheaper products at Super-Israel.[26]

One way I got perspective on these tensions between activist boycotts and commercial contact, organized politics and everyday ones, was to spend the final months of the research working with Husam al-Abed. He was a Jerusalemite human rights researcher who was himself a left-leaning activist, but also had worked at a Super-Israel branch inside Jerusalem, and he had family in a Ramallah-area village who were more similar to working class men like Abu Omar.

Husam and I conducted about 30 further interviews with mostly Jerusalemite Palestinians who had worked service and other jobs in the settlements and Jerusalem, as well as some other West Bankers and Palestinian citizens of Israel. This method facilitated rapport and trust with more workers without my having to spend lots of time getting to know them, and it allowed me to scale some of my observations up to make broader claims about Israeli modes of power relating to differently governed groups of Palestinians. It also allowed me to connect my findings from Super-Israel to broader stories that interviewees were telling about their employment by Israelis, such variations on the notion of having to "stay quiet" when working for Israelis.

Chapter by chapter

The chapters are on four themes, each marked by a tension between the normalization of settler colonialism and the limits of such normalization via various forms of politics in the workplace. The first theme is Palestinian interpellation into settler commercial publicity, which is marked by a tension between Israelis' affective investments in exploiting Palestinian labor as a

[26] On Palestinian ideas of Israeli goods having better quality, see Stamatopoulou-Robbins 2011.

form of normalizing Israeli dominance, and a charged Israeli antagonism against Palestinians that is in tension with this normalization. The second is security at Super-Israel, and the ways it can help to normalize Israeli dominance, but also how a blurring between the military and civilian can stimulate antagonisms and undermine normalization. The third is a focus on how workplace interactions can blur into distinct forms of settler-indigenous antagonism—indirect gestures and slurs, as well as frontal political debates—which constitute limits to the apolitical character of the marketplace and the normalization project. And the fourth is a Palestinian counterpublic at Super-Israel, which crops up in a dissonant relation to the dominant Israeli publicity.

Beyond these key analytical emphases, the chapters can also be read in other ways. The first and second can be read in part as a commentary on contemporary Israeli society in an age of neoliberalism, militarism and resurgent ethno-nationalist populism. The third and fourth can be read as partial, albeit oblique, cultural histories of Israel's 2014 Gaza war, as it reshaped everyday life around Israel/Palestine. And the last chapter can be read, in conjunction with my comments on my Palestinian interlocutors in this introduction, as an account of the political practices of politically unaffiliated Palestinians in an era of foreclosed options, with an emphasis on the patriotic resonance that Islamist politics has for many Palestinians in this constrained context.

Chapter 1

"Happy Independence Day from Super-Israel": the Ambiguous Exploitation of Palestinian Service Work

Late one afternoon in May 2015, a few hours before Israeli Independence Day began, Super-Israel was blanketed in the blue and white of Israeli flags and nationalist branding. The store always had a row of Israeli flags atop the entrance, mixed in with flags bearing the company's name. But today the aesthetic was intensified. Blue and white discount stickers reading "Happy Independence Day" [Heb. *chag atzma'ut sameach*] adorned displays of cookies, barbeque ingredients and plastic-ware all over the store.[27] Plastic Israeli flags hung in rows over the aisles and the deli counter, fluttering in the air-conditioned wind between Palestinian workers and the settler customers they were serving.

Perhaps the most notable intensification was that the Palestinian workers were not in their usual uniforms, which had the phrase Super Service [Heb. *super sherut]* on the back. Today they wore bright blue polo shirts, which read "Happy Independence Day from Super-Israel" in white, and bore a cartoonish Israeli flag on the back. Most of the 100-plus workers at the store were West Bank Palestinians and Jerusalemites. This meant most wearing these Zionist shirts were not citizens of Israel, but instead subjects of Israeli occupation.

The first few workers I spoke to said nothing about the shirts—part of their motto of "don't talk politics at work" [Ar. *tiḥkish siyasa bi-ish-shughl*]. Indeed, talking politics could

[27] In what follows, at various points where the language being spoken may not be clear, I use "Ar." to refer to translations to or from Arabic, and "Heb." for translations to or from Hebrew. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted. I translate phrases and terms that I judge to be particularly important – e.g. the official slogans of the store, and key phrases through which the Palestinian workers spoke about dispossession or discrimination, which are often distinct from a more formal Palestinian lexicon.

result in them being fired or losing their work permits from the Israeli Civil Administration.[28]

Then Tareq, a cashier, beckoned me over. He was a giddy teenager who usually asked me about what smartphones I could bring him from the U.S., and who struggled to support his family with this job. Today he was upset.

"For them it's a happy day. For us it's a black day [Ar. *yom aswad*], when they invaded us [*lamma dakhalu ʿaleina*]," he said, referring to the fact that during the events that led to the establishment of Israel, Zionist and Israeli fighters displaced over 750,000 Palestinians.[29] Indeed, some Bedouin Palestinian workers at the store, whose communities had also been displaced following that war, were now facing an imminent threat of dispossession to make way for the expansion of this very settlement, though Tareq did not mention this.

Tareq continued, "The workers said they didn't want to wear the shirts. But Shlomo [the Israeli manager] said, 'Whoever doesn't want to wear them can go home.'" That is, they would be fired, then likely lose their work permit.[30] "…You see, they know we don't have [other] work so they can do this to us," he added, his eyes wide as he got to the mechanism at play. "*Allah* is the only power," he said, shrugging his shoulders with a faint smile of resignation.

Later, others confirmed to me that managers forced the Palestinian workers to wear the shirts by threatening that they would lose their jobs, and that this wasn't the first time at this

[28] I often use the phrase "the workers" to refer to specifically Palestinian workers. I do this for three reasons. First, most workers were Palestinian—about two thirds, by my estimate. Second, I focused on this group. And third, Palestinian workers referred to themselves as "the workers"—[*ash-shagīla*] or [*al-'ummāl*']—by which they distinguished themselves from Jewish-Israelis. Jewish-Israelis made up roughly one-third of the workers. This included nearly all of the managers, and the vast majority of the customers (although some Palestinians shopped there as well).

[29] See Walid Khalidi, "Plan Dalet: Master Plan for the Conquest of Palestine," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 18, no. 1, Special Issue: Palestine 1948, (Autumn, 1988), pp. 4-33; Ilan Pappé, *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2007).

[30] See section entitled "The Service Encounter..." below.

store.[31] Abu Omar echoed Tareq's feelings of resentment at the episode, telling me over the phone: "We are Arabs! They should understand that, they shouldn't make us do this. What, I'm gonna wear the Israeli flag? If someone photographed me and put it on Facebook and everyone saw: *hadha 'eib* [that's shameful]!…." [32]

This anecdote serves as a rich starting point for exploring, on the one hand, how the exploitation of Palestinian service work at Super-Israel contributed to producing a Jewish-Israeli settler-national atmosphere and its temporal rhythms as taken-for-granted in the store; and on the other hand, how the workers' status as constitutive outsiders to the Israeli polity entailed certain limits to this process, pointing to broader tensions within the Zionist project today. With Palestinian workers already made vulnerable by limited work opportunities and a military permit system, they were under added pressure compared to Jewish-Israelis to work faster as well as to provide better service. Deferring to Jewish-Israelis as customers and managers also meant, in effect, deferring to their specifically ethno-national dominance; even the language the workers had to speak when addressing customers—Hebrew—was part of producing an Israeli atmosphere in this West Bank space. In fact, Palestinians' customer service work helped in many ways to produce a Jewish-Israeli settler-national atmosphere in the store. For example, Palestinian workers would have to work extra hours leading up to Jewish holidays, pushing their patience with customers to the limit; and the job also entailed offering and returning the greetings specific to these holidays (e.g. "*Shabbat shalom*" [a good Sabbath] or "*Shanah tovah"* [happy (Jewish) new year]) which were clearly not their own.

In a context of Israeli ethnocracy and militarized segregation, few Jewish-Israelis would

[31] Still, the practice seems not to have been repeated in the two subsequent years.
[32] While the vast majority of the workers complied with wearing the shirts, Abu Omar added that he had misled managers in order to avoid wearing the shirt, telling them he hadn't been given one, then taking extra breaks to avoid being asked about the matter.

expect occupied Palestinians to significantly buy into Israeli nationalism, and of course none expected them to mark Jewish religious holidays beyond the store. As noted in the introduction, settlement normalization at the store was about having a contained atmosphere where political questions were pushed to the background, even if most participants were aware that these questions were live nearby, in the form of violent confrontations and more. For Palestinians' part, the key was simply that they mostly complied, regardless of whatever sentiments of resentment they might hold.[33] In this respect, a certain kind of retail work was well disposed to mediate the ideological contradictions of Palestinian's constitutive outsider status here. Unlike retail work in some American contexts, there was no official idea here of workers, even Israeli ones, being "associates," "team members" or part of a corporate family. Unlike other forms of affective labor that anthropologists have explored in other contexts, this workplace did not involve managerial practices that attempted to shape the subjectivities of the workers (Salzinger 2003), encourage them to "be authentic," or otherwise "dip into" their "interior dispositions" (Muehlebach 2011).[34]

In this chapter I am not only interested in the ideological efficacy of this exploitation of Palestinian service work, but in the tensions inherent to Israelis exploiting specifically *Palestinian* service work—tensions already implied in the modest scope that this exploitation had to have in order to work to the extent that it did. I am specifically interested in Israelis' broader, collective ambivalence about employing Palestinian workers in the first place—an ambivalence between Israelis wanting and enjoying Palestinian labor on the one hand, and not wanting Palestinians around *at all* on the other. This ambivalence points to broader tensions

[33] I will discuss this further in a moment with reference to Wedeen 1999; Žižek 1989.
[34] To be clear, I am not endorsing an analytical distinction here between the interior and exterior of the subject—only pointing out that there is no self-conscious project here of mining workers' (alleged) interior dispositions.

within Israel's settler colonial project today, between an Israeli orientation of normalizing their dominance over Palestinians, and a different orientation of enacting that dominance in populist, antagonistic ways that has surged in recent years on the Israeli right (Anziska 2017). Because Palestinian workers are often some of the only Palestinians in the segregated settlements and Jerusalem, they have become key targets for this rising populist antagonism, especially during the recent escalations from 2014-2016.[35] In that period, the Gaza assault sparked populist calls to fire all Palestinian workers. It also triggered an increase in Israeli youth mobs attacking Palestinian workers in West Jerusalem, the West Bank settlement I focused on and elsewhere. In everyday service encounters, this antagonistic orientation took the form of both aggressive demonstrations of Israeli dominance, which I explore further in Chapter Three, as well as casual Israeli expressions of desires that Palestinians be absent from Israeli space, which I explore in this chapter.

My focus on these dual Israeli tendencies regarding Palestinian workers, dramatized by some Israelis' up-close experience of exploiting Palestinian labor, primarily intervenes in two scholarly literatures in Palestine Studies: one on Palestinian labor migration to Israel, and the other on the political, economic and spatial logics of Zionism as a form of settler colonialism since the 1990s, particularly the logics of exploitation and "elimination" (Wolfe 2006). Scholars have focused on the decline of two market-based forms of relations between Israelis and Palestinians since around the 1990s. First, they have observed a decline in Jewish-Israelis having ostensibly apolitical experiences of consumption in Palestinian urban areas in the West Bank. In a more structural register, they have noted the decline of Palestinian labor migration to Israel—

[35] As we will see again Chapter Three, this was not the first time that such negative counter-currents came into tension with Israeli desires for market coexistence with Palestinians. On tensions even during the years of the Oslo peace process in the 1990s, and much moreso as that process collapsed and gave way to the second *intifada*, see Stein 2008.

though this migration continues, and in settlements it has arguably increased (Farsakh 2002). In the 1990s and 2000s, in a system Leila Farsakh characterized as a "bantustanization" comparable to South African *apartheid,* Israel increasingly locked Palestinians into enclaves and regulated the now-diminished flow of their exit for work in Israel based on security and other factors.[36] Patrick Wolfe, the late theorist of settler colonialism, saw the trend toward Israeli confinement and killing of Palestinians and away from allowing them to come work in Israel as an acceleration of a Zionist settler-colonial logic that prioritizes "eliminating" indigenous people over exploiting their labor (Wolfe 2006). These shifts away from everyday market contact are undeniable, and significant.

Nevertheless, Israeli-Palestinian market encounters—and the idea of them—remain crucial sites for mediating a broader tension in contemporary Zionist politics between neoliberal pragmatism and populist antagonism towards Palestinians. To be sure, as some have argued, settler life has achieved much of its normalcy since the second *intifada* through Israelis' spatial, strategic and affective *separation* from Palestinians and the Palestinian question (Weizman 2007: 111-137; Tamari 2013: 56-58). But the market *contact* in service economies in the Jerusalem region, and the attendant up-close Israeli experience of exploiting Palestinian labor, stands as a site of rich and complex negotiation over the politics of normalization. Paying attention to this negotiation reveals an important account of the intertwined roles of labor exploitation, market ideology, and settlement normalization in the contemporary Zionist settler colonial project. Doing so also allows us add layers of complexity to Wolfe's formula of settler colonial logics of elimination trumping those of exploitation. Namely, a certain kind of exploitation, of Palestinian service work, is actually crucial to normalizing the dispossession (or, per Wolfe, the elimination)

[36] Again, as Farsakh (2005) notes, Israel was more willing to let Palestinians work in West Bank settlements, though this movement is still policed, as we will see in the next chapter.

of the Palestinians; at the same time, something like the logics of exploitation and elimination are at times in a real tension with one another, a tension expressed by Israelis' collective ambivalence about Palestinian labor—wanting the experience of exploiting it on the one hand, but not wanting Palestinians around on the other.

Attending to the exploitation of Palestinian service work also allows me to comment on notions of affective labor and interpellation in their own right. Theoretical discussions of interpellation have long had a structuralist orientation that assumes that the interpellation happens as part of a given social whole, and focuses on how subjects come to be deeply invested in their roles within this given society (Althusser 2001). Similarly, studies of affective labor tend to focus on the ways that a given project of classed exploitation or citizen-making—within a given, bounded society—dips into its subjects' "interior dispositions" via forms of care work (Muehlebach 2011) and certain service jobs such as airline attendants (Hochschild 2003). Yet in the various forms of service work at Super-Israel, we cannot say that West Bank Palestinians are in fact being interpellated into "Israeli society," because they are constitutive outsiders and enemies vis-à-vis that society. These gestures of interpellation only make any kind of sense within the confines of specific market spaces, and not within the broader West Bank landscape of segregation and occupation. An account of ideological interpellation across national lines such as these necessitates that we put aside the assumptions that interpellation takes place within a given social whole, and that interpellation is as fully naturalizing as Althusser often makes it out to be.[37]

[37] I draw here on Wedeen's interpretation of Althusser, including her attention to the ways that ideology can be "saturating without being fully naturalized," (2013: 845) or, we might say in this context, without fully naturalizing a political order. In some ways addressing my problem of how interpellation happens across national political lines, Wedeen also attends in this piece to the unevenness of ideological saturation even within the same national communities.

In what follows I contextualize my ethnographic account amidst broader tensions surrounding Palestinian labor in currently Jewish areas of Jerusalem and the Jewish-only settlement in question during, the escalations of 2014-2015. I then move through the broader structures of the occupation's permit system and racialized political economy to the everyday market encounters that they shape. I conclude by comparing Israeli Independence Day at Super-Israel in 2015 to early Independence Day celebrations after the conquests of 1947-1949, which also solicited Palestinian participation.

"He won't fire us - he wants to keep on fucking us!": a settlement's ambivalent relation to Palestinians circa 2014

One night in August 2014, I parked my rental car at the edge of the settlement where this Super-Israel was located and listened from a distance to a rally at the settlement gate. There, perhaps a couple hundred Jewish-Israelis chanted populist refrains: "Death to Arabs! [Heb. *mavet l'aravim*]" "A Jew is beloved, an Arab is a son of a bitch! [*yehudi ze-neshama, aravi ze-ben-zonah*]" That same week, Palestinians told me a relative who worked in the settlement had been attacked there, and Jerusalemites would relay a much broader pattern of such attacks in West Jerusalem in fall 2015 (cf. Switat 2014). Indeed, the escalations of 2014-2016 saw a surge in the racialized, antagonistic Jewish-Israeli orientation towards Palestinians on both sides of the Green Line that had been slowly on the rise for years. Crucially, this orientation also found expression in rightwing activists' and politicians increasing calls to fire all Palestinian workers from stores such as Super-Israel, which were known to hire them (Kershner 2015; Cohen 2016). Such calls were part of a renewal of the longstanding Zionist concept of "Hebrew labor" [*avoda ivrit*], which means the preferential or even exclusive hiring of Jews.

The rally was just one example of how this populist anti-Palestinian sentiment, and a broader rightwing orientation, characterized this settlement, as well other middle and lower-middle-class areas at Jerusalem's margins, on both sides of the Green Line. The settlement, like much of Jewish Jerusalem and nearby settlements, tended to vote with for rightwing parties, making the terrain of my inquiry, and of the politics of markets in Israel/Palestine today, rather different than the ostensible political liberalism of the Israelis on whom Stein's ethnography focused in the 1990s peace process era (2008).

On the other hand, this settlement was also often called an "economic" or "suburban" settlement—meaning that many had moved there for cheaper housing, and some there voted for centrist or even progressive parties. The settlement was not largely inhabited by core activists in the religious-nationalist settler movement, even though that movement had significant support there. Like some other suburban-style settlements, this one had undergone significant commercial development since right around the time of the second intifada. When I talked to settlers in the summer of 2013, they described the arrival of shopping centers, and national retail brands like Super-Israel and Café Aroma (a Starbucks analogue), as part of what made it feel like "anywhere else in Israel."

These businesses employed many Palestinians from neighboring West Bank towns and Jerusalem, and settlers thus also related to Palestinians through this economic prism. Settler corporations enjoyed cheap, vulnerable laborers, and settler consumers enjoyed seemingly uncontested relations with them.[38]

Tensions between Israeli publics wanting and not wanting Palestinians came to a head in 2014-2015. Some settlements temporarily banned Palestinian workers. Most, however, kept on

[38] Many settlers also hired Palestinians directly for piecemeal contracting work or odd jobs.

going to work in Israeli businesses; the difference was that the pressure, tension and threats against them were dialed up. Even during the "death to Arabs" rally, I watched a few Palestinians who worked in the settlement quietly walk home just meters away from the Jewish activists.

The Palestinians at Super-Israel had not heard about the rally, but they were aware of, and worried about, the public campaigns calling for their firing. Still, they were also aware of the broader political economic forces that made them attractive as workers to Israelis. As they discussed this one day at the deli, a young worker named Yusuf commented wryly "[the boss] isn't going to fire us – he wants to keep fucking us!"

Yusuf's metaphor can be interpreted as getting at the complexity of this relation of exploitation: it was about Israeli businesses' material prerogative to exploit Palestinian labor, as well as Israeli consumers' affective attachments to the experience of exploitation in these service encounters, which could mean getting to feel their own dominance or getting to *not* feel it. And for Palestinians themselves, as for workers in many contexts, Yusuf's comment pointed to the ambivalence of wanting—even desperately needing—a job that was unavoidably exploitative.

The service encounter at the nexus of Israel's occupation and racialized political economy

The broader structures of Israeli rule and racialized political economy helped shape the political and economic predicaments of Palestinian workers at Super-Israel. These workers' families were mostly of *fellahi* [peasant] background, and one worker estimated that in terms of class hierarchies amongst West Bank Palestinians, they were "not exactly middle – a bit lower." Many owned homes and some rented. Most had cars of models going back to the 1980s—Yaser's was in particularly bad shape. Some of these, such as Yusuf's, were *mashtoobeh,*

meaning they were not registered with either Israel or the Palestinian Authority, and could only be driven in Palestinian enclaves such as Eizeriyya/Abu Dis, mostly classified as Area B, where neither authority had much of an everyday police presence. A *mashtoobeh* car could be had for as little as a couple thousand shekels (around $500). Abu Omar leased a newer SUV—part of his aspiration for middle-class status that had taken root in the more prosperous years of the 1990s—but struggled to make the payments, and took out secondary loans to do so.

Indeed, most of the workers who headed households struggled to afford food and other basic needs, and relied heavily on borrowing and other forms of help from family, friends and banks to get by (cf. Harker 2014). Certainly, they were marginal from Palestinian political, economic and cultural elites. Yaser, a deli worker who was constantly broke and deeply in debt, blamed both Israel and the Palestinian Authority for his situation, in a conversation that was sparked as we drove to his mother's home in Hebron, as we reflected on how tax and import structures made it especially unaffordable for West Bank Palestinians to buy new cars, compared to Jewish-Israelis. People like him, he told me, were caught between a rock and a hard place [*bein al-maṭraqa w-as-sindān*]: Israel's occupation and suffocation of the Palestinian economy, and the PA's corruption and exacerbation of economic inequality amongst Palestinians.

As noted in the introduction, the workers' current state was shaped by decades of land-loss, unstable but previously more plentiful wage labor in Israel, and then the Israeli imposition of closure on the West Bank which devastated the Palestinian economy. Indeed, workers described the average available wage in these Palestinian towns at just over 2,000 shekels a month.

Wages were around double this figure at Super-Israel and other settlement businesses that paid the Israeli minimum wage of 4,000 to 5,000 shekels a month (the majority of settlement

businesses, especially those with less of a public profile such as factories and warehouses, paid more than the typical Palestinian wage, but under Israeli minimum wage).[39] In the memorable words of Muhammad, a Super-Israel stocker from whom we will hear more shortly, losing one's permit and being limited to working in the Palestinian economy was like "house arrest [*ma'atzar bayit*]" (he playfully used the Israeli Hebrew term).

Thus, West Bank workers were desperate to get and keep these jobs, or get them for their sons, even though most said that working in settlements was not ideal for them in terms of political principles, and/or because they felt socially uncomfortable working there. This was the best option available among various bad options.[40]

As noted in the introduction, the workers' vulnerability also stemmed from their dependence on work permits issued by the Civil Administration, sponsored by Israeli employers who could easily get them revoked, and cleared by Israel's internal security service, which most Israelis and Palestinian workers colloquially called the *shabak,* and which Palestinians sometimes called the *mukhabarat* (a term used around the Arab world for secret police or intelligence services). To get a bit more of a sense of what this pressure looked like, consider the following stories. When Muhammad, Yaser, and other Super-Israel workers had worked in Israel without permits in the 1990s, as those permits became harder to get, authorities had arrested them and tried to blackmail them into becoming collaborators; the request in each case was to

[39] For an account of the terrible labor conditions for Palestinians in Israel and the settlements, see Kadman 2012.

[40] Though the question of why Palestinians work in settlements at all was not my central one, I did get some inklings into what this social discomfort consisted of: it clearly included the humiliation of being discriminated against and of being made to celebrate Israeli holidays, but also included speaking Hebrew, having Palestinian socio-religious rhythms infringed upon (i.e. having to work on Eid, not being able to have proper *iftar* meals at work), and being in a setting where gender norms were different, which workers indexed with their expressions of shock at the way some Israeli women dressed. At the same time, workers also evinced a familiarity and intimacy (perhaps not the same as comfort) with Jewish-Israeli language and cultural norms.

help the *shabak* identify and capture alleged Hamas members in Hebron, where both workers were originally from. If they helped, interrogators promised them Israeli IDs; if not, they would arrest them. I heard a broad range of these stories from West Bank Palestinians and also from Jerusalemites, who were permanent residents of Israel and did not need work permits, but were still living in a *de facto* police state, and subject to pressure from Israeli authorities to collaborate (Kelly 2009; Cohen 2009; Shalhoub-Kevorkian 2015).

Over dinner on a cold Friday night at his poorly heated home, Yaser told me about a *shabak* attempt to recruit him in the 1990s, when he worked at a Palestinian deli in East Jerusalem without a permit. There was an initial "good cop" meeting back in Hebron, where a *shabak* officer had asked if he "needed anything," and he politely said "no, no I'm fine," apparently playing along with the knowledge that this was the beginning of an attempted recruitment.

Then one day when he got to the deli, there were three officers waiting for him. They brought him for interrogation to a police station in the Old City of Jerusalem, and the same officer who'd been in Hebron was there. Again, they asked in a seemingly friendly way if he "needed anything." He said he was fine. They offered to get him work with a permit, even Jerusalem residency, to "set him up." Then the bad cop came in and asked him to "bring them" people from his hometown, threatening to deport him to Gaza and separate him from his family when he refused. They told him not to come back to Jerusalem. He described feeling dazed when he left the police station: "I walked out of there and the first thing I did was go to al-Aqsa and pray, '*Al-hamdulilah* [thank God] that I was *samid* [steadfast] and stayed strong.'"

These various forms of political and economic pressure gave Israeli corporations and customers immense leverage over the Palestinians, and allowed for a pronounced exploitation of

Palestinian labor relative to Jewish-Israeli labor (Clarno 2017)—what Bornstein calls a "super-exploitation" akin in some ways to the exploitation of migrant labor elsewhere (2002). As noted in the introduction, Palestinians often worked the most menial, difficult and lowest-paying jobs at Super-Israel, such as stocker, bagger and cleaning worker, which Jerusalemites called "black labor" [*shughl aswad*]—jobs that, as some told me in interviews, Israeli Jews were loathe to do. The situation heightened Palestinians' exploitation relative to Jews even in the same jobs. One day at the registers, Abu Iyad, a Palestinian bagger from Hizma, noted this extra exploitation and registered his resentment of it: "They favor some people over others [*bfaḍalu nās ʿala nās]*. Them," he gestured towards a few Jewish-Israeli female cashiers sitting down the line. "They don't work! But they get special treatment. They get extra days. Look, she does one customer while they [Palestinian men] do three." Meanwhile, at the deli counter, a female *mizrahi* worker in her 60s, Rachel, worked much more slowly than Yaser and Yusuf; she sometimes simply asked Yusuf to do parts of her work for her, the way a customer might ask him for something, and without the reciprocation that the Palestinian men usually offered each other when sharing duties. Yusuf and the other Palestinian were wont to show respect to an older woman, but one less charitable worker, Asad the Jerusalemite, noted that Rachel only held onto the job because she knew Shlomo, the head manager, from the settlement. The other workers seemed to be clear that they did more work than Rachel, similar to Abu Iyad's insight. Of course, as a *mizrahit,* Rachel was, like many other Jewish-Israelis at the store, structurally disadvantaged within Israeli society, and may have had her own difficulties that led her to keep trying to do a job she clearly had difficulty doing, and did not seem particularly happy in. But the crux of my interest is in the structural factors that made it possible for her to work more slowly, and to ask Yusuf to do parts of her work for her, while Yusuf could not do these things and expect to keep his job; by

contrast, he went above and beyond what was asked of him in every regard.

To say that there are racialized, discriminatory forms of state repression and political economy operating here is by no means new. Still, it is worth noting the distinct and banal form that that discrimination takes in a supermarket. Moreover, there was not only heightened exploitation of Palestinians here in a material sense; I show, in this chapter and those that follow, how there was a heightened power over their modes of social performance, interaction and speech in the store. Put another way, not only do the Israeli state and corporations exercise and draw on negative power here – dispossessing and impoverishing Palestinians, preventing them from doing political or labor organizing - but the positive power of soliciting certain forms of Palestinian affect, performance and comportment that seem to affirm the normalcy of Israeli dominance, and normalize the status of this settlement, located on land expropriated from Palestinians, as a part of Israel. While the exploitation of Palestinian affective labor depended on these structurally violent and negative conditions, and included negative everyday injunctions – such as, occasionally, not to speak Arabic or play their music (see Chapter Four) – the everyday process of this exploitation was equally a matter of *soliciting* Palestinian practices, such as providing good service [*sherut*], speaking Hebrew and offering Israelis greetings for their holidays. This ideological play of speech and performance had distinctly civilian elements which are crucial to the settler project.[41]

Subsequent chapters will deal more with how workers "got by," to use Lori Allen's felicitous phrase (2008), in these adverse circumstances. For now, let me note that to get by here was not only to get by and carry on everyday life amidst the overt violence and dislocation of Israeli military occupation, as Allen and much other Palestine Studies scholarship emphasizes

[41] Even the forms of security associated with this workplace were often rather civilian, as we will see in Chapter Two.

(Ibid.). It was to get by the social forms of pressure that customers and managers imposed on their everyday practices, speech and social ties within in the store. That is, it was to get by "in the teeth" (Simpson 2014) of the specifically civilian, normalizing face of Israeli settler colonization—its specifically *settler* component. It was to deal with a colonizer who was often smiling.[42]

"Where did my bagger go?": Israeli attachments to Palestinian labor

At the cash registers, Israeli customers often expressed a curiously strong desire to have Palestinians bag their groceries. It was their excited solicitations of little 10-minute intervals of baggers' labor that initially made me think: there was a degree of "service" that Israelis really wanted from Palestinians, that they seemed attached to emotionally, and that they could only get to this degree from Palestinians here. Indeed, because bagging was "black labor," the lowest rung job at the store aside from cleaning jobs, it was mostly done by Palestinians, with the exception of a few Mizrahi and Jewish-Israelis from the former Soviet Union (who seemed to have these jobs because of their extreme socio-economic marginality even within their marginalized communities). So while the demand for baggers was not *technically* one for Palestinian service, it usually was in effect a demand for, and an attachment to, Palestinian service work. These attachments to Palestinian labor cut against a very different desire to experience Israeli space as free of Palestinians entirely. That is, Israeli publics wanted

[42] I borrow here from anthropologist Audra Simpson's (2014) notion of Mohawk political life happening "in the teeth of settler governance" and interrupting the latter. The phrase provocatively suggests an up-close encounter – as if indigenous people are in mouth of settler society, even as a struggle ensues. Still, as I develop my account of settler-indigenous antagonism and indigenous practices in the commercial contact zone, I will distinguish between Simpson's emphasis on settler *governance* and indigenous sovereignty, on the one hand, and my account of a settler-indigenous antagonism that occurs in an everyday social space very much distinct from (albeit shaped by) both settler governance and organized indigenous politics.

Palestinian labor but did not want Palestinians around, allowing for a new twist on former Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol's well-known comment upon Israel's conquest of the Occupied Territories in 1967. Golda Meir asked him "what are we going to do with a million Arabs?" and Eshkol replied, "I get it. You want the dowry but you don't like the bride!" (Gordon 2008: 1). In the ensuing years, the logic of Israeli rule was to control the land and manage the population without incorporating its people into Israeli society (Ibid.: 6). This logic, to the extent it holds, could set Israel apart from settler projects that have pursued the assimilation and incorporation of native populations more assiduously (cf. Povinelli 2002). But rather than attributing a coherent logic to post-1967 Israeli settler-colonialism—useful as it may be for the work of comparison—my interviews about and observations of settler feeling about Palestinians push me to attend to the constitutive paradoxes of contemporary settler affect. Regarding Palestinian labor, then, the settlers here are at times saying 'we want the bride'—of Palestinian labor—and times saying 'no we don't.' Or more particularly, they want this bride in certain ways, while being able to tune out aspects of her (like Muslim prayer) that they do not like, which we will see in Chapter Four.

"Bring me a bagger," customers would ask cashiers, and cashiers (whether Jewish or Palestinian) would be expected to recruit the baggers even if the baggers were taking a brief rest or barely finishing at another register. When a customer was waiting on line and a bagger at that register left for another task, the customer would throw up their hands and say, "where did my bagger go?" with a mix of entitlement and self-pity. "I come here for the baggers," muttered one woman in line, "and if there aren't baggers…" she threatened. Given that the vast majority of the time those baggers were Palestinian, I played in my field-notes that day with interpreting the statement as, "I come here for the Palestinian baggers." Interviews corroborated broader

manifestations of this Israeli solicitation of cheap, flexible Palestinian labor.[43]

The customers were mostly able-bodied people who could easily bag their own groceries; this was not only a practical request but a performance of socio-economic status that in this context could not be divorced from ethno-national and hence political status. Yaser, after having gone so far as to help resolve a dispute between customers that had nothing to do with him, put it to me this way in the driveway of his mom's house in Hebron: "these customers, they're lucky to have us and the service we give. They can't get that from other workers." The implied "other workers" were Jewish-Israelis, whom he watched daily giving slower, less polite, and sometimes even rude customer service, without the same pressures of employer discrimination or losing work permits.

Because of the extra leverage the customers had over occupied Palestinians, the workers had to cater to aggressively made demands, doubly affirming the customers' power as both customers and settlers. For example, some customers wanted to separate meat and milk (as part of Jewish dietary restrictions), while others scoffed at that. Palestinians were often expected to be familiar with these detailed questions of Jewish religious observance – which it was presumptuous to ask them to know, because they lived segregated from these Jewish-Israelis - and scolded if they guessed wrong. Some customers wanted to use many plastic bags in order to disperse the weight, while others would snap, "what, we're going to waste all those bags? Come on, I care about the environment!" Again, they often wouldn't clarify their preference until the bagger had begun.

[43] For example, Palestinian workers at an Israeli hotel in the East Jerusalem settlement of French Hill reported that customers would recruit their Palestinian colleagues for work beyond the hotel, saying things like "you make a good espresso – why don't you come work for me at my café?" In the settlement where I focused my research, settlers also recruited Palestinians who did outdoor maintenance work for the municipality to do odd jobs for them, or to bring their relatives or friends to do so.

There's no respect," Abu Iyad said to me as I worked a register and he bagged. "They're always saying 'do it like this,' 'do it like that… like you work for them [*btishtighl ʿandhum*]." This is a phrase I heard the workers use a number of times when they found a manager or customer to be too pushy with their demands, as if to stay 'I'm not your personal worker!' The phrase was characteristic of vernacular ways, among these rural, politically unaffiliated Palestinians, of critiquing their labor conditions without using NGOs' language of "violations of workers' right." The excessive leverage that settler-customers had in this exploitation process sometimes pushed Palestinians to register their objections in more daring ways, and in national political terms, as we will see in subsequent chapters.

But more often, it was Israelis themselves who enacted their dominance in excessive ways. These enactments had more and less confrontational iterations. One, that was not directly confrontational towards Palestinians, but nonetheless highlighted the collective Israeli ambivalence about exploiting Palestinian labor, was Israeli customers' casual expressions of a desire that there be fewer Palestinian workers at the store, or none at all. Here were everyday versions of Israeli public calls at the time to ban all Palestinian workers from Israel, which also echoed this store's initial policy of not hiring West Bank Palestinians. These expressions of not wanting Palestinian workers around sat uncomfortably with Israeli framings of the commercial encounter as one of coexistence.

On two occasions, when I was the only worker at the deli counter because the Palestinian workers were on break, Israeli customers explicitly tried to celebrate this fact with me. One customer asked me in a cheery tone, "Where are all the Arabs? Are they gone? It's just our people? [H. *bnei ameinu*]." Another woman told me, "Good to see one of our forces [H. *kochoteinu*] here, there aren't a lot." Here, a sense of relief at a decline of the amount of Arabs

on a micro-level—a fantasy indulged for the very few minutes this was true, in a small area of Super-Israel—was bound up in a narrative of anxiety about being overwhelmed by Palestinian presence on a local scale, which mirrors broader and longstanding anxieties among Israelis and other early settler polities about demography.[44] These brief anti-Palestinian comments could also produce easy moments of social connection between Jewish-Israelis, precisely animated by encountering and differentiating from Arabs. But they stood in stark contrast to the ways that customers otherwise desired, and were attached to, the experience of getting service from Palestinian workers. In the contradictory ideological equation of 'we want the bride but we also don't,' these were definitive, albeit passing moments of, '*we don't.*'

In other contexts, in which Israelis made the more negative kinds of sentiments clearer to Palestinians, this jarring contradiction between Israelis wanting Palestinian labor and either not wanting them around or being casually racist towards them was crucial in making Palestinians reflect negatively on their workplace relations to Israelis. In this vein, my interviews included stories of Palestinian workers, both Jerusalemites and West Bankers, doing exterior work on buildings or their grounds, and then not being allowed inside to go to the bathroom. Workers had a broader sense that some Jewish-Israelis were reluctant to bring Arabs into their houses. A worker who did landscaping and maintenance work at an Israeli park added "you stop to sit under a tree and they say, 'no, we don't want you here'" [his Arabic translation of what would have been Hebrew]. The same worker had worked for an Israeli company that got multiple contracts to do electrical work in buildings that Palestinian workers were then not allowed into, forcing the company to lose the contracts.

The "Israel" in Super-Israel's Customer Service: Producing Jewish-Israeli Space and

[44] For a North American variant of this settler anxiety see Simpson 2011.

Temporality

The service encounters not only affirmed Jewish-Israeli dominance, but specifically a sense of the store, and of the settlement, as part of Jewish-Israeli space and temporality. This affirmation was especially notable on religious holidays (cf. Deeb and Harb 2013). It did *not* quite entail normalization of occupation and class hierarchies through a corporate multi-cultural "happy holidays" mode, an American phrase with no Israeli counterpart. For as noted above, to say *chag sameach* in Hebrew, whether for a religious or national holiday, marked both speaker and listener as part of a narrowly construed, specifically Jewish-Israeli public. Rather, it was normalization of a consumer-settler *ethnocracy* (Yiftachel 2010), in which Jewish-Israeli religion, culture and language were the supreme constituent, and most variants of Palestinian identity were disqualified.[45] This went way beyond just Israeli Independence Day. Most of the holidays were nominally Jewish holidays, which were not only religious but, within a Zionist-Israeli context, profoundly social and national moments. Taking part in all of this was a part of the Palestinians' job.

Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year, was a holiday the Palestinian workers knew well. Even though the majority of workers, and a small minority of shoppers, were Palestinian, the sign adorning the store entrance before Rosh Hashanah during my fieldwork was specific about its addressees: "A good and sweet year, a year of love and peace… to the whole house of Israel." Yet it was still the norm for Palestinians to tell customers "happy holiday" [*chag sameach*]—a phrase which, when spoken between Jewish-Israelis in Hebrew, implied a marking of a

[45] The association between economic neoliberalism and socio-political liberalisms that one finds in Australia or the U.S. is complicated in Israel by its strong ethnocratic and ethnic republican political traditions, which racialize Palestinians as inherent others who mostly cannot be assimilated. On Israel's tense and partial adoption of certain liberal political structures before the neoliberal era, see Robinson 2013. During the neoliberal era, see Shafir and Peled 2002. On Israe as ethnocracy see Yiftachel 1999.

specifically Jewish or Israeli holiday.

Rosh Hashanah and Passover were the main occasions for the company to distribute bonuses—but they were only worth a few hundred shekels at most, less than $100, which the Palestinian workers pointed out was a low amount for the Israeli economy. They said bitterly that the bonuses, which were assigned with no transparent method, mostly went to Jewish workers, or usually to the same few Palestinians who had better relationships with the boss—for example because they invited him to a family wedding, which other workers considered shameful.

Muhammad, the stocker, had not gotten many bonus checks. When he finally got one after I had stopped working at the store, he ripped it up theatrically in front of other Palestinian workers. Abu Omar reported on this with a satisfied laugh to me and his family over dinner at his home. Muhammad was an especially bold participant in a whole class of playful, antagonistic and risky engagements between Palestinian workers and Jewish-Israeli customers, managers and co-workers, which I explore further in subsequent chapters. These included heated and political debates and exchanges of epithets were more triggered by political escalations such as the Gaza war than by Jewish holidays. Still, even if Jewish holidays was not the main trigger of the debates, they were crucial to the lower-level, simmering tensions that were a condition for further escalations.

Indeed, the aforementioned exploitation of Palestinian workers, and the Palestinian resentment that simmered in response, were deeply bound up in the Jewish-Israeli calendar. Here this meant that holidays became stand-ins for the excessiveness of the exploitation more generally, opportunities for the ethno-nationally discriminatory aspect of the exploitation to stated more clearly. As Yusuf and I sat on his balcony in early summer and I asked him how work was, he complained, “first it was Pesach [Passover] in April, then Shavuot [The Feast of

Weeks] in June, then they said it would calm down but they're still coming and coming!" Others said things like "'*Eid* Pesach is coming - work is killing us."[46]

Yet even if Jewish-Israeli holidays heightened Palestinian exploitation, resentment, and in the case of Independence Day, humiliation, they were not particular stimulants for the kinds of Jewish-Palestinian tensions we saw in the previous section. In some ways they were the pinnacle of Jewish-Israelis' ability to experience the store as a purely Jewish socio-cultural world, despite the fact that there were Palestinians all around. For example, one Friday as I was bagging, with Sabbath-themed elevator music playing in the background, I was struck that a customer wrote an ostensibly friendly "*shabbat shalom*" message on the home delivery slip before handing it to a Palestinian cashier, who would then pass the slip to an all-Palestinian delivery crew. The service encounter was driven by Palestinian workers, but customers did not have to fully contend with the Palestinian-ness of these workers, and the fact that they certainly did not celebrate Shabbat.

Conclusion: Israeli Independence Day and Palestinian Subjects in Neoliberal Israel

I want to conclude by comparing everyday market normalization at Super-Israel to two similar iterations of normalization in the past. Both point to the ways that normalization at Super-Israel today can be effective precisely because its scope is so limited, both ideologically and geographically; and they also point to the ways that this limited scope is well suited to, and

[46] The Jewish holiday of Shavuot – whose long tradition of eating dairy has in neoliberal Israel turned into a heavily marketed national rite of mass consumption – exacerbated Palestinians' frustrations, and became convenient idioms for them even without being the prime focus. Abu Omar would often complain about how customers fastidiously demanded that he slice their cheese thinly, a practice we noted above. Around Shavuot he seemed extra bothered, with the extra work aggravating his back, for which he was delaying surgery so as not to miss work. "Thin, thin they want it!... So I give it a little stamp," he said bitterly, showing how he would push his palm down into the cheese. "They'll never be able to pull apart those thin slices!" he laughed. As noted above, this kind of sabotage was nonetheless rare among the workers.

indicative of, a political present of indefinite occupation, neoliberal economics and increasingly illiberal Israeli politics.

As Shira Robinson relays in *Citizen Strangers,* during the first Israeli Independence Day celebrations in 1949 and the 1950s, Israeli officials forced Palestinians who had remained during the *nakba*, still under military occupation in the Galilee and Little Triangle, to attend spectacular state-sponsored independence festivals. Palestinian school-children and others read effusive poems and songs praising the new state and declaring their loyalty to it in front of the Jewish-Israeli generals that had ethnically cleansed and now occupied their towns (Robinson 2013: 113-152). For Robinson, these spectacles were part of an ambitious, albeit haphazard state project of cultivating the loyalty of Palestinians in the new state of Israel, of navigating the contradictions between being a liberal state that would include these Palestinians as citizens, and an ethno-nationalist settler-colonial state in which even Palestinian citizens would always be strangers (Ibid.: 8, 115-116).

At Super-Israel, in 2015 in the occupied West Bank, the gesture of normalization is different: questions of Palestinians' loyalty, and even their political status as occupied subjects, are bypassed from the start, and the only liberalism here is the liberalism of the market – which is fitting for an era in which the Israeli state is increasingly and more bluntly illiberal towards Palestinians on both sides of the Green Line. That is, the market becomes a kind of exceptional space, where ideological moves are possible that are not possible otherwise, including in the official realm of the state.

On its face, what Super-Israel demands from Palestinian workers is not all that different from what the State of Israel demanded from them in the 1950s - their outward gestures of celebration – but the significance today is different. While the archives show growing

ambivalence throughout the 1950s among Israeli leaders about compelling Palestinian citizens of Israel to participate in Israeli Independence Day celebrations, there were nonetheless major state investments in this project, and the basic structures of Palestinian citizenship in the new state were still being negotiated. In the 2015 example, the Palestinians in question are not citizens of Israel, but rather live under ongoing Israeli occupation; even Palestinian citizens of Israel increasingly assert Palestinian national identity today, and populists on the Israeli right are increasingly vocal about solidifying these Palestinians' second-class status. So it would be even less likely today for Israelis or Palestinians to expect Palestinian occupied subjects in the West Bank to be deeply invested in an Israeli national project that does not even nominally include them, and that no longer speaks of even coexisting with them—except, true to the *neoliberal* aspect of this Israeli rightwing reality, in these limited economic encounters. In terms of official discourse, for example, the Netanyahu government promotes "economic peace" but otherwise generally argues that Palestinians are so embedded in violent rejectionism that Israel cannot pursue coexistence with them. Ethnographically speaking, nearly all settlers and Palestinians I spoke to felt on some level that force, asymmetry and indefinite occupation are the horizon of the foreseeable future. As I suggest further in the next chapter in regards to security, the ideological milieu of Super-Israel did not fully erase these things; it simply de-emphasized them within a certain space, inviting customers to filter them out, even if they were well aware of them and experienced them directly in other spaces, and sometimes here. Here I am drawing on philosopher Peter Sloterdijk's notion of "cynical reason," as employed by Zizek as well as Wedeen, while giving particular spatial texture to this form of ideology—showing how it works to some extent within an enclaved market space of fantasy, even without necessarily working elsewhere, and how its efficacy in this enclave must content with its spatial limitations. This

spatial fragmentation maps on rather well to the metaphorical Israeli political landscape, in which the market is an exceptional space of liberalism: economic liberalism.

This limited scope of normalization—its confinement to the market space—also stands in contrast to another past iteration of normalization, namely Israeli-Palestinian market encounters in the West Bank before the first intifada. During the 1970s, these encounters often took place in Palestinian urban areas or at roadsides in Palestinian areas, such as the junkyard at the edges of ’Eizeriyya, which I explore later in the dissertation. Here, Israelis told me nostalgically, they would go to buy cheap goods and get their cars fixed, and Palestinian shopkeepers also spoke of these times as having been peaceful and better (Tamari 2013), though importantly, I did not know most of these shopkeepers well; and workers who I interviewed typically gave a more complex account of these times. The encounters not only took place in more areas than they do now; they were part of a broader, more optimistic orientation among Israeli civilians that these market encounters signified real coexistence, and among Israeli generals that the Palestinian population could be managed and political resistance contained, in part through market interactions (Ibid.). More modestly, for Palestinian workers, they had been sites of limited economic stability and, compared to what came later, relative freedom from movement restrictions and military violence. The Palestinian uprisings from 1987 to the present, and Israeli counter-insurgency, have significantly reduced the scope of such encounters, leaving Oslo-era hopes for market coexistence largely hollowed out. Today, these market encounters are limited geographically to Israeli settlements, under heavy, militarized security; the normalcy they do enable is the saturating yet paradoxically precarious normalcy of overwhelming domination.

Chapter 2

"The Supermarket Became an Army Base!": Security and the Military/Civilian Blur on a Settler Frontier

Introduction: Ethnographer, Deli-Slicer, Stocker—Spy?

About a week into my participant-observation work at Super-Israel, during the 2014 assault on Gaza, I was stocking dairy products with Hamdan, a West Bank Palestinian, when Noam, a young Jewish-Israeli in a black hoodie and jeans, came up to me. "Are you the new worker?" he asked. "Yes," I said, uncomfortably. I'd remembered him by his tough, unfriendly expression. Palestinian workers had told me that Noam had just returned from army reserve duty, where he filled in in the North for soldiers deployed to the southern Gaza front. Here at Super-Israel, he was a *kabat,* or "security officer" of the branch, employed by the Super-Israel company.

"Come with me," he said with an air of seriousness and curtness that in retrospect I might have shrugged off, but scared me given my precarious social positioning in the store so far. He seemed like he was on a mission. We walked briskly upstairs, past the workers' lunch area to the adjacent, closet-sized security office.

Inside, the other *kabat,* Yotam, and an assistant manager waited, all Jewish-Israeli men in their 20s. "Close the door, so people can't hear," Noam said, at a volume that would have been audible to the Palestinians outside.

Coming from the air-conditioned store, the room felt warm from all of the full-color displays of surveillance feeds.

Noam turned to me: "We have this Facebook page here, and – you speak Arabic, right? – we need you to help us translate it. It's from a worker at one of the other chains, and the *misradim* [central offices of this company] asked us to check it out."

In addition to being a bit afraid of Noam and company compromising my research and relationships with Palestinians, my interest was piqued. Their jobs were ostensibly to prevent theft or direct physical harm at the store. Why were they spying on Palestinian workers' Facebook posts? Was the worker really from a different store? And what were they up to in recruiting *me*, who, as far as they knew, was just a worker at the store? It was my first week of work. The Israelis had already seen me appear friendly with Palestinian workers, though they apparently did not take this too seriously. They seemed to know that I was the only Ashkenazi worker there, and my speaking Arabic alone made it clear that I probably had other work opportunities available to me. I had told all the Palestinians I had worked with that I was there doing research, and implied something vague about being a student to the head manager, who had seemed to ignore it when he hired me. A number of Jewish-Israeli workers had found out I was there doing research, presumably from the Palestinians, but neither Noam nor Yotam seemed to know this when they called me to the office.

Part of me felt this was a kind of hazing ritual, to clarify the status of this confusing person whom another Israeli had assumed must be at least half Muslim, since I spoke Arabic. By so brazenly placing me as one of them, as willing to spy on any old Palestinian, the *kabatim* created a conundrum for me: to refuse would have been to let on to my political commitments, and might have led to further questions from the management, forcing me to dissimulate even further or leave the job; but how could I participate and maintain the rapport I was beginning to

build with the Palestinian workers? They, and their *de facto* leader Muhammad, would have plenty to say about this matter shortly thereafter.

***

As part of the dissertation's focus on the ambiguity and vacillations between settler normalization its limits, this chapter highlights ambiguity and vacillations between two, mutually imbricated tendencies of Israeli security at Super-Israel: on the one hand, the *partial* civilianization of military occupation (within a particular space) which aids the normalization of settler dominance; and on the other hand, the ways that militarized forms of security end up blurring with the civilian ones in ways both latent and eruptive, with the effect of troubling this normalization.

The civilianizing tendency is well expressed by the ostensibly civilian character of the store's private guards, that helps fashion the experience of the market as a space of liberal civil society, where there might be space for merely commercial activities like consumption, and/or political debating that can be marked off from violence. The private guards are ostensibly distinct from state authorities, and certainly look it. They wear polo shirts, button-downs or plainclothes rather than fatigues, greet customers and other workers at the entrance to the store in an often friendly way, including Palestinians (and occasionally there are even Jerusalemite Palestinians working *as* security guards, though this is also the case in the Israeli military and police); pistols subtly hang on their belts rather than the M-16s of soldiers.

Of course, this is only a partial civilianization, opening up a space of military/civilian blurring and ambiguity between the political and everyday life. Indeed, many customers are off-duty soldiers or security forces in any case, and carry pistols and M-16 assault rifles as they shop, drawing occasional stares from Palestinian workers—little registers of tension that do not

quite amount to events. There are military jeeps in the parking lot, and checkpoints and jeeps on the roads nearby. Moreover, the whole arrangement of employing Palestinians who live under military rule relies on intense forms of monitoring that ostensibly occur out of view of customers and most workers, in which store managers cooperate with the Israeli military's Civil Administration which issues workers' permits, and the *shabak* (the Hebrew acronym for the Israeli internal security services, also commonly known in English by the Hebrew initials Shin Bet), many of whose operations are clandestine and at the margins of legal regulation. These ostensibly hidden forms of militarized policing structure everyday interactions in the store in various ways, especially they suspicion they foster among Palestinians.[47]

And at times, as part of the tendency towards re-militarization and de-normalization, civilian managers and even customers brazenly perform themselves and others (including the ethnographer) as actual or potential extensions of Israel's militarized security apparatus. Here, borrowing from Masco (2014) the Israeli counter-terror apparatus operates with a "boundless" effect, perpetually haunting the prospect of civilian personhood, space and time, in at least two ways. Almost any Israeli can come to function as security personnel, as an extension of the state, including by being deputized by the state to carry a firearm, as some are in the settlements. And almost any Palestinian can become a target at almost at any time. Even when Palestinians are physically absent, they can be conjured as an imagined threat. At an extreme, in emergency situations, managers may help detain Palestinians, including workers, in cooperation with the state security apparatus. And the anticipation and aftermath of such moments of emergency shape everyday practice in expansive ways, far beyond isolated incidents themselves.

[47] In this sense, I elaborate on what Grassiani and Volinz (2016) characterize as the varying levels of visibility that Israeli private security apparatuses can have for different audiences within the same space.

Taking the two tendencies together—of partial civilianization/normalization on the one hand and militarization/blurring/de-normalization on the other—and borrowing again from Masco (2014), we can think of these tendencies as part of an open circuit. An everyday normalcy in which latent suspicion simmers can give way, sometimes with the speed and energy of an electric current, to escalations of antagonism and occasionally overt violence; the return to a fragile normalcy can then also happen in an instant or over time.[48] It is important to the workings of these shifts that even where military occupation and its antagonisms are not explicitly acknowledged, participants can be dimly aware of these things on some level, constituting them as public secrets (Taussig 1999; Masco 2014). Yet scholars have often emphasized the ways in which the logic of the public secret is at the heart of the national security state and other forms of domination – so that even revelation of the secret can fail to undo its power. Going in a slightly different direction, I show how moments that push a public secret to its breaking point can partially *interrupt* the normalization of a form of domination rather than simply reinscribe its power.

In addition to drawing on theorizations of secrecy and suspicion in anthropologies of security, my argument draws on anthropology and critical international relations literatures on a global blurring between military and civilian forms of power. Key examples include the militarization of municipal policing and everyday life (which applies in Israel), and the reconstitution of international military intervention as a form of policing, which pertains on a broader scale to Western military coalitions (Duffield 2001; Lutz 2002; Jauregui 2010; Bachmann et al. 2014). Indeed, on a basic level, as societies grounded in conquest and violence,

[48] Here I adapt Joseph Masco's characterization of U.S. national security affect as having a "circuit of shock, terror and normalization" (2014), but with added emphasis on the ways that the open-ness of this circuit can unsettle not so much state sovereignty itself but its normalization, which is so much at stake in the West Bank today.

settler colonial societies constitutively imply at least some kind of military/civilian blurring, because violent tendencies in the present are shaped by the practices, institutions and collective memories of militarized conquest (Rana 2014; Masco 2014). The resurgence of the concept of settler colonialism in Palestine Studies partially attempts to connect Israeli military occupation in the West Bank to a broader settler project (Salamanca et al. 2012). This including connecting it to forms of Israeli military rule over Palestinians who remained under Israeli sovereignty after the mass dispossessions of 1947-1949 (Robinson 2013), as we saw in Chapter One, and of course to that violent dispossession itself (Wolfe 2012). Today, military occupation in the West Bank, which is technically a temporary status under international law, has come to feel *permanently* temporary for many Palestinians (Barghouti 2005; cf. Weizman 2007). Militarism remains endemic to Israeli society (Shafir and Peled 2002), mixed in to various aspects of civilian life, from social media cultures (Kuntsman and Stein 2015) to the homes of soldiers around the country (Ochs 2011) to what are supposed to be quintessentially mundane, civilian spaces: supermarkets.

My ethnographic focus on military/civilian blurring helps me converse with the anthropology of security, as well as with recent critical theories and geographies of the War on Terror. As part of the dissertation's broader move away from Foucauldian notions of depoliticizing governance, I redirect anthropologies of security which, intersecting with Science Studies, have focused on security as an object of knowledge and intervention by proliferating apparatuses of liberal governance, population management, and expert knowledge (Lakoff 2008; Masco 2014; O'Neill 2015; cf. Khalili 2012). This focus, in Foucauldian fashion, shows how such apparatuses undermine agentive politics and democratic contestation (Hall 2012), focusing on logics of governance, for example as found in U.S. and other counterinsurgency manuals

(Kelly et al 2010; Khalili 2012). Masco is a somewhat rare voice who is not only interested in the constitution of security apparatuses and the politics they suppress, but in the forms of collective affect, belonging, and friend/enemy dynamics (cf. Schmitt 2007) that they mobilize.

My ethnography draws attention to these affective and antagonistic elements of security, and to the instabilities generated by security logics' contact with target populations in everyday life (cf. Goldstein 2012), amidst an ongoing, awkward co-presence of violent military occupation and liberal forms of settler life (cf. Robinson 2013). I thus attempt to offer a more dialectical account of security – between its controlling and destabilizing, its depoliticizing and politicizing aspects – rather than focusing primarily on logics of security, their proliferation, and the forms of politics they *un*-do.

This chapter is also crucial to the dissertation's broader aim of pushing analogies between Israel and other sites of military occupation to go beyond a narrow focus on military violence and militarized infrastructure (Gregory 2004; Weizman 2007). I suggest we must further attend to the tense, ambiguous relationship between military and civilian forms of security, or between military rule and liberal forms of civil society—those two faces of Israel and other liberal-settler projects (Rana 2010; Abu El-Haj 2012; Robinson 2013). This focus on the multiple faces of such projects can broaden Israel's comparative footprint beyond the obvious battle sites of the War on Terror, such as Iraq and Afghanistan, to various service economies and migrant labour economies in other setter societies, in Fortress Europe, and even in sites of "militarized global apartheid" across the Global North (cf. Besteman 2017), where liberal spaces of civil society are intertwined with violent forms of exclusion and security, as well as racialized populism and antagonism.

The chapter proceeds as follows. First, I demonstrate how military occupation is partially civilianized at Super-Israel. Then I unpack how military/civilian civilian blurring troubles this civilianization through various forms of suspicion, militarized escalation, and performance of the supermarket as a space of political antagonism, continuous with violent confrontations happening elsewhere. As the opening anecdote indicates, my attempt to ethnographically immerse in a setting with such competing socio-political demands is highly productive here. For my confusing, interstitial positioning allows things like the wide net of the Israeli security apparatus—the capacity of any Israeli to participate, even the stocker at one's supermarket—to become visible as they wash over me. I conclude with an account of how a violent incident, during which a settlement supermarket "became an army base" points to the broader tensions that structure everyday Israeli-Palestinian market encounters.

Civilianizing military occupation

On their way to work, whether in their own cars or in the company van, Palestinians encounter various military checkpoints which focus specifically on regulating their movement and not settlers'. But at the gate to the settlement industrial zone where this Super-Israel branch is located, as with the gates to many settlements, we begin to shift from a zone of military security to one of ostensibly private security. There is a private security checkpoint here, where yellow-plated Israeli cars are waved through by guards in T-shirts, flak jackets and either pistols or assault rifles.[49] As at military checkpoints on settler routes, the guards appear to pay little attention to cars whose plates and passengers look Jewish-Israeli, for whom a quick nod or "shalom" in Hebrew is enough to get through. When I tried to give rides through the checkpoint to workers, I was occasionally able to get them through without having to show their papers, but

[49] Yellow-plated cars can be driven by Israeli citizens, Western tourists, or Palestinian permanent residents of Israel – anyone but West Bank Palestinians (Bornstein 2002; Bishara 2015).

was sometimes stopped and chided in Hebrew, while the guards asked the workers for their permits or made them get out and go to their separate pedestrian-only lane—one of those micro-forms of segregation one finds throughout the West Bank (cf. Weizman 2007).

This lane is essentially a sidewalk next to the road, where a guard stands in a small booth. There is no covering for the workers from the desert sun while they wait for a guard to come to the booth (and they often wait, for the checkpoint often seems understaffed). There is only a blue-painted railing that subtly separates those standing there from the road, and seems to double as a decorative touch, looking quite distinct from the mostly gray metal of the nearby checkpoints.

These checkpoints are sites of micro-political negotiation and antagonism among a settler and indigenous population who see each other every day—negotiations that continue between the workers and various Israelis inside the store, as I explore elsewhere. The guards are stern and sometimes cruel, other times matter of fact, but rarely as polite or friendly as some of the store managers can be. Getting slowed down at these checkpoints angers Ziad, a friendly but no-nonsense, slightly overweight Jerusalemite Palestinian about my age, who works at the butcher counter and rides back to Jerusalem with me some days. “Them? They’re dogs!” he says, as we approach the industrial zone checkpoint and they check the ID’s of the people in the car in front of us. He lives in Eissawiya, a neighborhood just down the hill from Hebrew University, just inside the Separation Wall but surrounded on-and-off by checkpoints and blockades throughout my fieldwork, as clashes erupt between youth and militarized Israeli police and Border Police. The barriers make it hard for me to drop off and pick up Ziad. He often calls at the last minute and asks if I can go around to a different entrance to the village, where after a few minutes he’ll emerge with his breath heaving from having run across the neighborhood. Workers from areas

just outside the Separation Wall in the West Bank are more permanently hemmed in by military checkpoints. Their towns are subject to similar raids, but more often by the military itself. And crucially, while they experience this military intervention by Israeli forces, most lack Jerusalem IDs, and thus do not get the limited services from the Israeli state that Ziad does.

At the Super-Israel store entrance, security begins to feel different from in Eissawiyya, Eizeriyya, Abu Dis, out on the highways and even from the private checkpoint at the industrial zone entrance. There is not a full check-point here, just a private security guard wearing a polo shirt and khakis, sitting on a chair by the automatic doors with a pistol in his belt, like at a supermarket "anywhere in Israel," as settlers from this settlement would say. He glances casually at people's bags as they come in, including Jewish-Israelis. At Super-Israel, the guard is often a middle-aged Russian-Israeli man, with a firm handshake and a *kippa*. Here and there he asks me why I don't where a *kippa,* and suggests that I apply for a job like his, saying it pays better than being a cashier (my job at that point).

The *kabatim,* or branch security officers, both have experience in the Israeli military and ongoing involvement with the security forces. As noted, Noam is doing reserve duty when I arrive in the summer of 2014. The other *kabat*, Yotam, is applying for a career with the Border Police—which is itself a fitting icon of the blurriness between foreign and domestic, military and police, within the Israeli security apparatus, for it operates in the West Bank, East Jerusalem and elsewhere near Israeli borders, and its targets are primarily Palestinians.

Still, at Super-Israel, Noam and Yotam's jobs are private. They sometimes wear the white, long-sleeve button down shirts that other managers do, while other times they wear sweatshirts and other plainclothes—itself a kind of adoption of secret police norms, and a private iteration of the blurring between police and secret police.

A key aspect of how the *kabatim* communicate their security goals to cashiers is to prevent theft by workers or customers. This seems to be the main focus of all those cameras throughout the store. In my new employee orientation, Yotam shows me how he can tell if someone tries to sneak merchandise around the cashiers, and stealing seems to be his main concern: "If you get caught, that's it, you go home." Later, when I become a cashier, I get another orientation that is again focused on preventing theft, even if its tone is remarkably serious, reminiscent of the Facebook "mission" in the opening anecdote.

This emphasis on theft shapes interactions between the store and its Palestinian workers, in a kind of labor discipline that blurs class with race or ethno-nationality. In the first few days, Muhammad chides me for leaving some merchandise in the wrong place:

> They're going to accuse us of stealing it. You don't understand. [Shlomo] wants to get me on every little thing! Once one of the sales reps wanted to bring me a gift on one of their holidays. I said no but he insisted on some toys for my kid, so I went to Shlomo and asked if I could leave the gift somewhere while I was at work, and he said no!"

Workers are not allowed to have any items in the store that are not accounted for in the merchandising system. If workers buy any food for snacks or lunch, they need to keep the receipt with them at all times to avoid being accused. This kind of policing against theft affects both Palestinian and Jewish workers, but as we will see, it is both directly and indirectly bound up with broader forms of policing Palestinians in which the Israeli state security services also take part.

The Military/Civilian Blur I: "Secret" Security?

To continue with this theme of military occupation being pushed to the background, much of the state security services' relation to Palestinians is conducted ostensibly out of view of the customers. This ostensible secrecy helps to facilitate an apolitical consumer experience in

which military occupation and its ensuing conflicts are deferred; though we will soon see how it is more of a *public* secrecy, in which the apolitical status of the supermarket is often rather unstable.

From interviews with workers at a range of Israeli service jobs, it became clear to me that the army's Civil Administration, the police and the *shabak* are constantly involved with this worker population, whether they work in occupied areas or not.[50] These entities used the military permit system as leverage against West Bank Palestinians to recruit collaborators to inform on their neighbors, and enforce rules of the occupation such as building restrictions. For Jerusalemite Palestinians who are permanent residents of Israel but live under a *de facto* occupation, the authorities use the economic vulnerability fostered by economic and political crisis. This system also works to suppress complaints of labor violations to Israeli courts. West Bank workers never brought up the prospect of making such complaints, and I when I finally did bring it up, they dismissed it with variations of the statement: "are you kidding? You complain and boom, no permit!" Finally, this system almost totally prevents labor organizing, which I never heard West Bank workers mention. Jerusalemites spoke of some proud walkouts but very few unionized workplaces.[51]

[50] The Civil Administration, despite its name, is a part of the Israeli military. It handles the administrative aspects of Israel's occupation such as distributing permits, managing checkpoints, etc. In areas under full Israeli control, the Civil Administration regulates Palestinian urban development, land use, and other civil matters. In areas under varying degrees of Palestinian Authority control since the Oslo Accords, the Civil Administration coordinates with the Palestinian Authority on these civil as well as security matters, a process which critics refer to as the sub-contraction of the occupation to the PA (see e.g. Gordon 2008).

[51] In my account, the question of Zionist-Palestinian relations through the economy has thus moved far away from when labor organizing itself was common enough for both populations to be a key site of potential cooperation or conflict (Lockman 1996). As Lockman documents, Zionist labor unions moved decisively to prioritize building a Jewish-dominated economy over solidarity with Arab workers—the effects of which are still felt today.

This *shabak* intervention often begins with theft as a pre-text, quickly escalating to entrapment as part of a broader, racially inflected project of policing, not entirely unlike broken windows policing in the U.S. (Camp and Heatherton 2016). One worker told me a story of a West Bank Palestinian who was stopped by police on his way home from work and accused of having stolen a small item. The *shabak* said that if he did not collaborate with them he would lose his permit. He came to other workers and they advised him not to cooperate. (I do not recall how the story finished, but such stories almost always finished with a proud declaration that the person refused to collaborate.) Workers had stories like this of interrogations going back decades, to when most of them worked inside Jerusalem and Israel. In the 1990s, with Israel's policy of closure, permits became harder to get, enforcement got stricter, Palestinians' illicit commutes became more dangerous, their employment even more precarious, and eventually many could no longer work inside the wall, experiencing economic freefall as a result.[52]

Other workers I knew were temporarily or permanently fired after the *Shabak* withdrew their work permits, for reasons such as a family member refusing to become a collaborator.

But this process did not stop with the *Shabak* – it was linked informally with civilian actors at the store such as the *kabat,* in ways that help make sense of why the Facebook incident could be so worrying to Palestinians. Interviews with Jerusalemites sketched a bigger picture of how branch security officers and the *Shabak* were connected when it came to Palestinians, though I never heard anything about this affecting Israelis. Workers suggested that *kabatim* would inform on workers to the *shabak,* and that the *shabak* kept tabs especially on any workers

[52] For example, before working at Super-Israel, Yaser had worked many jobs inside the Green Line without permits, most recently at a Palestinian deli in East Jerusalem. On a cold night at his home just outside Israel's separation wall around Jerusalem, he told me many stories of sneaking around checkpoints and border guards to get to work in those days. There were stories of arrests as well as of the notable attempt by the *shabak* to entrap him into becoming a collaborator. Other older workers had similar stories about the *shabak* detaining and attempting to entrap them.

who had spent time in Israeli prisons, though certainly not only on those workers. Workers also reported that the *shabak* might tell an employer that a worker had been imprisoned in the past, and the work could then be fired.[53] One worker with decades of experience cast the *kabat* as a kind of para-state presence, "There is direct communication between the security officers and the *shabak*," explaining: "The *kabat* at a store isn't just a guy off the street. He has reached a certain level in the *shabak*. He was probably working there and then had to stop for some reason, maybe he retired, maybe he was injured."

These forms of pressure and intimidation generally remained out of view of daily life at the store. Indeed, the stories I have shared here mostly come from interviews conducted outside the store. But they there was already a brazenness to the way that the *shabak* related to Palestinians, even if out of view of customers in service contexts.

The Military/Civilian Blur II: Public Secrecy, Brazenness and Suspicion

Moreover, as we saw above, these matters did come up in the store sometimes, for example through workers' expressions of suspicion and general awareness that they were being monitored in intense ways, *as* Palestinians. Indeed at work, Palestinians often just took for granted the interchangeability of supermarket managers, branch security officers and the *shabak*. The workers considered various Jewish Israeli colleagues and some Palestinians as well to be "spies," a rather loaded term when the impetus was often tattling for petty theft. Sometimes they specified that they meant spies for the boss; other times it was left unclear.

[53] This class of examples has interesting parallels to how mass incarceration affects employment prospects especially for black men in the United States. While there was the added factor here that the discriminatory imprisonment of Palestinians was more bound up in political matters (some of these arrests were likely for things like stone throwing at Israeli forces), workers' discourses on these topics did not make significant distinctions between "criminal" and "political" arrests.

As I learned when Noam approached me for translation duty (above), the prospect of Jews speaking Arabic was a major factor in making them possible spies. A Palestinian citizen of Israel with decades of experience working for Israelis said that many company security officers "know Arabic very well, Mizrahi and Ashkenazi. One came to me and joked about *sifara fil imara* with Adel Imam!" We laughed at the notion that the officers knew Arabic so well that they watched popular Egyptian movies. But the comment was as dark as it was light-hearted: the Israelis' knowing Arabic was the threatening kind of Orientalism that comes with military occupation.

Workers even suspected customers, often expressing this suspicion as part of their banal frustration with them. When Palestinian workers spoke to each other in Arabic or played Palestinian music at the deli counter or registers, Jewish-Israeli customers usually looked on blankly. Palestinians were unsure if these "unratified listeners" (Goffman 1981) were merely customers anxious to be served or malicious eavesdroppers. Yusuf, a genial deli-slicer who often slapped hands with macho Jewish-Israelis customers, surprised me with how matter-of-factly dark his interpretation was: "they all understand Arabic, I'm telling you – they just pretend they don't to see if you're talking about them."[54]

[54] Jewish-Israelis were open about their suspicion of Palestinians in interviews outside the store, and even at the store, within earshot of Palestinians—again, a distinctively brazen way of doing suspicion. One of the Jewish-Israeli female stockers started lecturing me right in front of Palestinian workers: "we can't trust the Palestinians, they aren't partners for peace. Here, they're good because they're dependent on the job. But in secret [*b'chadrei chadarim*], who knows what they're saying…." Needless to say, I found that Palestinians performed antagonism and resentment far more openly than she imagined. Interestingly, a Jewish scholar at an elite American university where I presented my research echoed this woman's ominous tone, asking "what do they [Palestinian workers] *really* think?" Again, the point is not what they *really* think, but the persistence of this question for Israelis and those who identify with them, as well as the (very differently situated) suspicion of Palestinians, which unsettle the apolitical cast of the market encounter.

Here, too, the workers had plenty of stories that linked customers to the *shabak*. Muhammad told me angrily about how one customer complained that they thought a Palestinian worker's Islamic-style beard made him look "suspicions"; they evidently had called the *shabak* and the worker lost his permit the next day.

***

For their part, Jewish-Israeli workers and customers brazenly performed their continuity with state security forces—right in front of Palestinians. This brazen-ness, while not constant, existed in close relationship to Palestinians' suspicion.

One ethnographic way I learned about this was through the brazen ways that store security, workers and customers openly interpellated *me* into potential security roles, such as in my opening anecdote.[55] These various kinds of informal recruitment pitches were based on the ways in which my positioning left me open to being interpellated as a Jewish-Israeli or someone aligned with Jewish Israelis (cf. Verdery 2014). These attempted interpellations of me, when as far as customers were concerned I was merely an overqualified cashier or stocker, helped to demonstrate the brazenness with which Israelis blurred the lines between military and commercial roles; on the other hand, in the opening anecdote, the interpellations could also be a

[55] The prospect of the ethnographer as spy can take various forms and is not unique to this situation. Verdery in Communist Romania (2014) and Caton in Yemen in the 1970s (2006), both wrestle with being suspected of being spies for the U.S. We might also think of classic ethnographies of indigenous peoples, in which the ethnographer was often identified with the colonial project, even if he/she/they had a somewhat idiosyncratic position within it (Asad 1973, 1975)—a situation in which ethnographic knowledge directly or indirectly advanced the colonial project (Deloria1988). Still, because this was a contact zone, the concrete situations that I entered were *already* shot through with the indigenous workers' suspicion of their Israeli settler employers and vice versa. In this context, being American actually helped quite a bit, and along with my expressions of solidarity and knowledge of Arabic, helped significantly distinguish me from Israelis despite my Israeli ID. Of course, some Palestinians remained suspicious of me, which was also revealing in its own right.

way of shoring up the status of a confusing person, of reinscribing shared assumptions and shared enemies by affirming shared participation in this apparatus.

The brazen-ness was on full display one day during the Gaza war, I was stocking yogurts with Hamdan, a Palestinian, when Tal, a skinny, brash Jewish-Israeli sales rep, arrived to deliver his shipment. I would quickly learn to avoid Tal. In between going over inventories with Hamdan, Tal began taunting him about the ongoing Gaza war, singing the Hebrew translation of a Hamas battle anthem (which Hamas itself had translated as propaganda): '"Go carry out attacks' [Heb. *lekh ta'aseh pigu'im*]." He prodded Hamdan, "Don't you know that song?" aligning him with Hamas in a way that would be absurd to the Palestinians, who saw in Hamdan the self-interested, impious and profoundly apolitical man who had invited one of the most hated Israeli managers to a Palestinian wedding in his town just to curry favor. The performance of Israelis and Palestinians as extensions of military or militant entities, coupled with other forms of military/civilian blurring in the supermarket, were key factors in making the store an intermittent space of political antagonism, which I discuss further in chapter three.

When Tal heard me speaking Arabic to Hamdan, he tried to pull me into this dynamic of antagonism. "Oh, you speak Arabic?" he said. "Yeah," I said flatly, sensing some unwanted interpellation on the way. "Oh!" he said.

And with Hamdan right next to us, he launched into a recruitment speech of why I should work for the *shabak*: "... it's easy, it's a good salary, they just call you up and say 'hey, we need to go nab someone in Ramallah,' and you go in there early in the morning, and you're home for lunch"—all as if Hamdan wasn't right there. Tal wasn't just picturing me as an intelligence analyst here; he was talking about the *mistarvim*, the Israeli units that dress up as Arabs to carry out the kinds of arrest and/or assassination raids in Palestinian cities which are dramatically

portrayed, for example, in the 2014 Palestinian film *Omar.* Before he left he took me aside and said, "really, think about it, it's a good deal." As with Noam, I tried Hamdan's approach: stoically nodding, faintly smiling and not really responding to the substance of the overture. This episode was a playful, brazenly open performance of the *shabak*'s "secret" work for someone from the population it targets. It made clear that the publicly secret nature of the *shabak* – that part of its power comes from the productive tension between its work being clandestine on the one hand, and everyone knowing it is happening—and, for Palestinians, can happen at any time—on the other. The public secret was also crucial to the paradoxical ways in which militarism and conflict both appeared and were modulated in the supermarket: they could be plainly visible but filtered out; ostensibly secret but bluntly acknowledged, sometimes with a kind of over-the-top or even humorous twist that somehow made certain things more sayable.

A few customers made similar "recruitment" pitches to me in front of Palestinians when they heard me speaking Arabic to them. The antagonistic positioning of settler and native meant, among other things, that my speaking Arabic to them could not be an index of my friendship with them, and surely not my solidarity or identification with their cause, at least not of those things being in tension with or outweighing the taken-for-granted-ness of my being willing to serve in security forces targeting them. Take this exchange from when I worked as a cashier, and was chatting with the Palestinian cashiers and baggers on the register line:

-Customer: Where's your Arabic from?

-J.S.: University.

-Customer: So why are you working here? Can't you find something in your field? You could work in the Ministry of Defense with that Arabic!

"Again!" I remarked in my fieldnotes.[56]

These interpellations were intersectional, with classed and gendered aspects bound up in my positioning as an Ashkenazi, small and not very macho, university educated ethnographer. Tal proposed a particular kind of intelligence work that was more reflective of the working-class, Mizrahi world he seemed to come from: to be one of the *mist'arvim*. This was also an attempt to interpellate me into the kind of Jewish-Israeli masculinity of being an armed soldier who *nonchalantly* carries out military raids before lunch, and who is skilled at mimicking the native precisely to ambush him.[57]

The customer's pitch was more honed to my specific positioning. From the start, he pointed to the implausibility of my being Ashkenazi, college educated, and working at Super-Israel. And he was voicing a very plausible scenario in which, as a college-educated, Arabic-speaking Jew, I would work as some kind of intelligence analyst in the Ministry of Defense, which is based in Tel Aviv.

[56] It seemed to bother settlers insofar as I was Jewish, for Jews should not be too close with Palestinians without some kind of reiteration of their Israeli-ness, of which I had very little to perform. It also seemed problematic for me to be close to them as an American, for Americans or other foreigners should not be that close with Palestinians either, certainly not without some mediation from Israelis. Said discusses a similar, more general dynamic, whereby the Orientalist proclivity to speak *for* Arabs gives way to a specifically Zionist claim to be able to speak for Arabs in Western public life (1978). Doing ethnography in the contact zone, where in some sense my primary relationships were with Palestinian Arabs, but very often mediated through Israelis, Israeli norms or the Hebrew language, especially at first, I found these Israeli insertions and recruitment pitches in front of Palestinians to be deeply frustrating and anxiety inducing. What would they do to my rapport with Palestinians? But these brash recruitment pitches were also excellent ethnographic material. And Israelis' inability to conceive of meaningful solidarity here made the case in its own way for how necessary that solidarity is.

[57] This reminded me of the way a colleague at an Israeli human rights organization, himself an Askhenazi iteration of the *sabra* - big, bald, plain-spoken and gruff at first blush, but with a less macho interest in jazz – made fun of me when I first lived in the country with my Israeli ID and feared being drafted for military service, calling me "GI Jeremy." Part of what was funny about this, and that Tal seemed not to get or care about, was that my own effeminate comportment and ethno-classed distance form violence made the nickname absurd.

Taken together, Tal and the customer's pitches illustrated the various forms of masculinity and personhood that militarism in Israeli society could work with. And when he said all this to me in front of Palestinians, it seemed he was not so much brashly demonstrating dominance over Palestinians (though to an extent he was) as giving a simple piece of career advice, of interpellating me into his world in which Israeli dominance and military careers were simply taken-for-granted. So a certain form of Israeli masculinity entailed a more brash kind of taunting Palestinians, while a more genteel, less macho kind could still parade military occupation in front of Palestinians' faces in a more taken-for-granted mode that was less liable to lead to destabilization.

***

The day after Tal's recruitment pitch for the *shabak* was when Noam came and recruited me to translate Facebook pages. Here, we return to a brazen performance of blurring the line between securing a supermarket from theft and doing national security surveillance; between private security and the state; and between Jewish-Israeli workers and this national security work. This was the kind of fluidity that Palestinians suspected was always lurking.

To recap, Noam had asked me to translate a Facebook page of a Palestinian worker, ostensibly at another supermarket chain, interpellating me as a Jewish-Israeli worker who knew Arabic; perhaps doing so as an Ashkenazi (European) and American Jew also lent a certain kind of expert authority to my status.

Even more than in the above episodes, I was extremely worried that any rapport I might build with Palestinians could be irreparably damaged here. For here the recruitment was actualized to some extent. At the same time, I felt that not at least playing along would risk arousing hostility and scrutiny from Noam and perhaps Shlomo; this exploratory interpellation

felt like an ambitious test of me by mid-level workers, trying to cut through their and other Israeli workers' confusion about my identity and reason for being there. So I tried to play ignorant and not tell them much, mimicking Hamdan's strategy of evasion.[58]

They scrolled through the photos, mostly political cartoons, asking me, "What about this one?... and this one?"

"Oh, this one is about the Egyptian president but I can't understand the joke," I would say, which was more or less true, though I surely could have tried harder or pulled up my Google Translate app which I sometimes used in conversations at the store. For other cartoons, they already knew what the gist was – basically, critiquing international media coverage of the Gaza war as too pro-Israel – and said "we get it, don't bother."

This raised the question: what, exactly, were they looking for? How would they know if they had found it? Their Arabic was bad, so that would not help much. But they seemed convinced that there was *something* threatening here about this Palestinian.

Of course, on one level, there was nothing surprising about a Palestinian being against Israeli bombing campaigns that killed hundreds of Palestinian civilians, and they even seemed to get this.[59] But it did not ultimately matter what they found. The investigation itself, and its attendant posture of suspicion about Palestinians served to: a) position these marginalized

[58] Consider a similar kind of recruitment for collaboration that Yaser faced at a checkpoint, also based on linguistic aptitude, but in vastly more difficult circumstances that demanded a far more crafty and multi-faceted evasion. One time, he said, soldiers stopped him at a checkpoint when he did not have the proper permit. They said, "oh, you speak Hebrew? Stay and help us translate and then we'll let you in." He told them he didn't want to translate and made like he was turning back, and "then I just went around the checkpoint," he said with a faint mischievous grin.

[59] In other contexts, there was an attempt to demonstrate that Palestinian workers were something like loyal to Israel – which again had a contradictory quality to it: of course they would go through the motions if forced to, and of course they were not that enthusiastic about Israeli Independence Day or Israeli holidays that vastly increased their work. I discuss these more incorporative hunts for Palestinian affect in the following chapter.

Israelis as part of an important national security project in which they could enact power over Palestinians. Indeed, this petty kind of playing detective—or, playing national security operative—was a part of these supermarket cops' aspirations to more prestigious, mid-level security careers, e.g. in the Israel Police, which were a common form of mobility available to the otherwise marginalized Mizrahi and former Soviet populations in this settlement. This identifying one's self with the national security apparatus suggests a populist, conservative politics (Robin 2017); and the fact that there were many similar cases during the Gaza assault, of Israeli workers or managers informing on Palestinian workers for their Facebook posts, resulting in their firing,[60] suggests the teeth of mobilization that this politics had. b) The investigation also it served to reproduce the notion of any Palestinian as a potential threat, even where specific threats could not be identified. In other words, the exercise was yet another example of shoring up a logic of settler and native, of friends and enemies, where such a logic might have faded into the background—indeed, where for some purposes, the management and customers might even be pushing into the background.[61] The line between the national security state and private businesses was blurred all over, on both sides of the Green Line.

[60] The following year, the Israeli security apparatus, which had of course been spying on Palestinians regardless of where they worked, began investigating and charging Palestinians around Israel and Jerusalem for "incitement" to violence on Facebook. According to reports by the Palestinian rights organizations Addameer and Adalah, hundreds of Palestinians were investigated in this way (Kane 2016). This was the Israeli political leadership's central response to the uncoordinated "intifada of the knives" that sprang up in Fall 2015: the problem was that Palestinians were inciting each other to violence. The former and current security establishment—emerging on the Israeli scene, in a parallel to the U.S. under Trump, as a more pragmatic, moderate force—allowed that the occupation itself was a significant cause of the uprising. But Netanyahu's more hardline position had significant popular support. Groups of civilian Israelis created Facebook groups specifically to 'expose' Palestinians as disloyal and get them fired.

[61] I have spoken to these contradictions in terms of Israelis' ambivalence about employing Palestinians in the first place in chapter one. To reiterate, when this Super-Israel branch opened, West Bank Palestinians told me that managers told them they were not hiring West Bank Palestinians; gradually, as Jewish-Israeli turnover became too high, they turned to West Bank Palestinians who now make up a majority of the entry-level jobs at the store.

The brazenness of these performances of surveillance in the workplace recalls the logic of the public secret, transposing it from state agencies to small-time mall cops.[62]
Scholars usually emphasize how the public secret serves to perform the power of the state in ways that deepen that power or magnify its mystery and allure. Surely this is operative here. Yet at the same time, performing Israeli domination in such brazen, excessive ways might actually undo a crucial aspect of Israeli power in the West Bank today, which is its normalization. For these brazen Israeli performances of the military/civilian blur stoked not only the Palestinian suspicions we have already seen, but occasionally mocking dramatizations of this blur.

Military/Civilian Blur III: Palestinian Suspicion and Dramatization of Brazenly Militarized Security

By the time I went back to the shelves to rejoin Hamdan, word had spread among the workers that I had gone up to the security office, the way it often did when someone was called up to the manager's office.

Hamdan asked me what they wanted. I told him that they had asked me to translate some Facebook pages, and that I told them I didn't understand it enough to help, aside from telling them some things they already knew. He shrugged it off.

Muhammad called me over a few minutes later, in clear view of Shlomo the manager's office and some nearby assistant managers, and he also asked me about what happened.[63] I told him the same thing.

[62] For example, in Masco's example, U.S. government personnel say they "are not at liberty" to discuss and demonstrate certain forms of threat or classified material. Even when these materials are public knowledge, they are performed as if they ere secrets, and the effect is to perform state power. There is a broader point here about the performative aspects of state security.
[63] Will add more here on the difficulties of my access. Key point: the fact that other workers continued to keep their distance from me helped illustrate the dynamics of suspicion in question.

"Look, I like you, I trust you," he said in his matter-of-fact, tough, almost cavalier way, managing to exude power and dignity in absurd, compromised circumstances. "I just wouldn't want them to come to you and say 'oh, what do the workers think about this or that.'" A friendly warning.

I said, "Don't worry, I will absolutely not do that."

"Good. Anyway, I speak freely," he added, gesturing seriously but nonchalantly up at the manager's office with its one-way glass. "They say this is a democracy right? …. But it's more democratic for some than for others!"

In this case and others, Palestinians actualized their suspicion in comments to each other, and to me, that highlighted the excesses of Israeli security, ridiculed the gaps between the self-presentation of Super-Israel and its actuality, indeed between the self-presentation of the State of Israel and its actuality, and served to de-normalize these forms of security amongst each other and sometimes with an Israeli audience as well. These deployments could also serve as modes of defense and of re-establishing re-establishing trust and social ties between each other, and between them and an ambiguous figure such as myself.

Indeed, the open-ness with which Muhammad voiced his suspicion that I was being recruited, and his preference that I not cooperate with the management, was powerful. Given other workers' respect of him and his informal authority as a kind of leader of the workers, I understood his demand that I not collaborate as a move of feeling me out, giving me an opportunity to commit to doing no harm, and giving himself a chance to get a bit more certainty that I would do no harm. We might think of this as a kind of small-scale security from below (cf. Goldstein 2010), where Palestinians cooperated with one another to protect livelihoods and social and national integrity as colonized people under threat. In another example less visible to

Israelis, when Palestinian workers were on break together or socializing on the job and managers would come, the workers would give each other little signals to go back to appearing busy; for the head manager, Shlomo, they had an Arabic codeword, "*al-dabbur*" [the bee]—"because one sting and you're done!" They occasionally laughed about this codeword, especially when I learned and used it, but it could also be used matter-of-factly, or with just the slightest knowing glance or smile.

Indeed, despite the Palestinian workers' social ties being constantly compromised by the management's installation of hierarchy between them (e.g. picking favorites, giving preferential bonuses) and the resultant difficulty in trusting one another, especially trusting those from other towns and villages, these defensive moves indicated that there *were* forms of re-establishing some degree of trust among them—and perhaps even between them and me.[64]

If Muhammad's "I speak freely" and "more democratic for some than for others" comments above speak to a kind of ridicule and dismissal of the logics of Israeli security, there was a broader, if more cynical, version of this: the notion that Israeli policing of Palestinians was so pervasive, so totalizing, so powerful that there was no point in trying to hide or fight it. When a worker asked to friend me on Facebook and I said was not adding any of the workers in order to protect their anonymity, he was not the first or last to laugh or fail to understand this practice. "But they know everything about us! They know when you come and when you go, they know who your friends are… so what's the point of trying to hide anything?" Indeed, the idea that I

[64] As I explore elsewhere, such moves were bound up in pre-existing family and neighborhood ties between some of the workers, but also in solidarities that had developed specifically at work, between men from different towns who nonetheless had a fair amount in common. When I began attending workers' engagement parties and weddings, I saw that they would invite many of the Palestinians at Super-Israel by passing out invitations in Arabic (and occasionally, sans invitation, an Israeli), and the workers would at least for a time all sit together, sometimes still wearing their uniforms with their bold Hebrew lettering.

could help maintain any kind of security for the workers by maintaining their anonymity became more and more flimsy, more and more of a sheer illogical protocol, as I went on.

Palestinians further dramatized the military/civilian blur, and the excessive power of Israeli security over them, through parodic performances, as part of a broader performative politics of antagonism in the supermarket.

Take this example, by way of some background about how surveillance worked at Super-Israel. Shlomo the manager's office was on an elevated platform overlooking the store, next to the security office. His office had one-way glass windows, and one of its most notable features was a 50-something inch state-of-the-art plasma TV screen on the wall, which was most often used to review security tape.

This kind of surveillance was panoptical in a sense. But it also brought out the performative dimensions of panoptical security, complicating a foundational principle of the panopticon and of clandestine security – that the officer sees but is not seen. For workers could see the screen from the deli when the office windows were open, while Shlomo called in the security officer to zoom in on blurry stills from around the store. One day Yaser gestured up to the open window where the managers were reviewing some tape. In his characteristically non-confrontational and playful voice, he simply said, "they're watching tape"—registering that he was seeing that he was being seen, and registering that this was unfortunate, and perhaps also that there was nothing he could do about it.

In fact, Shlomo had a habit of disregarding the one-way glass and simply standing in the open window, looking down at the workers. Workers were keenly attuned to his presence and the presence of his assistants [*sganim*] who roved the store. True, he didn't seem to come to work all that much – so, like Bentham's panopticon, one was not always sure if he was there or not. But

in certain moments, he was brazenly visible in his surveillance of workers. Palestinians further dramatized these subtle but brazen demonstrations that they were being monitored through parody.

One day I was slicing deli meat when I heard from above me: "Jerman!" This was one of the many names the Palestinians called me—a way of playing with my difference, sometimes with a note of endearment.[65] I looked up and there was Muhammad, chest puffed out, standing in Shlomo the manager's one-way glass window as Shlomo often did. He gave me a little military salute as he often did, and the whole deli department was giggling and energized.[66] Here was Muhammad, whom the workers called the *sheikh,* mimicking the store manager and a generic soldier figure all at once. Like Fanon's colonized subject but in a playful mode, he was portraying himself "in the place of the colonizer" (2004), and with great results from his audience.

Yusuf yelled up to the window: "what's up, ya *m'alim*?" connoting both the word's figurative meaning of "dude" and its literal meaning of "boss" or "master craftsmen" – hence the *sheikh* from Hebron (which Yaser described as "the city of Hamas") playing boss of Super-Israel. "Send us our salaries!" Yusuf yelled up. "I'll send you police!" Muhammad yelled back. Now Muhammad blended the figure of Israeli police into his already composite character of manager-soldier.

65

66 His salutes were part of a broader playful inhabiting of the military subjectivities around him. Towards the beginning, even as we were critically and frankly discussing the Gaza war together and he was giving me damning stories about occupation for my research, he used me as a foil for his humor, pushing the limit as to how much he was laughing with me or at me. (To be sure, this felt a bit different than how antagonistic he could be with customers.) In one instance, he referred to my price gun as my "weapon," asking me in Hebrew in his Arabic accent that itself seemed to mock it: "Did you get it? [*lakachta?*] Did you conquer it? [*kavashta?*]" It was also clear from early on that he was vouching for me with other workers – which mattered a lot because they respected him – and he later began to talk to me more in Arabic, share more stories, and even referred to me as "not one of them [the settlers]."

Here, Muhammad and Yusuf openly and playfully drew out the brazen-ness of Shlomo's monitoring into an enactment of this monitoring as bound up in a military occupation. On one level, they acknowledged the unacknowledged aspect of this public secret, unmasking it at least for each other, and with the risky possibility that managers or customers could hear them, causing discipline though likely not a revocation of permit. This possibility itself gave such a performance its exhilarating, antagonistic quality, as I explore in the next chapter. At the same time, the playfulness of their performance indexed the fact that making a serious, direct complaint was hardly thinkable. They thus enacted the simultaneous power and instability of this security arrangement, pushing its already unstable buttons without fundamentally undoing it.

Coda: "The Super[market] Became an Army Base!"

During the escalation of fall 2015, a number of violent incidents began occurring near and inside Israeli supermarkets that employ Palestinians, both in the West Bank and inside Israel—most of them Palestinian knife attacks on Israelis. Considering such episodes brings to a head my argument about a tension in Israeli security between normalization and de-normalizing antagonism, and a tension between Super-Israel as a civilian space and as part of a landscape of military occupation. They specifically highlight how this de-normalizing can not only be expansive in terms of who participates in it but of how big of a profile it can take on in settler life. These eruptive episodes only help further bear out the more mundane tensions running through the supermarket and Israeli settler life.

In one incident at a store like Super-Israel, a Palestinian from a nearby town stabbed a Jewish-Israeli settler-customer in the parking lot. Workers from that store told me that an off-duty security officer who was shopping there stepped in to shoot the Palestinian in an extremity,

while an unarmed assistant manager at the store helped detain him.[67] In cases such as this, the stores would flood with what one worker described wryly as "all kinds of military [Ar. *kul anwa' aj-jeish*]: police, army, special forces, *shabak*… *the super[market] became an army base!"* Here was a more blatant manifestation of the continuity, even the interchangeability of these various military, police and civilian forces, that otherwise was somewhat hidden at the stores (e.g. the cooperation between store managers, the police and the *shabak* in matters of revoking workers' permits or their jobs), and otherwise subject to suspicious sorts of statements ("I'm telling you, they work together") rather than the demonstrative "the supermarket became an army base" which referred to an overwhelmingly visible thing.

In this context, the *Shin Bet* practices of detainment and interrogation that generally stay outside of commercial contact zones would erupt within them. Older workers like Muhammad and Yaser had experienced somewhat similar raids when they worked without permits inside Israel in the 1990s; these were planned raids, specifically designed to catch workers without permits, detain them (often in bad conditions, such as packed into a van for hours) and pressure the to collaborate, as Muhammad detailed.

In 2015, during these responses to lone wolf attacks (some of which, per Palestinian claims, may have in fact been mutual altercations), Palestinian workers, almost always with no role in the attacks or altercations, were taken to police stations and detained for days, or even detained and interrogated inside their stores. In one case, for several hours they were detained in the storage area of a supermarket and not allowed to eat, go to the bathroom, or talk on the

[67] More typically in such incidents at the time, on both sides of the Green Line, off-duty officers would "shoot to kill" and often did kill their targets. They sometimes did so even when the evidence did not clearly show that the Palestinian in question was actually trying to attack anyone, such as a Palestinian woman in a northern Israeli town who Palestinians insist was only taking out her sunglasses when she was approached and shot dead.

phone, while the *shabak* interrogated Palestinian workers and allowed Jewish-Israelis to leave as soon as they confirmed they were Jewish. Describing this scene, one interviewee said, "Do you see the racism [*unsuriyye*]?" Indeed the "super" had become not only a military base, but a space of confinement and detention in a political sense (Khalili 2012), in addition to the broader forms of captivity that these Palestinians faced in the store—their time captive to managers' whims and the cycles of Jewish-Israeli consumption—and outside it, where they were confined to particular enclaves behind walls and checkpoints.

Incidents like this not only heightened Palestinians' experience of the inseparability of market from military encounters with Israelis. In some ways like the brazen Israeli performances I have recounted above, but in a far less ambiguous way, these actualizations of violence undermined the normalization of Israeli life on the frontier. They undermined the possibility of either party experiencing Palestinians as mere workers, or Israelis as mere managers or customers, as Palestinians morphed into threats and detainees, and Israelis turned into either security men or potential victims. These two shifts were bound up in one another—for Israelis stopped functioning as customers precisely because they felt that those who worked for them might be security threats, even though the mechanisms of Israeli security, reaction and escalation could also be said to very actively anticipate actual Palestinian violence and structure their lives around it, in addition to talking about it and reacting to it extensively after it happened.

After a similar incident at the Super-Israel where I worked, it was not only the idea of Israelis as mere customers but the physical presence of Israeli customers that evaporated: customers had fled the store, leaving shopping carts sitting full in the aisles, with commodities strewn about and blood on the floor; and many of the customers did not return for weeks, or at all. Again, it was surely a Palestinian act of violence that was a major factor in making this

happen; but it was also the discomfort that was already latent for many Israelis, articulated wordlessly by the customer who moved his hand to the holster on his belt when he heard a yell from the storage area; or by a female customer I interviewed as a hovering feeling of discomfort with how she thought Palestinian male workers were looking at her teenage daughter.[68]

Moreover, the overwhelming security response and ensuing media hype that sensationalized scenes of empty supermarkets also did their part in keeping customers away once they'd left. In the fall of 2015, Israeli and American news outlets repeatedly suggested that these incidents—which were rare, had few casualties, and paled by comparison to past uprisings (cf. Stein 2008)—had finished off a "coexistence" that the outlets implied had been there until now. Such dramatic framings could not exactly help the cause of normalcy. But they make sense for the argument I am making: if the supermarket was a key site for the production of normalized settler life, it was also a particularly sensitive site where little disruptions could go a long way. (Similarly, scenes of empty supermarkets often serve as icons of normality destroyed in sci-fi movies, as part of a whole world, sometimes *the* world, coming apart.) As in the mass-mediated production of national security affect and terror in the U.S. (Masco 2014), the mediation itself was crucial to the building up of the object of fear/intervention into a seemingly boundless thing.

The sensitivity of the supermarket as a site—which indicates that its normality was a fragile one—was also manifested in my observation that the emptiness of the supermarket was indeed a delicate topic for customers, a perhaps traumatic site of threat that, like the public secret, could be not be spoken of directly (Taussig 1999). In the weeks after this incident, rather

[68] These accusations could be racialized and exaggerated but they did point to a live, gendered tension I observed. This ranged from a few incidences of Palestinian male workers from adjacent factories cat-calling Israeli female workers at Super-Israel, to flirtations that happened between young female cashiers and both Jewish-Israeli and Palestinian men. It is worth noting that this was not the only racial pattern of flirting; the two female Palestinian cashiers, who had both been at the store for a number of years, had playful, friendly relationships with the Jewish-Israeli managers that sometimes bordered on flirting.

than simply saying that things were empty because of the incident, customers would remark to me, “hm, seems empty for a Thursday, right?” or ask me, their cashier, why it was so empty—as if the answer might be that there were no good sales, or something I knew that they did not. Some offered the incident as one possible reason, but generally did not fully commit to the idea. These were moments in a tense, fraught process of re-establishing normalcy, of re-establishing the supermarket as somewhat civilianized space, of receding from a precipice of antagonism and violence back towards an everyday marked by more latent tensions between normalization and de-normalization, of reconfiguring that blurry military/civilian relation back to a place where the military could be saturating but not eruptive, allowing a certain, fragile civilian normalcy to develop.

Still, even if settlers could recover from these incidents per se, the unstable, antagonistic side of the military/civilian blur, and the brazen performances of it and the suspicions surround it, were a key part of these encounters on an everyday basis. Along with the Israeli forms of antagonism explored in chapter one, this antagonistic side of security at Super-Israel was crucial in shaping the antagonistic political engagements I explore in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

The Limits of Market Depoliticization: Settler-Indigenous Antagonism and an Antagonistic Public Sphere

The first two chapters explored the partial, implicit normalization of Israeli settler colonization and occupation through practices of affective labor exploitation and civilian security respectively. One aspect of this normalization, I suggested, was how these everyday practices—such the ways Palestinians are supposed to defer to Israelis as customers, or how Israelis police Palestinians in somewhat de-militarized ways in the store—implicitly displace political antagonisms from everyday market interactions. Chapter Two also developed the two-pronged nature of the dissertation's argument, showing not only how civilian forms of security could displace politics from the everyday, but how this merely partial civilianization generated a blurring between military and civilian persons and logics, thus exacerbating suspicions and helping to foster a dynamic of political antagonism in the store.

This chapter begins by supplementing the first vector of my argument—the implicit deferral of politics from everyday life at the store—with an account of Israeli and Palestinian practices that consciously attempt to keep political speech out of the store. My account here more directly, if passingly, engages anthropological and theoretical literatures on market spaces and logics as depoliticizing. Yet Israeli attempts to limit political speech did not stop the supermarket from intermittently becoming a space of political address and political dynamics more broadly. Thus my engagement with the concept of market depoliticization here mostly takes the form of a critique, namely that scholars have overplayed its efficacy; and this critique opens onto an elaboration of the forms of politics that constitute limits to market depoliticization on a settler frontier, expanding upon their political and conceptual significance. I focus on two overlapping

forms of politics, both of which I conceptualize as forms of settler-indigenous antagonism. First, in everyday workplace interactions, Israelis and Palestinians sometimes referred to themselves and others through antagonistic political idioms. For example, Israeli customers and workers often identified Palestinian workers with Hamas, or as potential terrorists; Palestinians used a variety of political epithets for Israelis. Second, there were direct political exchanges about the 2014 Gaza assault, the Israeli occupation and more, which occurred between stockers, warehouse workers and Israeli sales representatives in the aisles and storage areas. Mostly initiated by settlers, and taking place at Super-Israel as well as some service workplaces such as Israeli restaurants across the Jerusalem region, these direct exchanges also articulated the interlocutors to national political forms of belonging. They ranged from passing exchanges of shouted barbs and slogans to lengthier political debates that drew upon, and offered distinct variations on, debates then occurring in the Israeli and Palestinian public spheres. *These forms of settler-indigenous politics in the workplace have a particular significance*: unlike some similar practices in other contexts, they do not constitute an agonistic, democratic public sphere, nor should they primarily be understood as forms of indigenous resistance; *they simply establish limits to the depoliticization of settler-indigenous antagonisms through the market, and thus to the normalization of settler colonization, by infusing an antagonistic political atmosphere into the market encounter and at times turning the space of that encounter into what I call an antagonistic public sphere.*

To begin with, these antagonistic engagements constitute a political kind of public sphere in at least three senses present in a range of accounts of public spheres, including Habermas' (1991) foundational account of a bourgeois public sphere, and Wedeen's (2008: 110-16) theoretical and ethnographic account of a non-bourgeois public spheres in Yemen: First,

participants critically debate issues of shared concern, including government actions and their legitimacy. Second, they negotiate power relations between social groups. Third they have some reflexive relation to broader forms of publicity outside an immediate face-to-face encounter: specifically, in this case, not to a broader national public but to Israeli and Palestinian mass-mediated publics which are generally separate.[69] In distinguishing political engagements at Super-Israel from other kinds of public spheres, it is crucial that the debates at Super-Israel are characterized *not only by disagreement about political differences*—this is true of most public spheres, including bourgeois ones—but *disagreements in the context of an existential struggle over land and power between settler and native*, occupier and occupied. Indeed, unlike in Wedeen's example, those participating here cannot all be called citizens of the same state, and unlike in Habermas' early bourgeois public spheres, participants here are not co-members of a public that, even ideally speaking, transcends political or economic differences and hierarchies between them. Rather, Israelis here are citizens of an occupying settler polity, and the Palestinians are stateless members of an occupied indigenous population, with its own longstanding and varied national public. Unlike in some more incorporative or multi-culturalist settler colonial contexts such as contemporary Canada (Simpson 2014; Coulthard 2014), Zionism's ethnocratic nature (Yiftachel 1999) renders the Israeli polity for the most part mutually exclusive with the Palestinian one (cf. Robinson 2013), especially in the West Bank. Thus, these exchanges do not point to a shared political project, and certainly not a shared

[69] To be sure, occasional forms of publicity in the supermarket were reflexively connected to what we might call an overarching mass-mediated form of public address in which Israeli and Palestinian public address one another. For example, Tal's taunting of Hamdan in the previous chapter referenced a song Hamas had translated into Hebrew for Israeli audiences which parodied them on YouTube. Palestinians also reposted video footage of violent confrontations that was posted by Israeli institutions, offering opposing interpretations of those confrontations, and more. Yet the supermarket was better suited to focusing on face to face forms of publicity, in which these mass-mediated forms of Israeli-Palestinian address rarely came up. For a partial account of the latter see Kuntsman and Stein 2015.

democratic project, between Israelis and Palestinians.[70] And crucially, they are not only *about* violent confrontations, such as alleged Palestinian "lone wolf" attacks in Jerusalem and Israeli bombardments in Gaza; they often align Israelis and Palestinians through playful synecdoche with those broader warring parties. This playful synecdoche articulates inter-personal interactions to cross-national antagonisms, while navigating the social awkwardness and potential risks of these kinds of political engagement in the workplace.

To make sense of the kind of political struggle that is performed in these exchanges, it is helpful to consider Chantal Mouffe's agonistic political theory. Mouffe distinguishes between a) the politics of antagonism, of all-out struggle between enemies who do not accept one another's existence, and in which violence is a possibility; and b) agonistic democracy, in which adversaries might have heated disagreements over "substantially different political alternatives," but nonetheless agree in advance not to question one another's existence. Having acknowledged that antagonism is an essential element of the political, Mouffe's normative project is to build on this insight to theorize radical democracy as the turning of antagonists into agonists. Putting aside this normative project, and stressing that Israeli-Palestinian antagonisms are highly asymmetrical in a way Mouffe does not always emphasize, I draw on Mouffe's notion of antagonism here to conceptualize Israeli-Palestinian encounters and clarify how they are

[70] This is an obvious point for critical scholars of occupation. But dominant discourses in the United States often fail to emphasize the occupation when talking about Israel/Palestine. Moreover, many are moved by the idea of the market's apolitical or peace-making capacities, or (in some ways relatedly) by the ideal of a public sphere transcending political hierarchies (a central aspect of the bourgeois public sphere for Habermas). These notions, combined with political commitments to Israel, might lead some to erroneously attribute democratic characteristics to these debates. Aiding such a mistake could be a misinterpretation of the playful and joking character of these exchanges: that they somehow indicate a coexistence that transcends political hierarchies and conflict. As I will show, this playful character is bound up with, but does not cancel, the antagonistic character of the exchanges.

different than other forms of public spheres.[71] But this requires the further intervention that *a public sphere*, a notion which Mouffe and others associate with agonism and not antagonism, can *take on an antagonistic form on this settler frontier. I call this form an antagonistic public sphere.* Despite being limited to certain spaces and times in stores like Super-Israel, despite not being democratic or transcending political hierarchies, and despite not being formally institutionalized, this antagonistic public sphere is worthy of attention. *For it has a distinct political significance*: *limiting the depoliticization of Israeli-Palestinian antagonisms and thus the normalization of settler dominance in Israeli-Palestinian market encounters.* Even some limiting of normalization and market depoliticization is important here, given a) how central market subjectivities (Newman 2006) and encounters have become to the Israeli project of settler normalization, and b) how this normalization has become a key aspiration for Israelis in the present, at least in this settlement.[72]

---

[71] Though Mouffe is focused on class and other asymmetrical forms of political hierarchy, especially in her and Laclau's *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy,* her political theoretical works such as *On the Political* (2006) and *Agonistics: Thinking the World Politically* often leave open the possibility (perhaps a misinterpretation of her thinking) that the adversaries she is talking about might be symmetrically situated—a kind of characterization of conflict that scholars of colonialism in Israel/Palestine are rightfully intent on avoiding (Bishara 2012). Of course, one reason for Mouffe's speaking this way could be that she is an interpreter of Antonio Gramsci, and is interested in workers' and other leftist movements, which are by definition marginal in capitalist society—therefore, perhaps their lack of power in the present does not necessarily need to be said over and over for Mouffe. Morever, like Gramsci, she is interested in such movements ideally becoming hegemonic and taking power, meaning it would not make sense to build asymmetry into her theory. In any case, Mouffe and Laclau's notions of antagonism have a dialectic quality that implies potential shifts (including to the left) in power relations. By contrast, the landscape is quite different in Israel/Palestine, where a term like antagonism could, like conflict, easily be misinterpreted to imply symmetry between the antagonists, as well to imply a kind of static quality to their confrontation. This is why I add that the antagonisms I speak of are asymmetrical. And while I avoid the terminology of dialectical movement towards new configurations, or any talk of Palestinians seizing power in revolutionary fashion (which is hard to imagine in the near future) I do write in a similar spirit to Mouffe and Laclau's dialectics, namely with attention to the instabilities in current forms of what these thinkers would call hegemony, or what I call the normalization or taken-for-grantedness of Israeli settler colonization.

[72] Indeed, with Israel having achieved overwhelming military and geo-strategic dominance over the Palestinians, and with large settlements such as this almost certain to not be dismantled, the question of how normalized this dominant order can become, how normal and "quiet" life within it can be, becomes

Because the antagonisms of this public sphere are settler-colonial ones, my discussion draws on, while offering a distinct contribution to, anthropologies and theories of settler colonialism. My discussion of settler-indigenous antagonism, and its unique expression in an antagonistic public sphere, draws on the political thrust of recent literatures on settler colonialism, which have turned away from a classical anthropological focus on bounded indigenous cultures, and from more recent discussions of radical alterity between indigenous and modern/Western ways of knowing in favor of a focus on settler-colonial violence and dispossession, and even moreso on struggles for indigenous sovereignty "in the teeth of" settler governance, in the past and present (Simpson 2014: 33; Simpson and Smith 2014). But even as I share with this research the goal of centering the political as part of an anti-colonial framework, my material is best accounted for without much recourse to notions of indigenous sovereignty or resistance: I rather focus on informal, improvised forms of political antagonism that clearly do not constitute moves towards indigenous sovereignty. Indeed, settlers themselves are usually the ones to initiate the antagonistic exchanges in question, so this is not primarily an indigenous politics per se but a settler-indigenous politics; moreover, state sovereignty is not an immediate option or major focus for my Palestinian interlocutors. Still, though my overall emphasis is on settler-indigenous antagonism rather than indigenous agency, I do engage with two forms of Palestinians practice in the context of such antagonisms: utterances to each other and to Israelis that mark Israelis as antagonists; and practices of evading Israelis' instigations and refusing their terms. This politics of evasion and refusal, explored in the chapter's conclusion, keeps antagonistic dynamics in play through indirect ways of marking Israelis as antagonists who are not to be trusted (in contrast to marking them as antagonists directly through speech). And by

prominent once again, albeit not for the first time (Stein 2008), and with the prospect of normalization through peace agreement rendered effectively moot.

evading or refusing certain Israeli overtures, Palestinians also exercise a certain power to shape what kinds of interactions can pass as friendly or uncontested in the store, as part of a contestation over the very terms of contestation in the store. These various forms of politics in the marketplace offer a strong cautionary case against over-emphasizing the efficacy of ideological processes including market depoliticization and the normalization of settler presence.

"No talking politics"? Attempts at depoliticization

"One more thing," said Shlomo, the store manager, as we sat in his office. He had just hired me as a stocker, a minimum-wage position almost entirely filled by Palestinian men from the nearby West Bank towns. "…about Jews and Arabs," Shlomo continued, "we don't want any problems, OK? … We keep the 'status quo.' No talking about politics or other subjects like that." Though "no politics" was not a formal rule that I saw written down anywhere, I later found out that Shlomo generally told this to Jewish-Israeli managers, although not to Palestinians (of whom only one was a manager).[73] This focus on Israelis made sense because Israelis were often the ones to instigate politically with Palestinians, and it made sense for managers (who were mostly Israelis) to be tasked with maintaining business as usual in the store, as will see one manager, Dudu, doing below. Palestinians, for their part, did not need to be told such a thing by the boss because the whole structure of their employment involved an explicit prohibition on

[73] Shlomo likely told me this even though I was not a manager because he knew I spoke Arabic and was a student interested in "relations between Jews and Arabs," as I had put it to him, already leaving out the more political terms I otherwise used, such as "occupation." Moreover, it is possible that he was intent on telling me this even as an entry-level stocker because, as his main assistant told me months later, they were interested in potentially making me a manager in the future, and this was why they had me work in several different jobs. Though I had vaguely mentioned my being a student writing about "relations between Jews and Arabs in the economy," and while his assistant understood that this meant research, Shlomo had seemed utterly uninterested in this, and I did not bring it up further with him. While being a manager would have yielded further research insights, it would have been highly ethically problematic, and I immediately told the assistant I would not be interested in any manager positions.

political affiliation, and an implicit, vague injunction to not cause trouble, and to not speak or even comport themselves in a way that would imply trouble, lest they lose their security clearance, their job or both. (This injunction was of course in addition to what Chapter One highlighted: what they *were* supposed to do, i.e. defer to customers, etc.) There were no consistent or clear standards for what speech was considered over the line for Palestinians; where the line was seemed to depend on the situation, the judgment of nearby Israelis, and perhaps whether the *shabak* was interested in targeting this worker for entrapment and recruitment at the time, which was an added reason for them to threaten withdrawal of a permit. Similarly, there were few clear standards for bodily comportment, but something like having an Islamic-style beard could subject workers to worse treatment or even firing, though it did not always. Amidst this vagueness, one thing shined through: in the store and in broader interviews, workers consistently told me that not talking politics was the most important thing for them to do in the workplace to keep their jobs—their "rule number one," as one put it, or "red line" as others did. I will return to Palestinians' internalized "no politics" rule in relation to their practice of "staying quiet" and evading Israeli instigation below.

Shlomo's "no politics" rule in in the workplace seemed a particularly blunt effort to maintain a feature of Israeli-Palestinian market encounter that journalists and corporate marketers often portrayed as naturally occurring: its apolitical quality. Of course, journalists and marketers went further, saying that there was not only no politics (in the sense of conflict) in such encounters; there was coexistence. The most basic form of this genre was that of feature articles in Israeli and American publications, in which reporters visited settlement businesses and mostly quoted Israeli managers and owners as claiming that these were sites of "coexistence" and "peace." Many such articles dwelled on the Israeli supermarket chain of Rami Levy, whose

popular CEO explicitly promoted the development of his stores in the settlements as a model of coexistence.[74] The most prominent focus of this discourse was SodaStream, which operated a factory in a settlement until a Palestinian-led boycott of its seltzer makers pressured the company to move the factory in 2016. The Palestinian-led Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement had called for the boycott because of the factory's location in the West Bank settlements, where the Israeli government offers special corporate subsidies and where Palestinian workers are vulnerable to labor abuses because they live under military occupation. In response, SodaStream claimed to be modeling coexistence between Israeli and Palestinian employees. For example, in one of a number of similar interviews with Israeli newspapers, its CEO, Daniel Birnbaum, called the company's factory in a settlement, where many workers were Palestinian, a "symbol of coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians" (Dagoni 2016). SodaStream materials referred to the factory as "An Island of Peace," and like Rami Levy the company and its supporters specifically touted its hiring of Palestinians as a gesture of peace and generosity that deserved praise in itself. The Netanyahu government's Press Office helped by organizing tours of the factory for journalists, ostensibly as part of an "economic peace" policy discourse that increasingly de-emphasizes an actual political peace process. Between 2014 and 2016, when a number of Palestinian attacks took place in or near West Bank settlement shopping complexes, much Israeli and American reporting on the events reinscribed the idea that the complexes were "peaceful" and "symbol[s] of coexistence" until the Palestinian violence in question (Kershner 2015).

[74]Levy has been a fixture in the neoliberal/rightwing conjuncture of Israeli public culture in recent years. Journalistic and marketing discourses tout his humble *mizrahi* upbringing and low prices, his hiring of Palestinian workers even over the objections of the far-right protests named in the previous chapter, and his consistent interest in real estate and commercial development in East Jerusalem and West Bank settlements.

We can consider Shlomo's statement as a variation on these broader economic peace discourses, with a twist that I will add in a moment. Indeed both Shlomo's statement and the broader economic peace discourse, framed the market as being in some sort of opposition to politics, understood as conflict. This opposition between the market and politics as conflict is reminiscent of at least three (neo-)liberal ideologies of the market to which critical scholars have attended, and begs the question of how existing scholarly critiques of neoliberal ideology might be brought to bear here. One is the early-modern *doux commerce* thesis, of the market as facilitating friendly relations between people and nations (Hirschman 1977), which recurs in later liberal internationalisms; a second is the longstanding notion of the market as a sphere that can or should exist independently of politics and debate (Harcourt 2011; Brown 2015); and third is the related neoliberal notion of the market as not only being autonomous from the political, but as constituting the grounds for solutions to a wide range of political and social problems. These various notions overlapped in the neoliberal "economic peace" framework of the Israel-Palestine peace process in the 1990s (Haddad 2015), and have come back to life, as noted, in the Netanyahu era.

Yet as explained in the dissertation's introduction, evoking scholarly critiques of depoliticization here risks reproducing what is often the totalizing character of such critiques. For in recent anthropologies of neoliberalism, and some of the political theories they draw on, there is an emphasis on apparatuses and logics of governance and control (Ferguson 1994; Mitchell 2002) that constrain political action and the public realm itself (Brown 2005, 2015; Low and Smith 2006). But there is not much of a sense in these studies of what forms of politics might still be operative amidst these constraints. As further explained in the dissertation's introduction, scholarship on neoliberalism in Israel/Palestine has somewhat similar problems of totalization,

implying that neoliberal restructuring and market-oriented ideology among both Israelis and Palestinians simply align structurally with Israeli occupation and colonization, without querying the social practices and ideologies through which this alignment might occur.

Thus, bearing in mind how Shlomo's statement resonates with neoliberal ideologies, but also how scholarly discussions of neoliberal ideology have often ignored or over-simplified the efficacy of such ideologies, let us return to Shlomo's statement. His idea of the apolitical marketplace was not so much a technocratic policy or marketing discourse, even if it resonated with such discourses; rather, it was part of a tenuous, improvised project of keeping business going as usual. Shlomo spoke not of creating a model of peace per se but of preserving a "status quo"—something like normalcy—from everyday "problems" relating to a broader conflict. Crucially, he implicitly acknowledged that everyday conflicts were an existing or imminently possible presence not only outside the store (as the formulation of an "island of peace" implies) but inside it. And indeed, forms of tension, conflict, or what I call antagonistic politics *were* common in the store, especially at times of political escalation. What interests me is not whether or how such forms of politics broke Shlomo's rules, which we will see were inconsistently enforced, but how these forms of politics constituted limits to the broader, if mostly uncoordinated, ideological project of which those rules were a part: the production of an apolitical environment focused on consumer satisfaction, as part of the normalization of settler dominance despite ongoing occupation and conflict.

Between customers and Zionists: the ambiguous shading of commercial into political interactions, past and present

Before coming to the more direct exchanges that most resemble public sphere activities

in other contexts, it is important to note the subtler gradations of antagonistic address at Super-Israel, which emerged ambiguously out of everyday commercial activities. In these fleeting moments, forms of commercial address could blur into address that referenced interlocutors as part of opposing political collectives. For example, while Palestinians usually referred to those they served as "customers" and interacted with them as such, they might at times refer to them as "extremists" or "Zionists," usually in the third person, but with the ambiguous possibility of the Israelis hearing. Or Israeli customers might openly and unapologetically refer to their military service in interactions with Palestinians, even as they often were otherwise trying to be friendly—an ambiguous mix of friendliness and antagonism from the Israeli side that met with a range of reactions from Palestinians.[75]

This was a particularly interesting moment to track the ambiguous emergence of antagonistic address in Israeli-Palestinian market encounters. For the prospect of these encounters happening in a strictly consumer-oriented or apolitical atmosphere was at the time in profound tension with the surging, violent escalations happening especially in the Jerusalem, Hebron and Gaza regions. The pronounced nature of antagonistic escalation in the country at this moment, however, should not be taken as an indication that the findings here are historically exceptional. For interviews with Palestinian workers suggested that while the 2014 escalation was more intense than those preceding it in 2009 and 2012, those escalations and the *intifadas* before them had similar effects on market encounters. My interviews also suggested that we might characterize the 1970s and early 1980s, which Israeli discourses often refer to as a golden age of coexistence, more through the lens of the ambiguity and tension I am describing here. For

[75] Interviews with Palestinian workers suggested that escalations like this one had also infused a profound tension into Israeli-Palestinian market encounters in the past, and while I do not elaborate on this historical part of the argument here, readers interested in Israel-Palestine may wish to consider my findings as having some bearing on past escalations as well.

one thing, settlers' nostalgia for this earlier period sat perfectly comfortably with their expressions to me of intense anti-Palestinian sentiment. This recalls the tension, elaborated in Chapter One, between Israeli orientations of market coexistence with Palestinians, and desires for Palestinians not to be around at all.

Moreover, my interviews and conversations with Palestinian workers painted those years in a more complex way. To be clear, most Palestinians I spoke to who were above the age of 40 *did* sketch some degree of positive Palestinian-Israeli relationships in the 1970s; but much of what they liked about those earlier years of the occupation was clearly that they were in better economic circumstances, had more freedom of movement, they did not face such overt discrimination and harassment from Israeli civilians and security forces on a daily basis. Of course, as Tamer, a Jerusalemite Palestinian, pointed out, a reason for this was that Palestinians were simply "not demanding their rights," and Israeli military rule was so overwhelmingly dominant that the situation was paradoxically stable: "One couldn't raise a flag, and [Palestinian] people didn't make problems, they just worked. Arabs didn't try to talk, to talk politics, to carry arms…" An Israeli had expressed this logic bluntly to another Palestinian interviewee of mine: that things used to be easier before the uprisings because Palestinians weren't "making problems," as the Israeli had put it. But when I asked Tamer, "wasn't there any conflict then?" he said, "Sure, the Arab looked at the Jew as occupier, and the Jew looked at the Arab as enemy, but these problems didn't appear [*ma yidhharush]*." That is, conflicts were just more latent—but they were there. As another worker put it, Israeli managers would lash out at Palestinians workers for little things, and there was nothing the workers could do about it. It is in this context of latent discrimination and antagonism in this period (as well as everything that came before and after) that one must understand stories about Israelis and Palestinians attending each other's

weddings or smoking together on the street after work, which are commonly known and which I heard from both populations.

We can now turn to exploring how this particular moment of political escalation shaped Israeli-Palestinian relations in this settlement and at one of its major commercial sites, Super-Israel. The escalations beginning in 2014 included the Gaza war and the wave of confrontations that preceded and followed it in the West Bank, which entailed clashes between Palestinian youth and Israeli forces, intense Israeli military raids and temporary redeployments in Palestinian cities in response to Palestinians' kidnapping and killing of three teenage settlers. In the settlement where I focused my research, there was increased Palestinian stone-throwing at Israeli cars, partly during the first full-blown clashes between Israeli forces and youth from adjacent Palestinian towns in several years. When I visited other stores in the settlement and asked about the escalations, Israeli service workers were quick to comment on how crazy the situation was, and knew about the right-wing anti-Palestinian rallies being held at the settlement gate. The stone throwing and clashes were the immediate cause of these rallies, including the one I witnessed where "death to Arabs" was a prominent chant.

As a way of seeing how antagonisms from outside the store, which surged with overt violence as well as a racialized language of enemies, manifested ambiguously within the store, consider this episode from the day after the "death to Arabs" rally at the settlement gate. Muhammad and I were stocking canned goods and chatting on and off when a loud yell sounded from the storage area. Heads turned quickly in that direction. The yell was not identifiably from a Jewish-Israeli or a Palestinian; just a male voice yelling "ah!" A middle-aged customer, wearing a knit *kippa*, a plaid short-sleeved dress shirt neatly tucked into his dark slacks, and Teva-style strapped hiking sandals—suggesting that he was part of the religious Zionist, pro-settler camp in

Israeli society—had been sifting through some frozen dinners near the gateway to the back areas. He now jolted his head up and slowly moved his right hand towards the pistol on his belt. Muhammad, who had been complaining to me about "extremist" [*mut'asabin*] Israelis after our conversation about the "death to Arabs" rally, raised his eyebrows at me suggestively and threw up his hands, as if to say, "Did you see that!? I'm *telling* you about those extremists!" This heuristic distinction between "extremist" settlers and others was a common one for Muhammad, Yaser and other Palestinian workers. As tenuous as the distinction was, it seemed to be a way of getting at the dissonance we will see below between different modes in which Israelis, sometimes the same people, related to them: antagonistic in some ways, friendly in others.

It turned out some milk crates had fallen. But the customer, instantly construing a yell as a Palestinian threat and himself as security guard, had instantly activated a particularly securitized iteration of a dynamic of antagonism, of the supermarket as a space where the felt threat of the colonized could activate the near-eruption – and at least the public brandishing of - a colonial violence that was otherwise withheld (Azoulay and Ophir 2012). The way the customer's gun was on his belt, ready to activate his military subjectivity at any moment, recalls Frantz Fanon's observation that first confrontation of the colonizer and the colonized was "colored by violence," and "their cohabitation—or rather, the exploitation of the colonized by the colonizer—continued at the point of the bayonet and under cannon fire" (Fanon 2004, 2, emphasis mine). To this claim about the ever-present reality of violence in colonial settings, we might add that, as noted in the previous chapter, conceptualizing Israel as a *liberal*-settler project (Robinson 2013) means attending to the ways in which violence is structurally present but often withheld in favor of other modes of power. Indeed at Super-Israel, something like Fanon's "point of the bayonet" shifted ambiguously in and out of focus in everyday life as an important

element of the broader dynamics of antagonism in which I am interested.[76]

The ambiguities of everyday dynamics at the store, in which the possibility of such near-eruptions and other forms of antagonism hovered over mundane commercial exchange, were particularly visible at the Super-Israel deli counter, which was one of my points of focus at the store, and at the vegetable aisle. Two key aspects of these ambiguities were the ways that antagonistic modes of interaction mixed with friendly or strictly commercial ones; and the ways that Israelis' use of, or knowledge of, Arabic and Palestinian-ness, could be a vehicle for the complex articulation between more friendly and antagonistic kinds of gestures.

For some Israeli customers, mostly middle-aged men, arriving at the deli counter was paradoxically a moment to perform friendliness and familiarity with Yaser and Yusuf, offering effusive greetings and handshakes before and after they ordered. They would appeal with loud confidence to Arabic phrases that the workers used with each other, for example the phrase "thank you, uncle!" [*shukran ya ʿammi*]. These overtures were complex. The loud confidence performed a heavy-handed diplomatic move, as if to say 'see? I know your language! I am making a friendly gesture to you, who are from the enemy group!' The addition of words like "uncle," coupled with the belabored tone in which they were added, reflected an intermediate kind of aptitude in the workers' Arabic: more than what most Israelis would know, but not reflective of extensive time spent with the workers.

Some Palestinians acted friendly as well. "Heeeey, how are you my *ḥabeebi* [my friend]" Yusuf greeted one of them in Arabic (he would switch to Hebrew when taking the man's order, as these men mostly had trouble actually communicating in Arabic about day-to-day topics like

[76] See Azoulay and Ophir (2012) for a Foucault-inspired account of "eruptive violence" vs. "withheld violence," in the Israeli regime and more generally. On variations of violence in settler-colonial and other contexts, including notions of "slow violence" and everyday violence, see: Nixon 2013, Montoya 2016, Besky 2013.

cheese.)[77] "How are you, *khabeebi*?" the customer replied, using the common Hebraicized *kh,* which perhaps reflected an unwillingness or inability to use the proper accent. Yusuf introduced him to me in Hebrew and he asked me where I learned Arabic. "University", I said, "and you?" "From my military service. I was the governor of Jericho" (a West Bank Palestinian city occupied since 1967). Here the customer bluntly tied his friendly use of Arabic to a reference to his role as military ruler over (Palestinian) Arabs. It was in the context of this military role—which, as would be clear to both participants, was part of an asymmetrical, antagonistic relation with Palestinians—that he acted friendly.

To further underline how friendliness could be bound up in, but not cancel out, broader dynamics of antagonism, recall from Chapter Two that in the broader context of West Bank Palestinian workers' interaction with Israelis, even something as baldly coercive as a *shabak* interrogation could begin with a ritual of friendly overtures as Yaser's did ("come on, I'm your friend, I want to help you") before it slipped into entrapment and threats. To be sure, both parties would understand a *shabak* interrogation as very different than the market encounter, for the former entailed a far more immediate awareness of the limits of any friendly gestures; but for both parties, the market encounter was still shaped by, and peppered with reference to, the militarized one, as Palestinians made clear when they told me they felt that Israelis at the store could very well be *shabak* spies themselves.

While the ex-military governor was warmly received by Yusuf, notwithstanding his general suspicions, another very similar interaction at the check-out counter, between a customer and Tareq (the teenager from Chapter One), ended with less of a gesture of resolution. The

[77] I noted this when one such customer tried to order in Arabic, and managed to get through the order but used so much cognitive energy in doing so that he did not notice that *I* was not a Palestinian, or even ask about this, as most Palestinian customers did after having a brief exchange with me in Arabic.

customer started speaking Arabic to Tareq, who asked him where he learned it. "South Lebanon and Gaza [*janub lubnan u ghaza*]," the man replied, still in Arabic. Tareq asked, "From wars?" "Not exactly," the man replied, "From the army." (Even if his service had not been during a war per se, it would have been part of an occupation in either place.) While one might have initially interpreted his vague deflection from wars to "the army" as an attempt to backpedal from a controversial topic, he dispelled any such interpretation by going on to list other places in the Occupied West Bank: "Ramallah, Jenin…" Tareq looked at him in a kind of blank way, the smile faded from his face, and remained quiet. The customer named even a few *more* places – his tone was unapologetic but measured, so that he didn't seem to be specifically taunting Tareq - but by then Tareq had turned to the next customer. "Ok, you don't want to hear about it I guess - goodnight," the customer said, still politely enough, though his words now had an edge to them, faintly performing a sense of surprise at being ignored without just cause. I asked Tareq a minute later what he thought of the man. "I don't know," he said neutrally, either not wanting to talk about it with me or not wanting to talk about it at all. If Yusuf's exchange of warm hello's and goodbyes with the customer marked one common Palestinian approach to these interactions, Tareq's subtle shifts of tone and attention marked other interactional modes that anticipate my discussion of evasion and refusal below: being less animated with Israelis, less warm, and responding vaguely or not at all to some of their statements.

Another way that some customers would appeal to Palestinians' Arab-ness as part of staging the service interaction as something they might refer to as friendly or enjoyable, came at the vegetable aisle: there customers would ask Palestinian workers to help them figure out which watermelons, and sometimes other fruits, were ripe. They would thus call up, in an essentializing way, the agricultural background of many of these Palestinians, and the past experience that

many settlers had with buying produce from Palestinian produce stands (where asking for help choosing a ripe watermelon would have been more appropriate). This practice helps get at the ways that broader Israeli ideologies of authentic Arab-ness, food and the essentialized open-air market [*shuk* as opposed to *super*] were part of fantasies of coexistence in the supermarket. The bitter irony was that some of these workers, including the first one I had gotten to know, *had* been watermelon farmers in the occupied Jericho area [*ariha* to Palestinians] until, as one put it "the water ran out," referring to the occupation's diversion of aquifers in the West Bank to nearby settlements such as this one.

***

Alongside these mixed, friendly/antagonistic kinds of interactions, customers could often be more aggressive in how they demanded service from Palestinians—a consumer sovereignty (Manning 2012) that could shade into demonstrations of their power as settlers, with full civil rights, over occupied Palestinians. As noted in Chapter One, while any workers in such jobs were vulnerable, these workers were mostly occupied West Bank residents who were extra vulnerable. The customers were thus depending on, and potentially performing, their multiple power over a Palestinian worker when, for example, they demanded that slices be cut thin [Heb. *dak*]. It was hard for workers to tell *how* thin customers wanted it, and customers often only specified how thin after the worker had already started slicing the cheese. Customers sometimes aggressively demanded that the worker re-slice the cheese thinner ("NO, that is NOT thin!!").

These aggressive demands produced a range of reactions from Palestinians. Yaser in particular was adept at staying calm and not losing his temper, and Yusuf almost always remained calm and de-escalatory, despite the suspicions and frustrations he otherwise voiced. By contrast, Ahmad, a Jerusalemite, was angered by these demands and voiced his anger more

riskily, albeit not in explicitly political terms. He would visibly scowl, and would occasionally mutter under his breath things like "lick my ass" [*ilhas tizi*], sometimes at a volume I thought customers might hear; they never seemed to understand what he said, but sometimes noticeably changed their tone in ways that registered his demeanor.[78]

The slipperiness of the standard by which workers' service was judged as good, mixed with settlers' double sense of superiority over the workers, could easily lead to Israeli performances of antagonism that could undermine the normalization of their power in the sense of quiet or calm. In one case a customer at the butcher counter asked for a particular cut of chicken, and a Palestinian worker said they were restocking so it would be five minutes. The customer began yelling, and the micro-interaction now radiated throughout the store. People started walking over briskly and gravely from all directions, as if ready to intervene. The Jewish assistant manager, Dudu, came over, and, asserting his own masculinity, told the customer to calm down. When he would not, Dudu firmly told him to get out of the store, taking seriously his managerial duties of maintaining calm. The customer, his face flush with anger, yelled "you're defending an Arab?! [*ata magen al aravi?*]"

Here a situation tension between normalization and depoliticization on the one hand, and eruptive antagonistic politics on the other, mapped on to a social tension between different groups of Jewish-Israelis: managers and customers. Managers like Dudu and Shlomo often operated according to a logic of defusing conflict and maintaining an apolitical environment of consumption; yet, as we have seen, customers treated the store not only as a space of

[78] This was in part a matter of personality; he had a much angrier demeanor than other West Bankers or Jerusalemites at the deli. But it may also have had to do with his added socio-economic privilege compared to the West Bankers: he was studying law at Al-Quds University, and because of his Israeli permanent residency as a Jerusalemite, he did not rely on a permit to work at Super-Israel—a job he hoped would give way to something better anyway.

consumption but of rare interaction with Palestinians, and treating the store this way could entail antagonistic behavior that undermined the non-conflictual environment that managers were creating in part for the imagined benefit of these very customers (of course, also, for the benefit of their own jobs, and of the company's profits and brand). Indeed, customers were in some ways the more powerful party here. For they were powerful enough, relative to the Israeli managers *and* the Palestinian workers, that they could be as aggressive and even antagonistic to Palestinians as they liked without major consequences. While I witnessed a handful of examples of this kind of yelling at Palestinian workers, this was the only time I saw the customer kicked out—and this was a momentary, not a lasting ban.[79]

***

The ambiguous ways that Jewish-Israeli settler-customers related to Palestinians – being friendly while casually mentioning things like their military service, or the ways their power as consumers shaded into their power as settlers - stoked parallel ambiguities in how Palestinians referred to them, in the third person, as customers but also as settler antagonists.

When speaking in the third person about those they served, Yaser and Yusuf usually used the Arabic term *az-zabayen* ["the customers"], as part of a broader lexicon of customer service speak. Due to Israeli restrictions on Palestinians accessing many such settlements to shop unless they had permits to work there, most customers at the store were Jewish-Israelis, so *zabayen* usually by default referred to Jewish-Israeli, subtly implying social differences and economic power differentials without necessarily articulating them as political. Sentiments of annoyance or resentment were sometimes directed at a socio-economically dominant Jewish-Israeli "them"

[79] This dynamic, of a settler's empowerment over Palestinians simultaneously entailing a power unaccountable to Israeli authorities themselves, plays out in more dramatic ways in regards to the question of settler beatings and attacks on Palestinians in the West Bank countryside, for which there has been little accountability to Israeli authorities.

[*humme*] also without being explicitly political. For example, one Palestinian bagger said, "Do you see how much they eat?!" gesturing at a settler customer's shopping cart. "And she's here every week! That's how much I buy for a month, and I have 5 kids!" This common refrain, in tones ranging from playful to irritated to both, gestured at an immoral excessive consumer (Miller 2012), with this figure's political status hovering in the background.

Other Palestinian workers, especially Muhammad, invoked Jewish-Israeli workers or customers as political antagonists more explicitly. For example, one day a customer was trying to gesture to us at the deli counter from across the store, mouthing what kind of cheese she wanted. I couldn't make it out. Muhammad sidled up to the counter and said, "Why is she annoying like that?" "I don't know," I said. "Zionists! [*ṣahayana*]" he said loudly, throwing up his hands and making the other Palestinian workers laugh, as he channeled an epithet more commonly heard in Palestinian political discourse, such as the songs of militant groups. Yaser, Yusuf and I laughed.

Here Muhammad tested the limits of what forms of antagonism could appear in the store, albeit risking harsher consequences than settlers did. Indeed, his utterance here was in possible earshot of setters, and was so exhilarating in part because Palestinians knew there was a chance settlers might hear or understand. And if they did, and understood the utterance as an insult directed at them as Jews or as Zionists, he could easily lose his job and/or permit.[80] Muhammad exclaimed other epithets in this vein as well, which also commanded attention and laughter from other Palestinians while being ambiguously in earshot of Israelis. One that anticipates my

[80] As I explore further in Chapter Four, when workers spoke or sung to each other about Israelis in such blunt antagonistic terms, each utterance or song entailed its own implicit stakes of how likely Israeli bystanders were to understand it or find it threatening. In the scheme of these various utterances and their various stakes, this Palestinian colloquial word for Zionists – *sahayana* – was not, to my knowledge, particularly well-known by Israelis. But in terms of its rejectionist implications and resonances with Palestinian political discourse, the naming of Zionists as antagonists was risky in itself, especially given that Palestinians (who would surely understand the joke) did always trust one another in the store, and there were sometimes Palestinian customers around who the workers often did not know or trust.

attention later in this chapter and in Chapter Four to Islamic and Islamist idioms was *bani quraidha*, which is a Jewish Arabian tribe that, according to the Qur'an, betrays the Prophet Muhammad during a battle, and is then subject to massacre and forced conversion. The laughter in response to this phrase indexed that the Palestinian workers understood Muhamad's deployment of the term for the customers as a stretch, and that, as they made clear to me at other points, they generally distinguished between Israelis and Jews, especially Jews from other historical periods. Yet it was precisely the stretch that indirectly and enjoyably touched upon a kernel of resonance with the workers: the customers' role as antagonists.

Such third-person invocations of Jewish-Israelis as antagonists were characterized by the suspicion and pragmatic ambiguity that I explore further through questions of suspicion and public address in other chapters. On these questions I am indebted to sociologist Erving Goffman's (1981) close attention to how social interactions can be shaped by variations of participation, including bystanders who may or may not be directly addressed, and may or may not be listening. In this context, such questions had especially "high stakes," to borrow anthropologist Jessica Cattelino's (2008) term from a different settler frontier.[81] Were Jewish-Israeli customers and managers listening to such statements? Did they understand them? *How* would they understand them--as harmless jokes or as insults or threats? Indeed, my interviews produced some stories of Israeli managers—as well as *shabak* interrogators—inquiring into Palestinians' views about Jews and the Holocaust. Further, if the customers did understand, would they inform on the Palestinians? Such suspicions, ambiguities and risks infused Israeli-Palestinian relations in the store with suspicion, tension and exhilaration.

[81] *High Stakes* is the title of Cattelino's insightful book on Seminole casino ownership (a much different form of indigenous market practice than what I explore here) and its role in efforts to defend Seminole sovereignty. The play on words suggests, in part, how Seminole casinos have high stakes for questions of indigenous politics vis-à-vis a settler colonial state.

Direct political exchanges

At times, these references to selves and others as antagonists appeared in more direct, and directly political exchanges between Israeli and Palestinian workers, though usually not customers. These exchanges took place at Super-Israel, and I corroborated their existence at workplaces such as restaurants inside Jerusalem as well. A range of conditions facilitated these direct exchanges, as well as the more common conversations between groups of Palestinian workers that Israelis sometimes joined. Political mass-media peppered the store, from the Israeli newspapers sold at the front to news of political violence and other sorts that workers consumed on their smartphones. This was a rare space for otherwise separate Israeli and Palestinian publics to interact face to face, adding an interest in pursuing the interactions, especially for Israelis. The nature of some jobs at Super-Israel, as well as the layout of the store and its modes of labor discipline, also facilitated the exchanges. The exchanges happened mostly between stockers, warehouse workers and Israeli sales representatives [*sochnim*] from outside food companies, who had ample opportunities to interact with another. And the exchanges happened both in the storage areas and in the aisles; the potential for customers to be around did not seem to be a barrier to the exchanges. More importantly than the presence of customers was the fact that the back areas and some aisles of the supermarket did not always have *managers* around, for managers generally only made rounds every thirty minutes or so, and sometimes far less often, again leaving ample time for unmonitored interactions. By contrast, the cash registers were almost always watched by managers, and customers were usually interacting up-close with workers, and no lengthy exchanges happened there.[82] Finally, the sheer volume of workers at the

[82] The deli counter also did not have lengthy exchanges, but there was more room to interact there than at the registers.

store (around 150) and the moving nature of many tasks (e.g. going back and forth between the aisles and storage) facilitated many passing exchanges as well as the lengthier ones we will now explore.

Let us note two key aspects about the exchanges. First, Israelis were almost always the ones to initiate, or try to initiate, the exchanges, meaning that the exchanges could not be described as a strictly Palestinian practice or a straightforward form of Palestinian resistance, though Palestinians did further the exchanges' antagonistic dynamics by contesting the terms of debate in various ways, and by saying things that (and saying them in ways that) critiqued or pushed the limits of dominant Israeli discourses. Second, the exchanges were complex: they mixed elements of playfulness and antagonism, social familiarity and distance. Part of this complexity, which I will explore only partially, was linguistic: the debates were mostly in Hebrew, which was not usually the language in which Palestinians talked about politics, but was one in which they were nearly fluent, specifically and almost exclusively from these jobs; and like the over-the-counter interactions above, Israelis also tried to use Arabic, but with more difficulty, so that the conversations switched between languages a fair amount. These conditions generated lots of switching between languages, as well as creative turns of phrase, pronunciations and mimicking, adding to the playful quality of the debates and sometimes giving Palestinians a conversational edge.

I focus first, and for much longer, on examples in which Palestinians responded to Israeli instigations or escalated them further, even though these were less common than cases of Palestinians evading Israeli instigations or otherwise disengaging. For the mutuality and richness of the former kind of exchanges made them notable, long-lasting, and disproportionately impactful on the store's atmosphere relative to examples of Palestinian evasion. To be sure,

Palestinian evasions were at least as important, and the next section explores them, suggesting that these evasions, and relatedly their refusal of settlers' terms of debate, could still reinscribe the status of settlers as antagonists. But would-be or truncated exchanges that Palestinians evaded, and the subtle ways that such evasions did or did not index antagonisms, were intrinsically harder to observe, as they were shorter and less substantive.

***

The first example that I will share of these rich, mutual political exchanges illustrates that the exchanges were sometimes linked through mass media to broader Israeli and Palestinian publics—a helpful point in thinking of them as public sphere activities. This example also points to the fact that all these direct exchanges referenced the ongoing violence outside the store, which was occupying much of the broader publics' attention at the time. Specifically, the exchanges performed interlocutors in the store in various ways as being aligned with military occupation and violent Palestinian resistance respectively.

One day in August 2014, in the Super-Israel storage area, a group of Palestinians crowded around a smartphone belong to Ra'ed, a Palestinian stocker. The video was from an incident the day before in which a Palestinian, driving a small forklift truck in central Jerusalem, struck and killed a Jewish-Israeli pedestrian and flipped an Israeli bus on its side with vehicle's protruded fork, before being shot dead by off-duty Israeli security forces. Videos of incidents like this circulated fast through Israeli media and social media (Stein and Kuntsman 2015), which quickly labeled them "lone wolf" terrorist attacks; they also circulated through Palestinian networks, where social media posts sometimes questioned whether the attacks were on purpose and criticized Israelis' shoot-to-kill policy in such cases (B'tselem 2015). The two publics were like two separate realities spread over the same Jerusalem region, usually without much direct

interface; here in marketplace was a rare instance of direct interface.

Moshe, an Israeli warehouse worker, walked by and asked in Hebrew what the workers were watching. Ra'ed told Moshe that it was a video of the forklift from the day before, saying calmly, "they don't know if it was on purpose." Moshe yelled back: "it was *definitely* on purpose,"[83] escalating the argument with an indignant, angry tone, even as a playful quality was preserved by the hyperbole of his claim, the high pitch of his voice and the fact that the norms and rules of the workplace made it unlikely for arguments to escalate into serious physical fights.

Now Muhammad joined in, escalating further. "*Let* it be on purpose!" he yelled theatrically in Hebrew, both playful and serious at the same time. Here he defended the legitimacy of, and even in principle encouraged, violent Palestinian resistance in a way that critically challenged dominant Israeli discourses, and pushed the limits of what could be said in the supermarket in a risky and exhilarating way.[84] He then turned to a walk-in freezer and said in his heavily accented Hebrew: "*shalom* to all the fish and chickens!" The "shalom" and the accented Hebrew gave Muhammad's comment an element of comedic mimicry, and the address to the dead, frozen animals shifted the conversation's tone from playfully antagonistic to absurd, shattering the tension as the Palestinians laughed.

As many if not more of the debates took place between Palestinian stockers and warehouse workers, on the one hand, and Jewish-Israeli sales representatives [*sochnim*] from outside food companies on the other. The reps came about twice a week, and in some cases the

[83] Some Palestinians *did* consider this episode to be purposeful and praised it as an act of martyrdom and resistance, while others suggested that the Palestinian was first hit with stones by Jewish-Israeli youth, and this caused him to lose control over the vehicle before he was wrongly shot. In similar incidents, human rights organizations focused on critiquing Israeli leaders for encouraging on- and off-duty security forces to shoot first and ask questions later – what many called a "shoot to kill" policy (B'Tselem 2015).
[84] He and Moshe had an ongoing dynamic of this kind which it made it unlikely for Moshe to complain about him; the risk was more that others would overhear him and complain.

Palestinian stockers said they knew them well, relatively speaking. Indeed, these were some of the very few sustained relations each had with a person from the other population in recent decades, since Israel's regime of separation intensified in the 1990s and 2000s, along with a general deterioration in Israeli-Palestinian relations both geopolitically and socially (Tamari 2013). The rarity of these relationships helps further make sense of the way that these direct exchanges made rich use of playful synecdoche in which, for example, an Israeli would have the Palestinian in front of him stand in for the militant group Hamas, which at the time was waging an armed struggle against Israel from the Gaza Strip. This playful synecdoche, like the playful tone of Muhammad and Moshe's debates just above, was one way of navigating the potential tensions between the ostensibly apolitical character of the supermarket that managers were supposed to preserve and the highly political nature of these discussions and the relations they performed.

One day not long after the forklift exchange, a short, stocky Jewish-Israeli sales rep from the Tenuva dairy and meat giant ran up to the middle-aged Muhammad from behind, threw both arms around his waist and started picking him up—an instance of play fighting that was yet another regular aspect of settler-indigenous antagonism that I observed at this and similar stores. A Palestinian standing nearby half-anxiously, half-playfully raised an arm and yelled "woah, woah!" even as Muhammad shrugged it off—a range of reactions indicated how blurry the line could be between funny and serious, even though a full-blown serious fight was hard to imagine in the store. Later in the day, the rep—Muhammad occasionally called him Tenuva, when he called him anything—came back towards Muhammad and yelled in Arabic, at no one in particular, but with an audience of mostly Palestinians around him, "I want a *ṣārūkh* [rocket] to fire at him!" with his Hebrew-accented "r" giving the charged Arabic word a distinctively Israeli

sound. *Sarukh* was the term that Palestinians used for the mostly very low-quality rockets that Hamas and other Palestinian militant groups were firing into Israel from Gaza. As above, an Israeli switched to Arabic here to perform a familiarity with Palestinian-ness, this time associating both Israelis and Palestinians in the store with violent, military-style conflict. Still, it is important that Tenuva used the Palestinian term for rockets, which to some degree kept the emphasis on Palestinian violence, implying a logic by which, in the first place, Palestinian rockets existed (and by extension were fired), and second, Israelis responded in kind.

Muhammad shot back in Arabic, "Jerusalem is the bride of the Arabs!" [*al-quds 'arus il-arab*], going straight to a somewhat unrelated slogan that would bother Tenuva, but first conversationally disarmed him, because he did not understand the Arabic and had to shift from his aggressive tone, his command of the exchange's feel, to more quietly ask, with a sheepish grin, "what does that mean?" He was now made to invite the repetition of an utterance that was sure to offend him. Indeed, Muhammad began translating into Hebrew and Tenuva cut in, saying "—of the Arabs? I don't want to hear it!" and proceeded to make fart-like noises with his mouth to drown out the offending Arab nationalist slogan. The farting noise brought to a head the way in which this was an affectively charged, theatrical exchange of political phrases and slogans, which entailed arguments but not did not flesh them out or move towards any kind of substantive mutual understanding; an example which inscribed participants as personal acquaintances who partly stood in for political antagonists, and not as participants in a shared political project.

Muhammad later told me he spoke freely with Tenuva because he knew him well—relatively speaking, for he did not have any relation with Israelis outside the workplace as far as I knew, which was typical in this era of reduced Israeli-Palestinian contact. It was notable that he said this about someone with whom I did not notice him being *friendly* per se—again pointing to

the ways in which familiarity, friendliness and antagonism could intermingle here in different variations.[85]

On a spectrum from exchanges of barbs without arguments, to something more recognizable as a political debate with arguments, this exchange was at the extreme former end. The forklift exchange entailed fleeting arguments, putting it somewhere in the middle, and there were other exchanges that were somewhere between this one and a fuller-fledged debate, which consisted of multiple arguments exchange over the span of a few minutes. But I will jump for now to the extreme of this end of the spectrum—lengthy debates with plentiful arguments—which were rare but intrinsically rich and observable. These debates also had elements of linguistic and pragmatic playfulness, and an awkward yet generative setup in which the participants were strangers from segregated societies but also familiar acquaintances. The most notable debate I observed was about the Gaza war, the occupation, and questions of economic peace. In the frozen foods aisle, I walked up as Muhammad and a younger Palestinian stocker named Hamza were talking to a tall Israeli rep in his 40s from Tel Aviv who smiled a lot and spoke near-fluent Arabic. Muhammad was clearly comfortable talking to this man, but referred to him, too, only by his company name or not at all, an index of the mix between familiarity and distance. This rep was considerably friendlier than Tenuva, and the interaction mixed friendly gestures and comments with heated, and very much unresolved debate over existential settler-indigenous antagonisms especially in Gaza.

Muhammad argued passionately against the Israeli siege on Gaza, saying it was the main reason for Hamas' use of rockets—an argument rarely aired in Israeli public spheres, which

[85] Muhammad's relationship with Moshe was another variation: they knew each other far better than Muhammad and Tenuva, and they occasionally had simpler and warmer sorts of exchanges (which I did not see between Muhammad and Tenuva), and even moments where Moshe played along with some of Muhammad's political jokes, as we'll see in the following chapter.

suggested a unique critical edge to this *de facto* antagonistic public sphere at the store. The rep defended the Israeli siege by trying to position himself as a moderate, saying that while some Knesset members wanted to burn Gaza to the ground, he preferred to have Palestinians from Gaza come work in Israel. (The force of his gesture was somewhat undermined by the fact that Palestinians from Gaza *had* worked in Israel, to the tune of about half of Gaza's GDP until Israeli-imposed closures during the 1990s devastated the Gazan economy).[86]

"From Gaza?" said Hamza, more quietly than the others, but still visibly exercised relative to his usual calm demeanor. "They barely let people from the *West Bank* work in Israel."[87]

"No they do, they do," said the rep.

"Let me explain," Muhammad said. "Take Hamza here. He's a nice guy. But he's not married. Take him to the Civil Administration, ask for a permit and they'll say 'you're not married? You don't have kids? Get out of here!'" Marriage and children were some of the more stringent criteria for West Bank Palestinians to get permits to work in Israel proper, relative to the requirements for working in settlements.

The rep replied that even though Hamza was a nice guy, another worker could want to come here and carry out an attack.[88] This was why there had to be such heavy security, he said,

[86] See Roy 1999; Farsakh 2005.

[87] West Bank Palestinians could get permits to work in Israel at this time, but since the 1990s there were far fewer permits, and newly introduced restrictions, especially that they had to be above a certain age and have kids, which presumably decreased the chances of their being willing to commit an attack that risked their own life.

[88] And as in the other exchanges, an Israeli referred here to a Palestinian worker (this time a hypothetical one) as a potential terrorist. In fact, West Bank Palestinians who worked in Israel and the settlements very rarely committed violent attacks. Still, there were a few cases of such workers, or Jerusalemite workers, carrying out "lone wolf" attacks in the Israeli cities where they worked ("lone wolf" indicates that they were not affiliated with an organized group), as part of a broader wave of such attacks from late 2015 to the time of writing. These attacks very rarely happened at the workers' place of work.

both here and in Gaza. He then pivoted back to trying to frame himself as a moderate, saying that he wanted peace, and wanted Palestinians to work in Israel, but Hamas didn't want peace, only to "destroy the Jewish state"—an argument often heard in Israeli news media.

But while I knew Muhammad to have plenty of substantive retorts to these claims, he just shrugged, in effect refusing this line of argument, including its implicit demand to accept Israel. Here was another critical move that was rare in the Israeli public sphere, in part because making it could easily make Israeli interlocutors aggressively attack a Palestinian speaker and shift the focus to the speaker being against Israel or Jews. Interestingly, this Israeli rep did not become particularly exercised by Muhammad's shrug; this sphere of debate had different rules, allowing novel space for some things to be said. Yet this did not mean there was resolution.

As time wound down, the rep, who had mostly spoken in Arabic, now said in Hebrew, "*Inshallah* there will be peace," which was a common thing for more liberal Israelis to say in passing interactions with Palestinian workers (though a fuller sense of the rep's political leanings was hard to judge). With a wry grin, Muhammad loudly retorted, "*Inshallah* one day we'll sit together in Gaza and eat fish!" registering the absurdity and naïveté of the rep's earnest expression of hope for peace, as well as of his earlier visions of Palestinians from Gaza working in Israel.

After this sharp, unresolved ending to the conversation, Muhammad invited the rep for coffee out back—a gesture which was not mutually exclusive with social tension or heated debate in many Palestinian social contexts, including the store. The rep politely refused—also not an unusual move in the context of being offered hospitality by Palestinians, and perhaps due to his apparent familiarity with Palestinian society (he accepted a similar invitation on a different day). He said he had to get home for a child's birthday party, and the men began chatting about

their kids going back to school (a week apart due to the separate school systems). This apolitical chatter and hospitable gesture capped off a heated debate in which, among other things, the participants had taken up, and put distinct variations on, already circulating discourses regarding the war and siege, some of them with a particularly critical edge.

Yet the story was not quite finished. Muhammad was still bothered the next day by the sales rep's comment about Palestinians from Gaza working in Israel. His face in a scowl, he was talking about this to himself and in principle to the absent rep, but loudly and theatrically enough that he was broadcasting to me what he thought:

> Oh, you want to have tourists coming in to Gaza and people going back and forth? You [Israel] closed this area for 8 years [referring to the siege] and the people don't have anything to eat. They're just trying to get something to eat. And you want to have tourists going around? … They [Israel] want peace and Zahar and Meshal [top Hamas leaders] don't? Do you know how much a bag of cooking fat costs in Gaza? 120 shekels!

He walked out of the freezer yelling "Liars!" *[kadhabeen]*. He was out in the aisles now, repeating "Liars!" This recapitulation of his earlier argument, and his linking the rep's suggestion of labor migration from Gaza to even more naïve ideas for tourist development there made this a critique of discourses of economic peace. Muhammad mocked such ideas as utterly inadequate to core issues of colonization, siege, impoverishment and starvation for Palestinians in Gaza. The occurrence of antagonistic political argument here had not only undermined the status of this marketplace as a space of what Israeli leaders would call economic peace; even one of the arguments critiqued the idea of economic peace itself.

Evasion, refusal and antagonism

There was also a subtler way that Palestinians responded when Jewish-Israelis instigated

exchanges in the way that Tenuva did, or escalated them in the way that Moshe did: to evade engagement, or "stay quiet," as the vast majority of Palestinian workers put it in interviews. In these interviews, they sometimes gestured at a pragmatic logic to staying quiet. Why would they risk having to go back to less than half the Super-Israel minimum wage in the West Bank Palestinian economy if they lost their permit? But my main interest here is not so much in highlighting the tactical nature of these Palestinian engagements (cf. de Certeau 1984) and especially not a strategic rationality of the peasant or other subaltern (Scott 1987), which implies an analytical effort to preserve a realm of subaltern autonomy that Mitchell convincingly critiques (1990), and that is not necessary for my argument. Rather, my interest is in how this evasion indirectly kept in play the antagonistic dynamics that Israelis were already setting in motion, by performing the Israelis as antagonists not to be trusted, and by implicitly refusing Israeli terms of debate. This refusal was partially agentive but, again, emerged in response to dynamics set in motion by others, and thus was not a straight-forward form of resistance (McGranahan 2016). It implied limits on Israelis' power to shape the terms of the exchange, even if they had largely unchecked power to initiate, constituting a contestation over the very terms of contestation in the store.

Recall the exchange between Tal and Hamdan from the previous chapter, when Tal, a sales rep, taunted Hamdan, the Palestinian stocker who other workers considered so self-interested, and so lacking in character or commitments to other Palestinians, that he had invited the hated Shlomo to a local Palestinian wedding simply to curry favor with him. Tal had aligned Hamdan with Hamas, suggesting that Hamdan must know a popular Hamas anthem.

This debate continued with Tal taunting Hamdan about the Gaza war, in a boastful, aggressive tone that stood in tension with the defensive nature of his claims: "every house we

destroyed in Gaza was used by Hamas. No one there was innocent!" The "we" bluntly identified him with the Israeli state and military. In a playful variation on the Israeli violence that his claim referenced, he physically elbowed Hamdan, who was a head shorter than him, in the gut as if bullying a littler cousin, albeit without threatening significant immediate harm. He egged Hamdan on - "Right? Right?" - seeming to try to get him to engage.

Hamdan offered a grin and a vague one-liner about getting back at Tal personally, but otherwise he "stayed quiet," completely evading the political content of Tal's taunts.

"I'm just playing with you!" Tal continued, in a still-aggressive tone that did not walk back his claims, but did seem to register and respond to Hamdan's evasiveness, continuing to try to get Hamdan to go along with the kind of interaction he seemed to be trying to have with him.

Here Hamdan implicitly refused both the political and inter-personal terms of engagement that Tal was trying to dictate, including the idea that Tal was "just playing" and therefore that Hamdan should respond in perhaps a more playful or robust way. Sure, from a certain angle, Hamdan simply did not challenge the Israeli or address the specific arguments he made. Yet by barely responding, Hamdan also refused the Israeli's terms of engagement here. He marshalled what little power he had to stop a conversation about the Gaza war before it stopped, and thus to not be drawn into making claims against the Israeli military or on behalf of Palestinian militants, which surely would have escalated and lengthened the conversation, as well as put him at risk, in a way he was not comfortable with or prepared to navigate in the way Muhammad was. Moreover, given that Tal had already aligned himself with the Israeli military, Hamdan subtly affirmed the antagonistic logic here, not by calling Hamdan his enemy but by refusing to engage further, implying a lack of trust, or of the dark sort of conviviality Tal seemed to want, or both. This refusal reaffirmed the Israeli as antagonist, albeit in a much subtler way

than Muhammad did, even though Hamdan did not challenge the Israeli's claims or his dominance per se. Other Palestinians did something similar, as above when Tareq subtly refused the customer's comment about learning Arabic from military service as grounds for connection between them. Seen in this light, Muhammad's interactions with the sales reps were also interesting not just because of the overt performances of antagonism they entailed, but because, through explicit argument as well as the modes of its performance, he refused Israeli workers' terms of debate and dictated many of the terms himself, crucially including how and when the tone of exchanges shifted between seriousness and light-heartedness.

The terms of such shifts were important, as illustrated by the Israeli warehouse worker Benjy, who crossed what one Palestinian interviewee called a "red line," namely insulting Islam (he had brought up ISIS, made quasi-intellectual arguments imputing an inherent violence to Islam, and in effect asked a few Palestinian stockers to answer for ISIS, implying an identification that they adamantly refused). Some Palestinians argued with him for awhile in that instance, but they largely dropped an air of conviviality with him, and seemed to generally avoid him as an interlocutor, in contrast to their ongoing ties to Moshe. Given the social capital of workers like Muhammad, even with Israelis, this was a powerful exercise of social isolation that could shape the political nature of the exchanges.

We might also note the one story of collective Palestinian refusal of managers that I heard at Super-Israel, which resonated with some episodes I heard of from other stores, and was the furthest Palestinians went towards direct, confrontational collective action, at this Super-Israel and similar stores. Shlomo had told the workers they could pray at work (they did so once or twice per shift, often in groups of ten or more) "but not on [his] time," as they remembered him saying it. He wanted them to clock out before prayer and clock back in after; but as Abu

Omar put it, the workers simply "refused," and the policy didn't stick. Occasionally, then, refusal gave Palestinians traction to partly set the terms of their collective relation to the manager.

The stakes of Hamdan's and Muhammad's refusals, and of the workers' rare collective forms of refusal, can be further interpreted by reference to the recent anthropological and political-theoretical scholarship on an Indigenous politics of refusal in North America (Coulthard 2014; Simpson 2014), as well as related anthropological theorizations of refusal as a social and political practice (McGranahan 2016). The Palestinian refusals recall McGranahan's suggestion that refusal can "mark the point of a limit having been reached," and even more importantly that it "can be generative," including by reorienting the terms of an encounter. Here, Muhammad and Hamdan's refusals marked limits to Israelis' abilities to set the terms of everyday intercourse. More broadly these inter-personal refusals of certain Israeli political instigations, as well as various forms of engagement, obliquely regenerated—or at least kept in play—an element of political antagonism to Israeli-Palestinian relations. They thus helped to constitute limits to the market encounter as apolitical, and more broadly to the ways such encounters could normalize settler dominance.

Central to this anthropological interest in refusal has been Audra Simpson's *Mohawk Interruptus,* were the refusals at hand are Kahnawà:ke Mohawk "refusals of Canadian and U.S. state sovereignty" (Ibid.) For Simpson, this refusal "structures possibilities" (Ibid.) for indigenous subjectivity and especially for indigenous sovereignty. Though Simpson's notion of sovereignty is capacious and not limited to the state, the sovereignty she describes is nonetheless grounded in Mohawk institutions of self-government. This focus on sovereignty is characteristic of a fair amount of recent work in Native American and Indigenous Studies, and crucial to the engaged, anti-colonial politics of such work (Simpson and Smith 2014).

By contrast, the specific Palestinian refusals I speak of are less institutionalized and on a much smaller scale than the indigenous refusal that Simpson connects to indigenous sovereignty.[89] Indeed, while the refusals I explore do constitute Palestinian political practices, these practices are best understood as part of broader dynamics of settler-indigenous antagonism, dynamics often initiated and escalated by settlers. Using the concept of settler-indigenous antagonism instead of that of indigenous sovereignty is helpful in making sense of these particular small-scale conditions in the store, as well as of the current lack of a horizon of sovereignty in the Palestinian context more broadly, where Palestinian sovereignty has meant a Palestinian nation-state, which no longer seems imaginable (Khalidi 2010). But ethnographic elaboration of the distinction between sovereignty and antagonism as different concepts of the political (cf. Schmitt 2007) may be useful in making sense of an even broader range of political practices in other settler-indigenous encounters.

To be clear, my distinction between settler-indigenous antagonism and indigenous sovereignty is by no means due to any theoretical or political antipathy to indigenous sovereignty or the idea of sovereignty itself; on the contrary, my emphasis on antagonism shares a set of

[89] Of course, Palestinian political history has many more organized and scaled-up iterations of a politics of refusal, from the general strikes during the first Palestinian *intifada* (Beinin and Lockman 1989), which at least temporarily animated grassroots Palestinian politics and brought strategic geopolitical gains for the Palestinian cause, to the Palestinian Authority's refusal to engage with the Trump administration in 2017, following Trump's announcement that he would move the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem. This latter case, which has not brought strategic gains or significantly aided a Palestinian political landscape in crisis, illustrates that even principled refusal may not necessarily be politically meaningful if those carrying it out lack broad support, as in the case of the PA. As in instance of this lack of support, the workers I got to know saw its leadership as out of touch with their needs, utterly ineffective, and morally compromised due to their cooperation with Israel. Finally, an analysis of these principled forms of refusal should nonetheless be distinguished from the common narrative in pro-Israel variants of U.S. foreign policy discourse that Palestinian leaders have repeatedly said "no" to good-faith peace offers from Israel (a narrative echoed above by the sales rep from Tel Aviv), and that these "no's" illustrate that Palestinians are inherently not pragmatic, committed to violence or both. For a critique of such narratives, which among other things, rely on Orientalist tropes and erase the broader political circumstances of the peace process, see Said 1992.

analytical impulses with these studies of indigenous sovereignty. I share Simpson's (2014) aim of pushing back on the ways in which some theorists have overemphasized the efficacy or teleological actualization of settler logics of rule over time (Wolfe 2006; Veracini 2010, 2011, 2013), which can efface questions of indigenous politics.[90] Relatedly, I want to highlight not only how indigenous peoples are governed, are made subjects, but to highlight indigenous forms politics and forms of politics in which indigenous people participate (or refuse). Not only does my attention to the emergence of antagonisms in settler-indigenous encounters in Israel/Palestine highlight the limits of a certain form of settler power (Wolfe 2006; Veracini 2011), namely its normalization through forms of market depoliticization; it also highlights the limits of market depoliticization more broadly, advancing a nuanced ethnographic approach to power in the anthropology and critical theory of neoliberalism more broadly.

[90] Simpson is in conversation here with Wolfe's (2006) and Veracini's (2011) analyses of settler colonialism, pointing to the ways in which they both leave little room for limits to settler colonial power. This tendency is present in both authors' writings on Palestine as well. Where Veracini does speak of such limits (2013), he does so in a heavy-handed way, arguing, based mostly on vague invocations of international discourse and opinion, that settler colonialism has "succeeded" at becoming normal inside the Green Line but "failed" at doing so in the West Bank.

Interlude

A Palestinian World at Super-Israel

The next chapter explores how forms of Palestinian sociality, sound and address, such as prayer practices and Islamist militant music, helped to subtly challenge settler dominance in the store. A key way in which I became attuned to this Palestinian world inside Super-Israel was through Palestinian gestures at incorporating and recruiting me into some aspects of it—especially Muslim and Islamist ones. A moment of reflection on these gestures, then, will helpfully preview the next chapter.

While I have already spoken to other aspects of this incorporation (such as Muhammad's playful recruitments of me into the Hamas' Qassam brigades), here I want to focus on the Palestinians more seriously trying to get me to convert to Islam, as well as teaching me about it. This practice pointed me to what we will see was a key aspect of Palestinian sociality and soundscapes within Super-Israel, with interesting connections to broader Palestinian geographies.

Yaser gave me informal Islamic piety lessons as he served customers, telling me stories from the Qur'an. One day he stopped between serving customers to show me how to drink water according to the *sunna*, kneeling on one knee and drinking from a plastic container otherwise used for shredded Emek and mozzarella. When he and I served a Palestinian female customer and she asked him about me and he praised me, they quickly moved to talking about how I could be a good candidate for conversion.

While Yaser did not pursue the matter with me during our extensive time together inside and outside the store, other workers did. As I sat with Muhammad, Ja'far, and Abu Khaled in the warehouse, they would try to persuade me to convert to Islam. Muhammad would say, "Because

I like you…" or "because you love Arabs… you should become Muslim." These conversations interspersed with our political discussions of the Gaza war and the occupation, as their responses to the killing of Palestinian civilians often invoked God; my solidarity with them politically also raised the question of whether I might become more like them, and it sometimes seemed as if they cared more about my becoming Muslim—that my politics was just an avenue to conversion (an idea that unsettled me and my understanding of the solidarity I wanted to build with them).

"Islam doesn't force you [*mish ghasbin 'annak*]," Muhammad would say, so loudly and so often I had trouble keeping an awkward smile from my face. I should study it, he said, maybe even try it for a while, and if I didn't like it, no problem. I explained that even though I do not identify with Israelis, I am Jewish because my parents are and that wouldn't change. This didn't impress him.

Soon, these solicitations incorporated a broader Palestinian geography. Muhammad began inviting me to his hometown of Hebron, which is known as one of the more conservative cities in the West Bank, and a stronghold of Islamic piety as well as Islamist groups which have a prominent presence there despite their formally being banned ("Hebron is Hamas City," [*al-khalīl madinat Hamas*] Yaser joked as we saw a green Hamas flag flying from an apartment building while driving into town one day.)

Ostensibly Muhammad's idea was that I would come early in the morning to watch the Palestinian workers cross into Israel at the nearby Tarquimiyya checkpoint—a well-trodden image in journalistic and academic writing about Palestinian workers in Israel (Bornstein 2002), which I was less than excited to reproduce. But his invitations ended up focusing on Hebron even more as an Islamic place, and the visit as a religious one: "we'll go to *markaz al da'wa* [the

Islamic outreach center]" he would say.[91] This frustrated me because, for disciplinary, political and other reasons, I did not want to focus on religion; but it turned out to be an important factor in understanding these other questions.

After a while it seemed to me that these repeated invitations, the related conversations about conversion, and the piety practices that suffused the store constituted a kind of *markaz al-da'wa* in the storage areas and behind the counters of Super-Israel—part of a broader Palestinian social world that in a place like Hebron was unremarkable, but in Super-Israel had a political edge, existing in tension with highly proximate settler space. This informal, mini-*markaz al da'wa* pointed back to a whole Palestinian world outside, to an alternative sense of the location of Super-Israel within Palestine (not Israel), as we will see below.

[91] I was already paranoid about Israeli authorities monitoring my research (Johnson 2016), and figured that a visit by a foreigner, a Jew, an Israeli—any of the above—to a space associated (rightly or wrongly) with Islamists would surely raise eyebrows from Palestinian security forces, with the Israeli Shin Bet with whom they collaborated, and who knew who else. So, I both very much wanted to do this and very much did not want to. I could sense a tension, too, between Muhammad's repeated enthusiastic invitations and the days or weeks at a time that he let the matter rest. Though I spent plenty of time in Hebron with other workers, the visit with Muhammad never happened, which he reminded me pointedly on a What's App chat through Yusuf's phone a year and a half later. But the repeated invitations were ethnographically rich nonetheless.

Chapter 4

The Smartphone *Adhan*: the Politics of Dissonance and a Palestinian Frontier Counterpublic

On a Thursday evening at Super-Israel, Yaser and Yusuf are slicing cheese for their settler customers. The store's elevator music (mostly instrumentals of Western pop hits from the 90s and 2000s) plays over the store's loudspeaker, punctuated by announcements in Hebrew addressing "dear customers" [*lekochot yekarim*].[92] The Palestinian workers serve the customers in the Israeli version of customer service speak.

Yaser serves someone their cheese, saying *bevakasha* [Heb. here you go], and addresses the cluster of folks at the front of the line which runs 10 or 15 deep, "*ken, mi bevakasha*," [Yes, who's next please?]. As he prepares the orders, the fastidious customers look on intensely, ready to call to any worker who doesn't seem to be busy and ask his help—a classed kind of power that, as we have seen in the previous chapter, overlaps to a great extent with ethno-nationality here, in a latent complex of intersecting tensions that can quickly magnify one another and escalate.

For a moment, all one hears is the low din from the cash registers some 200 feet away, the whir of the industrial cheese wheel, and the elevator music.[93] Then a high-pitched call of "*Allahu akbar, allllahhhh hu ak-bar"* bursts in a sharp, tinny amplified form, as if from nowhere in particular, climbing several notes and stopping abruptly on the last *r*. A few customers quickly

[92] As noted below in Chapter One, this dominant public of the store was not merely a generic consumerist one but also a Jewish-Israeli nationalist one, in ways that sometimes undermined the normalizing effect of the marketplace regardless of specific Palestinian practices in the store.
[93] Selections included "Can you feel the love tonight" from The Lion King, "The Wind Beneath My Wings" by Bette Midler, the "525,600 minutes" theme from RENT, and "P.I.M.P." by 50 Cent.

turn their necks and eyes, looking for where this clearly Arabic, Muslim, Palestinian sound is coming from. It is the Muslim call to prayer [*adhan*], which some Israelis clearly recognize while others may not. Yaser switches from Hebrew customer service speak to Arabic, muttering the short ritual response he always does when he hears the call to prayer.

After a few seconds, the customers seem to find the source of the call: it is sounding not from a mosque's loudspeaker atop a minaret, where Israelis in the Jerusalem area would usually hear it at a distance, but rather up-close, from the small but powerful loudspeaker on one of the workers' two generations-old smartphones. It is activated automatically on schedule by an app that many Palestinians use.

The workers often do not silence the call—not specifically to bother settlers, but simply because it does not occur to them to monitor this taken-for-granted practice. Even if it does, they are wearing gloves sticky with cheese residue. Sometimes, a similar Saudi recording (this genre is used by many local mosques too) plays from multiple smartphones at once, creating a faint surround effect that is magnified by Yaser's ritual response and Muhammad's eventual call from the aisles: "Yaser! Yusuf! *Salah* [Ar. prayer]!" While it is hard to get a sense of exactly how unsettled the customers are, Yaser later tells me that one customer has complained to management. (We will see more obvious expressions of Israeli unsettled-ness below.)

If the previous chapter theorized the politics of antagonism between Israelis and Palestinians, this chapter explores a more oblique form of the political: a politics of dissonance on the settler frontier, between a dominant Jewish-Israeli public and a Palestinian frontier counterpublic, both of which are miniature variants of broader publics. The Palestinian frontier counterpublic at Super-Israel consists of Islamic prayer and its sound sounds, as in this anecdote, as well as Palestinian Islamist and secular-nationalist music, all of which correspond to and

highlight certain aspects of broader Palestinian publics. In this frontier counterpublic, Jewish-Israelis sometimes figure forthrightly as political enemies and occupiers rather than customers, recalling the antagonistic themes of the previous chapter. This Palestinian frontier counterpublic flourishes in particular micro-spaces – such as the storage areas – as part of a distinct Palestinian social world within Super-Israel. This world consists of Palestinians simply addressing each other in Arabic (including Hebrew phrases incorporated from the store's official vocabulary), and connecting around masculinity, shared Muslim practices and more, partly in ways that would pertain in their hometowns, and partly in ways constituted specifically by the contact zone. Still, my primary interest is not in identifying and interpreting a bounded space of Palestinian "culture" in itself, nor in providing a comprehensive account of an Islamic or other Palestinian public and the particular technologies it relies on (Hirschkind 2006); is rather in Palestinian sound and sociality precisely as they constitute sonic encroachments[94] into an ostensibly settled Israeli space. These encroachments entail a sonic, spatial and political dissonance between a taken-for-granted settler presence and forms of Palestinian presence that unsettle it—in both the ordinary and political senses of the term. What makes Palestinian sound and address here a *frontier* counterpublic is the way they emerge in up-close dissonance with Israeli public address. By contrast, the same practices, like the call to prayer, are not politically important in this way when performed in the adjacent Palestinian towns, although Islamist forms of address have their own edge there given the dominance of the secular-nationalist, U.S.-backed Palestinian Authority, which I shall explore below.

This physical proximity is closely related to the importance of sound as a political medium here, and to the question of how Palestinian forms of address relate to settler audiences.

[94] I am grateful to Lisa Wedeen for suggesting the phrase "sonic encroachments"; any faults in the argument remain my own.

Due to the "indiscriminate" character of public address, especially insofar as it is amplified by loudspeakers in densely inhabited, urban-scale public spaces (Larkin 2014), address that is ostensibly meant for Palestinians can sometimes have Jewish-Israeli audiences too.[95] Thus the carrying of Palestinian sound from a Palestinian social world to a settler audience, and the ways this sound can feel immersive and highly proximate, in ways that written words may not, can profoundly unsettle settler phenomenologies of place and everyday-ness.[96] The force of this unsettling emerges most poignantly, perhaps, in the ways that it elicits Israeli efforts at tuning out or suppressing Palestinian sound. For sound constitutes a particularly immersive, and thus potentially threatening marker of Palestinian collective presence. Thus I discuss Israeli micro-strategies of suppressing Palestinian presence in the supermarket, which shed light on broader Israeli attempts to suppress Palestinian presence on the urban and national scale, while also allowing for crucial attention to the limits of such attempts.

Indeed, the supermarket is not the only place where these struggles over sound and public address happen. In a loose parallel to the customer complaining about the call to prayer at Super-Israel, an Israeli Knesset bill in 2017 attempted to ban amplification of the Muslim call to prayer in frontier areas such as Jerusalem, causing Palestinian protests before being quietly stopped by Prime Minister Netanyahu, likely for fear that it could lead to an escalation of conflict. Just as the supermarket brings together different forms of Israeli relations to Palestinians, and different modes of governing them, the micro-struggles over sound in the supermarket condense broader

[95] This offers a small-scale version of Mazzarella's notion of an "open edge" of mass publicity—that is, how public address can resonate in powerful ways with various publics. This open edge makes mass publicity central to shoring up political authority in a mass society—or to undoing it.

[96] Scholars have explored sound more generally as a way of broadcasting and claiming political space (Corbin 1999). "Sound" can be a verb that describes precisely the testing of distance between objects, as in sonar equipment (Helmreich 2015); this meaning also points to the political ways in which sound tests the limits of Palestinian versus Israeli space.

struggles over sound and space, allowing for analysis of their detailed forms. Moreover, while scholars have spoken of sound as a militarized technology of Israeli rule (Goodman 2012), this chapter's focus on everyday, largely civilian sound wars links up with my broader aim in the dissertation of highlighting civilian dimensions of the Israeli settler-colonial project, which are a key locus for struggles over the normalization of that project.

This chapter also builds upon the previous chapter's intervention of revisiting agonistic theories of the public sphere in the context of the zero-sum, antagonistic quality of political encounter on a settler frontier (cf. Mouffe 2006). Here I specifically want to put Michael Warner (2005), Nancy Fraser (1990) and Charles Hirschkind's (2006) notions of *counterpublics* in conversation with this form of settler-indigenous political encounter. Warner is helpful here in a couple ways. First, he argues that publics and counterpublics are by definition "autotelic"—that is, they are constituted purely by public address circulating among strangers, and thus have a highly emergent quality. They go beyond existing institutions, and can even have an ideological effect of seeming autonomous from them (Hirschkind 2006), even if they generally do have some relationship to them. At Super-Israel, Palestinian forms of address operate in a context where Palestinian institutions, such as mosques and political parties, are absent, while the same practices, repeated in nearby Palestinian areas where these institutions are present, tend to lack this emergent quality. Second and more importantly, for Warner, counterpublics exist in a relation of friction with a dominant public (2005: 120). This friction would seem to be present at Super-Israel.

Yet here our exercise falters. For Warner says that something is not a public/counterpublic relation simply because there is friction between groups or sets of statements, or even – and this is absolutely crucial – simply because one group in question is

dominant and another is subaltern. Here Warner departs from Nancy Fraser's (1990) notion of "subaltern counterpublics" because Fraser's counterpublics are no different *in form* from dominant public spheres; they make political counter-claims but do not do what Warner considers definitive of counterpublics: enact "different ways of being in public." Warner offers Christian fundamentalists in the U.S. as an example of his version of the concept, for they challenge normative ways of being in public without being subaltern. Thus, rather than broadening Fraser's notion of "subaltern counterpublics" to account for differences in form, Warner's more extensive reconceptualization plays down the element of subalterity, and hence the elements of political hierarchy and domination. Because this move risks diluting the political force of Fraser's version of the concept (though it need not do so) I offer the concept of a frontier counterpublic, which resonates with Fraser's emphasis on subalterity.

Indeed, the key point about a Palestinian frontier counterpublic here is not that it constitutes a "different way of being in public"—not that it poses how a given public sphere, shared by those present, could be inhabited differently. As noted in Chapter Three, the Israeli frontier in the West Bank is structurally hostile to a democratic public sphere shared by Israelis and Palestinians. This point holds for my account of a counterpublic here, in the following way. For both Warner and Charles Hirschkind, while the counterpublics they analyze address only certain people, those people can in principle be the same people that a dominant public might address, within the same socio-political universe.[97] But this is not the case at Super-Israel. This

[97] For example, in Warner, gay or queer people can in principle be addressed as part of heteronormative publics, such as those having to do with marriage, *or* as part of a queer counterpublic, or something in between. Or in Hirschkind's somewhat different context, many of the same "ordinary Egyptian Muslims" (11) that have long been addressed by as a dominant public in which Islam is regulated by the state in certain secular-liberal ways, have increasingly become reconstituted as part of an Islamic counterpublic. To be sure, somewhat like the Palestinian counterpublic here, Hirschkind's Islamic counterpublic also offers a different way of imagining Egypt itself (e.g. locating it within a broader Muslim world, and even rejecting the authority of the Egyptian state in some ways), but it generally does not quite imply that "this

Palestinian frontier counterpublic does not address a dominant Israeli public as part of itself.[98] Rather, its ultimate force, that which makes it "counter," is that it sharply raises the zero-sum question of whose territory Super-Israel stands on in the first place. Further, it implies collective forms of Palestinian presence and spatiality that are mutually exclusive with a Zionist settler project, whose foundational principle is what Wolfe calls "destroying to replace" (2006), or establishing political dominance by erasing collective indigenous presence and attachment to place (cf. Abu el-Haj 2001).

This settler-colonial frontier thus raises questions of space—of excessive spatial proximity and of zero-sum struggles over space—in particular ways that Warner's notion of counterpublics de-emphasizes. As in Chapter Three, I draw here on a strain of public sphere thinking in Habermas (1991) and others that highlights particular, concentrated spaces where genres of public discourse emerge (e.g. Negt and Kluge ; Wedeen 2008; Deeb and Harb 2013; Fennel 2015). [99] I focus on a particular space – in this case, a frontier – which plays host not only to public address in itself, but dissonance between two publics that correspond to political antagonists.

Still, the spatial quality of this frontier counterpublic should not be confused with a border between two states. Rather, micro-frontiers in Israel/Palestine are generated by ongoing settler-colonial expansion into Palestinian territory, and attempts to dominate, suppress and

---

is not Egypt" in the way that Palestinians often imply that Palestine is Palestine and *not* Israel. Similarly, a queer counterpublic questions certain aspects of a dominant way of being in public, but is not necessarily about challenging the legitimacy or normalized status of a whole country, though queer counterpublics specifically in settler societies may do so, particularly those whose publics intersect with radical indigenous ones (Morgensen 2010).

[98] Nor are these Palestinians addressed as part of a dominant Israeli public, except in the complex and often subservient ways I highlighted in Chapter One—as workers who are nonetheless political Others.

[99] I draw here on Fennell's exemplary analysis of how publics relate to space and sensory contact on an urban scale.

otherwise govern Palestinian collective life. Weizman notes that myriad attempts by Israel and Western powers to partition Israel/Palestine, and to maintain segregation between Israelis and Palestinians, have failed to bring peace or solve the conflict, instead generating an increasingly complex map of control. Weizman (2007) has mapped this micro-partition at the level of inter-city infrastructure (especially roads) and segregation between neighborhoods, but we have few sustained ethnographic accounts of how this operates on the even more micro-level, such as the sidewalk (but see Neuman 2000; 2018).

This problem of proximity is posed in a complex, particularly illuminating way by encounters at Super-Israel—by settlers' solicitation of Palestinian labor into spaces otherwise largely purified as Jewish-Israeli, for everyday activities that can involve intense and sustained physical proximity, especially on crowded days such as Shabbat and holiday eves.[100] The anthropology of sound in urban space can also help us make sense of this intimate register of contact—of how sound tests the limits not just between physical bodies and species (Helmreich 2015) but between groups within polities (Larkin 2014) and across hard political lines of membership. My analysis below draws on Larkin's notion of the "indiscriminate" quality of amplified sound in dense urban spaces, and his discussion of how unintended audiences (like Goffman's "unratified listeners") and considers them in a specifically settler colonial context.

[100] There is legalized and militarily enforced residential segregation in the West Bank, meaning that Palestinians are never allowed to live in settlements in the West Bank (though sometimes in Jerusalem they are), and that in areas near settlements (Area C), the natural expansion of Palestinian towns that might create zones of overlap is curtailed through near total restrictions on residential agricultural or infrastructural development; when people do build there, the Israeli Civil Administration punishes them with fines or revoked work permits, and often demolishes whatever has been built. One example is a junkyard operated by Palestinians between a nearby Palestinian town ('Eizeriyya) and this settlement, which soldiers demolished during my fieldwork because it did not have a permit from the Civil Administration.

As I do throughout the dissertation, here I tack back and forth between accounting for the structural antagonisms of the settler-colonial situation and the subtle ways they manifest in everyday life in the contact zone, often in civilian form. Here it is Palestinian sound and public address that partly unsettle the taken-for-granted-ness of dominant settler presence. As noted at various points, one goal of my tacking back and forth in this way is to offer a specifically political account of the contact zone—political in the sense of settler-indigenous antagonism—that attends to the ways in which such political dynamics are mediated by various categories of everyday life, but without letting cultural alterity or representation become the primary object of inquiry.

In the remainder of this chapter, I analyze the Islamist and nationalist music at the heart of the Palestinian soundscape. I consider how it is located in particular spatial strongholds, while encroaching upon Israeli space and fostering a politics of dissonance between itself and the Israeli public. Finally, I consider how Israelis attempt to monitor or regulate Palestinian sound – and Palestinian presence itself – on various scales, from the supermarket to larger-scale sound wars over Muslim calls to prayer in Jerusalem and other cities under Israeli control that have both Israeli and Palestinian populations.

A Palestinian Soundscape and the Politics of Dissonance

Recall from the opening anecdote, as well as Chapter One, that a Jewish-Israeli soundscape and public at Super-Israel often serve to normalize settler presence, claims to land, and dominance. In the opening anecdote above, I note one element of this soundscape, namely elevator music. Scholars have identified the development of elevator music, its ways of modulating collective moods and distracting consumers, as central to the depoliticizing,

sanitizing side of consumer society, exemplified in "non-places" such as shopping malls and airports (Auge 2009; Goodman 2012). I want to complicate such accounts. In Chapter One, I did so in part by speaking to the tensions in the official Super-Israel soundscape between consumerism and populist/nationalist affect, in ways that could advance but also complicate the process of normalization. I also showed how Super-Israel's forms of address to consumers helped reproduce this West Bank space as part of a Jewish and Zionist temporality. Palestinian workers were pressured to participate in this temporal reproduction by using the greetings for Jewish and Israeli holidays, even as tensions remained, due to the fact that these Palestinians were specifically enemy Others of this Jewish-Israeli public, and that these holidays often involved overworking the Palestinians. Here, I speak further to the limits of Super-Israel's forms of public address to undo political tension, through the notion of a politics of dissonance between this Israeli public and a Palestinian counterpublic.

Palestinian nationalist, Palestinian Muslim and Palestinian Islamist music were perhaps the most striking forms of a Palestinian soundscape at Super-Israel, with the latter two often more prominent than the former. Recall that the prospect of this music appearing in Super-Israel was risky, for Palestinians could lose their permits or be fired for nearly anything, including getting Jewish-Israeli customers or workers suspicious or angry. Such music also cut against, or was a way around, what most workers told me was rule number one when working for Jewish-Israelis: "don't talk politics" [*tihkeesh siyasa*], especially to Jewish-Israelis. Of course, this rule had exceptions, such as talking politics with Jewish-Israelis who one knew well, with some degree of playfulness, and usually after the Israelis had initiated. Playing Palestinian music had a different logic, however. It was not directly addressed to Israelis (even if they might hear it); it was less a frontal communication, more a crafting of the atmosphere in ways that made implicit

claims.

This left the question of Israeli audiences ambiguous. Palestinians would often be talking amongst themselves, or singing to themselves or each other, or praying, and Jewish-Israelis would simply be around as "unratified listeners" (Goffman 1981; Rutherford 2010) or potentially eavesdroppers, which generally made the status of this counterpublic ambiguous: to what extent where Israelis listening, hearing, understanding?

After a local concert by the Arab Idol champion, Muhammad Assaf from Gaza, workers played his songs more than usual, especially the most popular, nationalist one, *'ali al-kuffiyeh* [raise the kuffiyeh]. Having heard the song blaring from passing cars and playing in cafés in East Jerusalem and the West Bank, I immediately recognized the distinctive opening notes of the Arab orchestral prelude, and the rapturous applause from the studio audience, as soon as I heard it playing from someone's phone at the store—indeed, I recognized it as a highly intelligible icon of a Palestinian nationalist public, a marker of *Palestinian* public space. Jewish-Israeli customers and managers did not necessarily know this song, hence the possibility of singing it right in front of their faces and perhaps arousing curiosity but not immediate discipline, and being just risky enough to be exhilarating. Indeed, 'Ahed, the jokester of the deli, one day sang *'ali al-kuffiyeh* out loud out of nowhere, almost right in the face of a Jewish-Israeli he was serving, who seemed not to notice. Still, this couldn't be assumed for sure, given Yusuf's suspicion (chapter two) that man customers spoke Arabic and simply didn't let on that they understood the Palestinians in order to keep spying on them. Moreover, *kuffiyeh* was a word Israelis knew and might have been able to recognize from the chorus, even if they did not know the song itself. Prominent Israeli associations with the *kuffiyeh* include youth stone-throwers and the militant leader and eventual Prime Minister Yaser Arafat, whose famously wore one. The tune and Assaf's style of singing

might also have evoked Palestinian-ness to Israelis, even if they did not follow the song's message of national pride, including for political prisoners (perhaps the song's most antagonistic theme), and love for the nation and land. Still, the fact that someone as non-confrontational as Yaser would ask me to play the song on my phone one day at the deli-counter – Yaser occasionally talked with customers about desires for peace - suggested that playing this music was not necessarily intended as a particularly provocative act. Yet acts like this took on greater force in the context of the broader Palestinian soundscape..

That day, Yaser started searching on his phone for an Islamic girls' choir video he wanted to show me. We began listening to its lolling minor keys. Picking up on a musical ambience he liked, Muhammad yelled from the next aisle, "chant Qur'an!" and so Yaser exaggeratedly cleared his throat and started chanting *Qur'an* for a minute or two, pausing briefly to slice somebody some cheese in Hebrew—switching from the public of customer service to a Palestinian counterpublic as he did in the opening anecdote. For his part, Muhammad chanted Qur'an loudly and confidently as he walked around the storage area and sometimes even the aisles, making abundantly clear that he didn't care who heard him.

Qur'anic chanting was ubiquitous in the broader Palestinian soundscape, and of course quite separable from Islamism in principle, but it was one of the more risky things the Palestinian workers could do precisely because of the recognizability of this chanting for Jewish-Israelis, and because of their penchant for seeing Islamism in so many things merely Muslim (not least, in Muslims themselves).

Central to these soundscapes were Islamist militant music, and songs praising Islamist militancy, which were particularly prominent in Palestinian life during the 2014 Gaza war, and were particularly important to a politics of dissonance at Super-Israel.

Indeed, at this time, some of the workers took to singing what they called *aghani al-muqawama* [resistance songs], produced by militant groups ("the resistance" generally referred to Hamas and/or similar groups) in the back areas. In doing so, they brought these songs from Palestinian radio, where they were ubiquitous all summer, into an Israeli space where they were illicit, a potential cause for losing one's permit, and key idioms for dialing up Israeli-Palestinian antagonisms, as we have seen in chapter three.

The hit anthem of the summer was a song written from the perspective of Hamas and its followers, with lyrics about the precious blood of its fighters liberating Jerusalem:

Your blood is precious, O Hamas,

On to Jerusalem the honorable,

You pay no mind to the barking of the unclean ones—

Collaborators and Zionists.

The song, which goes on to narrate a recent history of Hamas' rise to power and ostensibly heroic fights against Israel, and taunts Israel's "army of giants" and its elite Golani brigade, seemed to be everywhere in East Jerusalem and the West Bank. I heard it blaring from car stereos, including on the street where I lived in East Jerusalem. A year and a half later I watched a Facebook clip in which the song played during a rally for a student branch of Hamas at a college in Hebron, as green Hamas flags fluttered all around. The opening line of the chorus had a catchy, staccato meter that would have been unmistakable to those who knew it, combining elements of a traditional Islamic *nashid* with the auto-tune effects and drum machines common to various genres of Palestinian and Arab pop music.

At the supermarket in August 2014, some stockers were singing and humming this catchy new anthem rather often. Abu Khaled was a particularly macho, 40-something worker who was a

friend of Muhammad, and constantly made jokes about sexual virility to me and the other workers, in a way that the pious Muhammad would occasionally laugh at but not repeat. Abu Khaled sang the song in a raspy, playful tone, right in the face of a mild-mannered Jewish-Israeli colleague who stared blankly and smiled, unsure what was being sung; Muhammad and the Palestinians laughed.

As I walked past the butcher counter one day, a Jerusalemite worker was humming the phrase *udrub, udrub* [strike, strike]—easily recognizable to me and potentially to some Israelis as part of a popular political song by the Palestinian singers Qassem al-Najjar and Yousef al-Bourini. "[Strike] what?" I asked, wanting to see how far he'd go. "*Tel abib*! [Arabicization of Tel Aviv]" he exclaimed and winked at me, completing the chorus of the song, which had come out during Israel's last assault on Gaza in 2012, and had echoes of earlier *udrub Tel Abib* chants that were common among Palestinians from past wars. The phrase *udrub* – yelled between men – was also a way I heard youth encourage each other to throw stones in clashes with Israeli forces. (It could also be used to encourage more mundane kinds of "hitting"—for example "*udrub*" could also mean "take a hit" of an *argileh* or water-pipe.)

These militant songs were thus a particular male iteration of Palestinian public spheres, sung by men (the aforementioned Hamas song was sung in Islamic *nashīd* style, by a chorus of multiple men) and corresponding to male-dominated activities like throwing stones, fixing cars, and (obviously for a much smaller number, with scant overlap to these workers) militant activity itself.[101] Hamas' Qassam brigades videos, which circulated on the Hamas-operated Al-Aqsa TV channel that local Palestinian businesses often played, and on Quds New Network, one of the

[101] Of course Palestinian women did participate in stone-throwing and other forms of resistance during the first *intifada*, but a more conservative reaction to the social dislocations and Israeli crackdowns of the *intifada* and its aftermath have made this rare today (cf. Tamari 2009).

most popular Palestinian news pages on Facebook, featured almost all men, though Hamas had used female suicide bombers in the past.[102] Moreover, though these songs obviously had women as part of their audience, their playing in public was often identified with male-dominated spaces in Palestinian life, like sporty cars being driven by men, or auto-body shops.[103]

This masculinity was one continuity between broader Palestinian public spaces and publicities and their reconstitution as a Palestinian counterpublic at Super-Israel.[104] At Super-Israel, the masculine character of this public address was bound up with broader forms of social affiliation. It helped connect the Palestinian workers, who were all male except two, to one another, for example through talking and joking about sex. It also animated a gendered relation between these male Palestinian workers and Jewish-Israeli female workers and customers. A thin majority of customers were women, in addition to the feminized way that the consumer can be imagined in some contexts, and was sometimes imagined here (Miller 2012). In relation to Jewish-Israeli women, Palestinian men sometimes reasserted their power in gendered terms for example by disparaging them as loose, flirting with them or showing interest, shock and/or judgment more indirectly by commenting on the scanty nature of some of their clothes.[105] Or, as

[102] This page, Quds News Network (facebook.com/QudsN) is not Hamas affiliated but is sympathetic to it, and to armed struggle more broadly. The brigades are the military wing of the broader Hamas movement and aref named after Sheikh Izz-al-din al-Qassam, an armed leader of the first major anti-colonial Palestinian uprising in 1936-1939, whose legacy has shaped notions of Palestinian resistance in the ensuing generations (Swedenburg 2003). It is important to note that Hamas is a multi-faceted movement whose social service arm is extremely important to its popularity among Palestinians (Hroub 2010).

[103] For example in a scene on the Palestinian comedy series *Watan 'a watar* [nation under pressure], the "udrub" song plays in the background at a mechanic's garage in the West Bank—part of the broader stereotyping the series does of working class or peasant Palestinians like those who worked at Super-Israel, who did not seem to watch the Ramallah-based show.

[104] For a more expansive account of Islam and gender in public space, which includes leisure practices involving various genders, see Deeb and Harb 2013.

[105] For example some Palestinian workers called some Jewish-Israeli female workers prostitutes (not to their faces) and sometimes flirted with them. This pointed to a way in which the Palestinian men were also unsettled by these encounters—not merely asserting their power over Jewish-Israeli women, but surprised and fascinated by them. On one occasion in the summer, one worker exclaimed to another at

we saw in Chapter One, they complained about how little work the Jewish workers, sometimes especially the Jewish female workers, did compared to them, which was bound up in their sense of honoring their work and dignifying themselves. Moreover, the sense of self attached to this work sometimes had to do with affirming virility through physical strength, which I saw when Muhammad mocked me for not being able to carry 30-kilo boxes of frozen meat like he did.

The Islamist songs were not necessarily a more significant part of Palestinian life than the nationalist songs or workers' other shared practices. But they were particularly incompatible with any accommodation to Israelis, and they were particularly risky at Super-Israel; they were thus particularly important to reconstituting broader Palestinian forms of address as a counterpublic within Super-Israel, in the specifically dissonant sense of challenging the dominant Israeli public in an existential way, including with reference to violence taking place elsewhere. As an index of the riskiness of these activities, when one worker hummed the "your blood is precious" song to himself out in the aisles, and I hummed along for a moment, he quietly but gleefully said: "whoever hears us will go crazy" [*illi bisma'na bitjann*], as he tossed expired Israeli yogurts into a crate. The yogurts as the backdrop, and the way the worker laughed, suggests that there was still something comically trivial about the supermarket encounter that dialed down the political energy that such dramatic discourses about Zionist enemies would have in other contexts, such as when played at the pro-Hamas rally at a Hebron college. Yet compared to the other forms of address at the store – particularly those endorsed by the customer service encounter – there was a live political edge to nearly any performance of such songs. As a further index of this stew of suspicion, high stakes, and triviality, we might note a scene in which two

---

how scantily clad a tall, female customer was, who looked to be in her late teens or early twenties. "That is not a shirt!" he said, as others looked surprised. On dynamics of male/female flirting in a more industrial context, see Salzinger 2003. Masculinity and labor is also a theme in Pachirat 2011.

Palestinian workers were singing a made-up ditty about a Jewish-Israeli female stocker they were friendly with, and an Israeli warehouse worked named Benji came up and asked, "Are you singing about *daesh* [ISIS]?" They chuckled, and one replied, "Benji, *daesh* is in Jordan, not here." [cut?]

The Soundscape's Ambiguous Relation to Islamist Idioms of Palestinian Nationalism

The ambiguity as to the seriousness and strength of such songs' effect in Super-Israel can also come through by unpacking the complexity of the resonance that Islamist militant media had with these workers, and with many Palestinians, during the escalations of summer 2014. On a substantive level that should not be dismissed, the role of Hamas and Islamic Jihad as embodiments of armed and unflinching resistance to Israel resonated with many of the Palestinian men I knew, workers or not. This mantle of resistance has long been a source of Palestinian support for Hamas (along with its provision of social services), since the Palestinian Liberation Organization's commitment to maximalist and armed struggle began to crumble in the 1980s and 90s (Hroub 2010). During fieldwork, the workers and most other Palestinians I met, mostly in the occupied towns just outside the Separation Wall in the Jerusalem area, were fed up with and cynical about the Palestinian Authority which now encompasses the PLO, both because they saw it as failing to challenge Israel, and because they saw it as corrupt and failing to help them socio-economically.

In this vein of substantive resonance, recall that in his debate with the merchandise rep from Tel Aviv at the store, as in other conversations with me, Muhammad provided a serious, spirited defense of Hamas's specific demands during the 2014 war, especially for Israel to end the siege on Gaza.

This resonance was perhaps strongest among some of the workers' kids, such as Abu Omar's 9-year old Hamada, who would proclaim in front of me and my partner that he wanted to be a Qassam fighter when he grew up, would play little clips of Hamas songs from cheap electronic gadgets he had, and was devastated when his parents forbade him from getting a toy gun, which they said could get him shot by Israeli forces.

But on another level, even if many workers and many Palestinians I met appreciated that Hamas challenged Israel, identified with Islamist versions of broader Palestinian nationalist idioms, such as the centrality of Jerusalem, and consumed at least some Islamist media, they *still had no affiliation to Islamist factions*. Nor were they necessarily sympathetic to Hamas' social or religious agenda. This gap between identification and full-blown support or affiliation is a longstanding ambiguity in Palestinian politics (Hroub 2010). Here at Super-Israel we can see how this ambiguity could be generative in subtle everyday challenges to Israeli dominance over space, despite broader weaknesses and divisions in Palestinian political culture.[106]

Indeed, Islamist militancy was an idiom for a Palestinian patriotism that was often shared among the workers in Super-Israel and beyond—where what was pragmatically crucial was the notion of challenging Israeli dominance, without committing participants to any institutionalized way of doing so, and without depending on their being entirely on the same wave-length, culturally, religiously or politically.

This broad patriotic resonance, which bypassed such questions, was one of the stronger ways of building Palestinian collective solidarities in the store despite deep constraints on doing

[106] As elaborated in Chapters One and Two, the lack of affiliation with Islamist factions was a necessary condition for working at Super-Israel; it would be extremely unlikely for the workers to have such affiliations or even voice open support for such groups, and not lose their security clearance from the *shabak.* In fact, a number of the workers' families (though not the workers themselves) were actually loosely affiliated with local Fatah bureaucracies, which was not necessarily a barrier to work in settlements the way that affiliation with the Islamist or banned Leftist factions was.

so, and despite the fact that such patriotism would not necessarily have been remarkable enough to build things like trust among Palestinians from different villages or families in another context. Still, this resonance of Islamist idioms, or of Islamist versions of broader Palestinian national themes, such as Jerusalem, also signals a broader shift in Palestinian politics in recent decades, in which Islamist movements increasingly set the tone (Tamari 2009; Hroub 2010).

Part of what made these Islamist idioms so important was that whether or not they heard Palestinians singing the Islamist or militant songs, Jewish-Israeli customers and some workers seemed highly invested in, and anxious about, the idea of Palestinian workers being part of, or supportive of, groups like Hamas. To build on the evidence for this presented in the last chapter (recall Tenuva and Tal), consider another anecdote. One customer, a large man who gave me and three Palestinian workers a ride to the store from the highway junction, began joking with them while explaining to his wife that he "understood Arabs": "come on, you're Arabs, you must have a Hamas flag at home!" These characterizations were based on existing Israeli discourses, and their purveyors seemed to have little idea about, or interest in, the complex distinctions between identification, sympathy and full-blown support or affiliation, or about the practical impossibility of these workers holding on to settlement work permits if they or even their family members had any demonstrable affiliation to such groups.

Yet as I have been showing, Islam and Islamism were not just idioms of frontal communication between Palestinians and Israelis; they were part of a politics of a dissonance which played out more ambiently, in terms of messy overlaps, forms of attention and inattention, and unstable, inconsistent, affectively driven Israeli attempts to police Palestinian presence itself.

Strongholds and Imaginative Geographies of the Palestinian Counterpublic

Crucial to the ambiguity, and at times the charge, of this politics of dissonance, was the complex relationship that the Palestinian counterpublic had to various spaces within Super-Israel and to differing geographies of Israel/Palestine more broadly. Palestinian forms of address could locate spaces within the store as Palestinian, and/or as within a broader Palestinian geography, thus helping to constitute improvised, contested boundaries between Israeli and Palestinian space, between Israeli and Palestinian worlds.

The different spaces where prayer happened offered a particularly spatialized form of Israeli public and Palestinian counterpublic. At Super-Israel, there was a small *bet knesset* [Heb. synagogue, or in this context a chapel] just off a storage area and a pair of walk-in freezers. Most days, an announcement would come over the PA system, "dear customers [*lekochot yekarim*] an afternoon prayer service [*tfilat minchah*] will now take place in the *bet knesset*." In the vein of Chapter One's inquiry into the sometimes awkward recruitment of Palestinian workers into particularly Israeli tasks, it is notable the one announcing these Jewish prayers was sometimes a West Bank Palestinian, in what seemed to be a recognizably Palestinian and not Mizrahi Jewish accent, for the two were similar in some ways but usually distinguishable. This meant that even in the announcement of Super-Israel as a strictly Jewish-Israeli space, the pragmatics of the announcement signaled that this was not entirely a Jewish-Israeli space.

For their part, Palestinians had no mosque, nor even a designated indoor prayer area, as the Sodastream company boasted it had at its now-shuttered West Bank factory. They mostly prayed out back in a small space between the recycling dumpsters and a fence that hemmed in the store's property, sometimes putting down cardboard boxes under their prayer mats or using the boxes themselves as prayer mats. After prayers, Muhammad would sometimes give an informal, short sermon. This area was also where the workers would sit on milk crates and have

Nescafe. Jewish-Israeli workers went to this area, but usually didn't stick around, and were not present for Palestinian prayer. It was a relatively good place to evade management for a long break, and also, at times, a distinctly Palestinian space (indeed, the two were likely related).

This prayer/dumpster area was part of a broader "back of the house" area (to use an American term)—the storage areas, walk-in freezers, closets, dumpster area, lunchroom, kitchen, and even the bathroom, where workers were less visible to customers and to some extent to managers. (Of course, the vast majority of the property was covered by surveillance cameras in any case and one had to assume managers were not too far away.) Of these areas, the storage areas were also especially full of Palestinians and Palestinian activities, and smaller groups or individuals occasionally prayed there as well. Still, a sizeable minority of warehouse workers were Jewish-Israeli, and Jewish-Israelis were never too far away, meaning that Palestinian practices, music and utterances here could quickly garner Jewish-Israeli audiences, and constitute a politics of dissonance.[107]

One such public form of Palestinian space-making was an ongoing performance of Muhammad's, in which he reflexively renamed parts of the store as an imaginative geography of Palestinian places and Israeli-Palestinian antagonisms. It is important to note here that place

[107] A microcosm of these back areas was a closet-sized nook between the deli counter and its designated walk-in fridge; some corners of the nook were nearly invisible to customers. While we have seen that workers were not trying to hide all that much, one thing they did hide here was make for each other, and eat, simple sandwiches they'd made from the deli, combined with rolls donated from the adjacent bakery station—much of which they were not supposed to be eating. There were other lightly subversive, though not really political, aspects to the deli space, including some little graffiti of workers' names done in permanent marker on a wall in the nook, and on the back of a fake bulb of garlic that was part of the kitschy "artisanal" façade of the deli. As noted elsewhere in the dissertation, I am interested in some of the workers' more furtive practices not to argue for some kind of hidden realm of autonomous resistance (indeed, these facts may not be particularly compelling evidence in that respect) (cf. Scott 1990), but as adjacent to, and nurturing of, the ways that Palestinian forms of address and sociality came into a relation of friction with Israeli ones, largely in ways that were not hidden, even if they were ambient enough to only be noticed—and policed—some of the time.

names are extremely charged in Israel/Palestine and other settler-colonies, with early Zionists having given Hebrew names to many Palestinian places with Arabic ones, often places destroyed and depopulated in 1948. Palestinian activists and their supporters have brought to light this renaming, highlighting pre-existing markers of destroyed places as well as using mapping technologies to super-impose Palestinian place names on Israeli maps and cityscapes.[108]

One day Muhammad called to me, "stock the yogurt in Ramallah… and the expired stuff over in Gaza!" gesturing to the far storage area and flashing a mischievous grin. Later his colleague Moshe got in on the joke, asking: "should I leave the shipment in Ramallah or Chevron [Hebron]?" naming two West Bank cities with potentially charged political connotations in the context of Israeli-Palestinian interaction. Ramallah is entirely Palestinian, and is known by Israelis perhaps most prominently as the site of a "lynching" of Israeli soldiers who were re-occupying the city during the second intifada; Hebron is mostly Palestinian (Palestinians call it *al-khalīl*), and has a Jewish settlement and military deployment inside its Old City, where there is frequent tension and violence—most famously, for Palestinians, the 1994 massacre of Palestinian worshippers by a Jewish settler. Muhammad escalated: "In *shujāʿiyya*!" he yelled loudly, in earshot of customers, naming the newly-iconic Gaza City neighborhood that Israel had relentlessly bombarded weeks earlier, causing extensive civilian casualties but also losing a number of soldiers to Hamas, who celebrated this fact along with many Palestinians on social media.

Muhammad's imaginative geographies might seem far-fetched in a sense; after all, Super-Israel was heavily marked as Israeli territory, and it was in a settlement that most Israelis

[108] Reasserting Palestinian names has been linked to reasserting Palestinian presence by activists working for the right of return of Palestinian refugees and other goals. On the politics of place naming see, *inter alia*, Abu El-Haj 2001*;* Pappé 2007; Kadman 2015.

and Western policymakers consider to be irreversibly a part of Israel. But it is notable that despite all this, and even though the places Moshe named were tamer than Shujaiyye, Moshe still caught on pretty readily to the idea that the store, or parts of it, could be experienced not just as part of Israel, but as part of a Palestinian geography that included places like Ramallah. To be clear, Moshe was *not* making a pro-Palestinian claim here – his playfulness and choice of places could even be understood to undermine the political edge of Muhammad's geographies. But by catching on to Muhammad's joke and joining in, he was in effect allowing it some of its political edge nonetheless.

Crucially, Muhammad was playfully and reflexively doing, in front of Israelis, what most workers did seriously and unreflexively amongst each other, especially in their hometowns: they often referred to the area where the store was located by its Arabic name (which I will not share here for anonymity reasons), even if at times they used the Hebrew name of the settlement or simply said they were "heading down to the *suber*"—which was a vernacularization of both the Israeli usage of *super* and the English from which it comes, that is, a term with vaguely Israeli connotations but without the political weight of using Israelis' name for the territory in question.

Indeed, the specific part of the settlement industrial zone where the store was built had been populated by Bedouin Palestinians until they were displaced to make way for the settlement's establishment some 40 years ago. Now local Bedouin, who were losing even more land to further expansion on the other side of the settlement, still herded their sheep in open areas of the industrial zone and rode in on donkeys to visit settlement businesses. From a certain perspective, at certain times, and taking into account things like the proportion of people who were there on a daily basis, the settlement industrial zone could be a far more Palestinian place

than was suggested by the signs marking it, or even by the blue shading that marks it as a settlement on human rights organizations' maps of the West Bank.

Reacting to and Policing Sonic Encroachments

This review of spatial practices further develops the idea I have been suggesting throughout: that these Palestinian forms of address, and the ways they rendered parts or all of Super-Israel as Palestinian space, hovered as a problem for Jewish-Israelis. Jewish-Israelis responded in various ways, ranging from something like Larkin's "techniques of inattention"—akin to what the novelist China Miéville calls *unnoticing*—to more concerted efforts, albeit mostly inconsistent and uncoordinated, to police and regulate the Palestinian soundscape, as part of regulating collective Palestinian presence itself. Considering these forms of policing will segue to the conclusion, which touches on more organized Israeli state attempts to regulate Palestinian calls to prayer from mosques.

From its strongholds in the makeshift prayer area or behind the deli counter, the Palestinian soundscapes carried into parts of Super-Israel where elevator music, Hebrew announcements and bright fluorescent lights otherwise produced Israeli consumer space. This happened, for example, in the very customer-oriented area at the store entrance. There, the public address system was piped through speakers and echoed faintly through parts of the large parking lot, so that as one left one's car even halfway to the end of the lot, one could faintly hear in Hebrew "so and so to the front desk" (and also see the bright signs with the store's name, and the seasonal holiday greeting signs mentioned in chapter one) and feel one was at a Super-Israel much like in West Jerusalem.

For example, during a nighttime break, I sat on a bench out front, right near the speakers broadcasting these announcements, and began to hear the sheikh's unmistakable voice wafting over from the prayer area off to the side of the store. His calls of *allahu akbar*... then silence as the workers prostrated, then *allahu akbar,* interspersed with the sounds of the Hebrew announcements, and customers chattering in Hebrew as they walked into the store, showing no sign of noticing the prayer sounds in this instance.

Of course, sometimes customers seemed to be working cognitively to unnotice such Palestinian sound. Recall the opening anecdote, about the call to prayer coming from workers' smartphones at the deli counter. In such cases, it was clear that customers noticed and were momentarily unsettled; one could see the several seconds it took as they performed their own kind of cognitive labor of figuring out where the sound was coming from and then, and/or tuning it out, and/or at least acting as if it weren't there, even if they were aware on some level that it was.

Israelis also reacted to these encroachments in more aggressive ways, by policing the Palestinian soundscape and counterpublic, and indeed Palestinian presence itself. This policing was a diffuse, inconsistent project in which Israeli managers, workers and customers all partook. Of course, its force was related to structures of occupation, namely the vulnerability that the Israeli security apparatus created for the Palestinians and the systematic discrimination Palestinians faced in the Israeli labor market (Chapter One). But it was still less formal than the top-down projects to regulate Islamic counterpublics that Hirschkind speaks of in Egypt. And of course it was less formal than the sonic technologies of Israeli occupation that avant-garde theoretical accounts of occupation often emphasize, such as Israeli jets breaking the sound barrier over Gaza (Goodman 2012), which of course interrupt Palestinian space and establish

Israeli dominance over it in a much more heavy-handed way. But this account of militarized sonic terror leaves out the presence of settlers in mundane roles such as supermarket shopper or manager—and *their* version of sonically policing Palestinian presence is more complicated.

The Palestinian counterpublic in the store, and Palestinian forms of sociality themselves, were fragile and could be interrupted at any moment—partly in ways that worker sociality would be in many racialized service economies, albeit with elements specific to the ethno-national and settler-colonial elements of this encounter. For example, as in some other racial imaginaries, there was a settler-colonial anxiety here of being overwhelmed by an indigenous population, which drove these forms of policing indigenous presence. Tensions often played out through religious sound and practice, which was hinged to the ethno-national here in complex ways. And perhaps more uniquely to Israel-Palestine at least in the contemporary world, these settler-indigenous tensions played out to a backdrop of ongoing military occupation, and openly declared forms of discriminatory governance and policing, which raised the potential stakes of seemingly little tiffs such as the following.

Israeli workers sometimes asked Palestinians to turn off the Qur'anic chanting they listened to from their phones, or Arabic music, or even Israeli trance music; managers enforced such things, though at Super-Israel they did so informally and inconsistently. Muhammad had been told to turn off the Qur'an chanting he played from his old Nokia phone, though as we know, he continued to chant it loudly. A Jerusalemite who had worked at an Israeli factory in East Jerusalem said they had allowed a Jewish-Israeli to bring in a speaker to play Eyal Golan (one of Israel's most popular *mizrahi* singers, who happens to have very rightwing politics, and who is an easy synecdoche for Israeli-ness for these Palestinians given their familiarity with

him). But Palestinians were not allowed to play music, even if it was trance music that was not Palestinian.

More generally, managers roved Super-Israel, ostensibly to supervise work and keep workers working ("get back to work" was their common refrain) but with the effect, in practice, of specifically limiting Palestinian socializing and breaking up coffee breaks, partly because most workers who congregated together were Palestinians (the Israelis were far less friendly with each other) and partly because managers had more strategic leverage over Palestinians and could be stricter with them without facing pushback.

Still, there was also curiosity and settler social desire here. When interrupting a coffee break, one manager interjected "what is this *ijtima'a*?" Here he mixed the Arabic word for "meeting" into his Hebrew sentence, with a playful gesture that expressed his dominance, demanded to be let it on secrets, and to know this opaque Palestinian social world, that paradoxically had a certain "cool" factor for Israeli assistant managers and workers like him, who had much less robust social ties at the store.

In contrast to the storage areas, where the Palestinian counterpublic had more leeway, the check-out area was a very consumer-oriented area, very visible to management and customers, where the informal policing of Palestinian address went in some ways the furthest. Here, Palestinians were *de facto* separated from each other by lines of customers. As noted in chapter one, I observed a strict Jewish-Israeli "department manager," (the lowest level of manager) who was disliked by Palestinians and even some Israelis, telling Tareq and other Palestinian cashiers (but rarely Jewish-Israelis) to stop talking, and even not to speak in Arabic. A Jewish-Israeli female cashier at one point yelled at Tareq and his friend in exasperation, "Speak Hebrew!" Like

the manager asking about the *ijtima*, this cashier evinced a presumption that Palestinians should be transparent to her and a frustration that they were not.

At its extreme, this project of regulating Palestinian space in the store even extended symbolically beyond it to render where these Palestinians lived as part of a Jewish-Israeli geography—in an inverse of Muhammad's re-Palestinianizing geographies. At the end of shifts, managers would, in Hebrew, announce a workers' van leaving for "Zero Eight [*efes shmoneh*]," which was one number higher than the numbers actually went for the neighborhood names of the settlement.[109] This made-up neighborhood name helped the store avoid mentioning the names of the Palestinian towns were the workers were from – towns adjacent to the settlement that settlers told me they were afraid to go to, and whose names thus evoked fear, even if they also were associated with past forms of settler consumption.

***

The aspect of this policing that was most legible and irksome for Palestinians was the policing of Muslim space and practice—which did not surprise me given the ways Islam seemed like a priority for them beginning with our first interactions. Among the workers' many complaints about Shlomo the manager, one they relayed with added emphasis was that in the period before my fieldwork, he had tried to make the workers clock out on the fingerprint

[109] It later occurred to me that these numbered neighborhood names can be taken as indices of the settlement's ongoing expansion and of the organized and cookie-cutter nature of its planning regime. By contrast, the Palestinian areas adjacent to the settlement had large swaths of seemingly haphazard urban sprawl (in addition to older areas laid out according to their own, more traditional logics). The areas closest to the settlement were the under full administrative control of the Israeli bureaucracy (Area C), where Israel systematically shelves any planning initiatives. Here there were improvised and precarious forms of urban development such as the flea market stalls and junkyards. Further into the Palestinian towns, the Palestinian Authority had only taken over administrative control from Israel since the 1990s, and had few resources to implement any kind of master plan. Moreover, the first theme that jumped out at me from my earliest interviews with community leaders in the town was Israel's expropriation of outlying town lands (*musadarat aradi*) to hem in the town's growth while making way for settlement growth.

scanner before their prayers, and then clock back in. His line was relayed as something like, "I don't mind if you pray, but not on my time." But many workers refused to do this, they said. This was perhaps the only instance of collective action I heard of at the store, standing in sharp contrast to the response to having to wear the Israeli Independence Day T-shirts (chapter one): open remonstration but near total compliance.

My interviews confirmed that the settlers' policing of—and disrespect of—workers' Muslim practices was particularly problematic to them. One Jerusalemite interviewee, who unlike most of the Super-Israel workers had (loose) affiliations with PFLP circles, and was very forthright with his characterization of work in the Israeli economy as exploitative and discriminatory, put it this way: of the many kinds of humiliation in Israeli workplaces, Islam and the Prophet were red lines. Other interviewees complained about their designated workplace prayer areas being near bathrooms.[110]

And again, not surprisingly, this issue of disrespect for Muslim practices was a rare locus of Palestinian collective action in these neoliberal workplaces.[111] Husam, my Jerusalemite research assistant, had worked at a West Jerusalem branch of Super-Israel in the past, where they

[110] Workers from Sodastream said the "prayer area" that the company had said it provided for Muslim workers was just a locker room. And they complained of Israeli workers who didn't respect their prayer: "They say 'what you're praying all day, *nu kvar* [come on already]'… What do they mean? They don't want you to pray." Some would taunt Muslims with food during Ramadan, while others – in one case, the *mashgiach* or kashrut supervisor – would try to be respectful, for example by closing a door to keep away those taunting the fasters. A pair of interviewees who worked at an Israeli hotel in an East Jerusalem settlement had some generally good things to say – about a generally respected prayer area in the hotel, and a friendly Moroccan Israeli boss who brought them gifts and made sure that cakes he brought them did not contain wine. Yet even here, they said that some Jewish-Israeli workers might be nice to them only until they saw them pray – then they would act differently.

[111] Still, it was not the only locus. Another example I heard in interviews, also from a Jerusalemite who was politically involved in both labor and national issues, was of Jerusalemite Palestinians at a supermarket chain inside Jerusalem collectively protesting that they got stingier holiday gifts from the management than the Jewish-Israelis. "The *yahud* [Jewish-Israelis] were getting toy cars for their boys and makeup for their girls. Why did the Palestinians only get simple gifts?" The workers convinced managers to give them nicer gifts. (At the Super-Israel in the settlement, recall from Chapter One that Muhammad had *individually* protested the amount of his bonus at the Jewish holiday of Passover.)

tried to prevent the Jerusalemite workers from having an *iftar* meal all together, right at the end of the fast, forcing them to take successive breaks by twos and threes. The workers considered this unacceptable. Husam got many of them to call in that they were not coming to work that day (offering various excuses), and the management relented. This was the second of only two such stories of collective action I heard in interviews, both about religious issues.[112]

So not only was Islamist militancy a shared idiom for antagonism between Israelis and Palestinians (chapter three); Muslim practices themselves were particular targets for Jewish-Israeli demonstrations of supremacy by denigrating Palestinians (in line with longstanding forms of Israeli Orientalism) and they were a particularly charged 'red line' that aroused Palestinian annoyance at Jewish-Israelis and the only (rare) instances of collective action. Even without these rare collective actions by workers, the fraught status of Muslim practice in the settlement subtly indexed a dissonance between normalized and de-normalized settler dominance. As noted earlier, the resonance of Islamism and Islam here for Palestinians should be understood in the context of a shift towards both in Palestinian society in recent decades, which in turn can be understood as part of a Palestinian turn to piety in the wake of the social dislocations and more progressive gendered practices of the first intifada in particular, when many women participated in organizing and resistance activities (Tamari 2009).[113] In effect, religion, like class and gender, became yet another ambiguous, indirect stand-in for an ethno-national and territorial politics of

[112] There were a handful of cases in the news about Palestinian worker organizing and strikes in settlements during my research, but it is notable that they did not come up ethnographically, and as noted in previous chapters, the workers I knew dismissed organizing or even filing complaints with Israeli regulators or NGOs as risky and unlikely to succeed. Filing complaints was also a bit more common among construction and agricultural workers who were more likely to be employed through Palestinian sub-contractors, to have wages stolen on a large scale, and/or to experience serious injuries on the job. See Kadman 2012.

[113] Of course, this resonance can also be understood as part of a broader, religiously conservative shift across many Arab and other societies since the 1970s.

antagonism; it sometimes pointed to these things or was inseparable from them, but at other times, religion itself seemed to be the point, with other questions deferred.

Conclusion: the Muezzin Bill and Sound Wars Across Jerusalem's Segregated Enclaves

Muslim practice, and the call to prayer specifically, have been privileged sites of tension on an urban and national scale as well. In March 2017, the Knesset reintroduced a so-called "muezzin bill" which would ban mosque loudspeakers from broadcasting the call to prayer at certain times of day in Jerusalem and Israel proper—the areas under full Israeli control where Palestinians live. The bill is named for the *muezzin*, an Islamic term which refers to the person who traditionally issues the call.[114]

Israeli leaders including Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, and Jewish-Israelis from the East Jerusalem settlement of Pisgat Ze'ev whose complaints were cited as the impetus for the law's renewed steam, framed the law as an attempt to curtail noise pollution, especially from the *fajr* or pre-dawn prayer. (This call was often at 4 or 5 am, but I got used to it coming from the several mosques near my apartment, and almost always slept through it.)

That the complaints came from Pisgat Ze'ev was telling, because while most Israelis regard it as simply a neighborhood of Jerusalem, it was planned and built after 1967, over the Green Line, as part of a strategic Israeli settlement effort to change the demographic and territorial makeup of the city. This means that Pisgat Ze'ev was long preceded by the Palestinian neighborhoods that the offending *adhan* was coming from, such as Shuafat and Bet Hanina.

[114] *Muezzin* is the key term that Jewish-Israelis associate with the call to prayer. Their common (mis-)pronunciation of the term has a distinctively elongated "i" vowel. Of course there are many terms associated with the call to prayer in Islamic parlance. Palestinians most often used the term *adhan* (referring to the call to prayer itself) in my experience.

As was understood by Palestinian lawmakers, activists and journalists, as well as by the right-wing Members of Knesset who promoted it, the bill was part of a nationalist, populist wave of legislation to further enshrine the priority of Jewish nationality in Israel and reinforce the second-class status of Palestinian citizens. At the extreme of this trend, Minister Avigdor Lieberman spoke (and continues to speak) of the mass "transfer" of Palestinian citizens of Israel into the West Bank, either physically or by stripping their citizenship. In this context, Palestinians protested against the bill across Jerusalem and the North, framing it as a part of this broader right-wing nationalist agenda. (In the end, as with some other Knesset legislation that has promoted this agenda and had the potential to escalate the conflict, Prime Minister Netanyahu's pragmatism won out over his right flank.)

This iteration of tensions over Palestinian sound on an urban and national scale helps to show some of the broader historical and geographical conditions of settler-colonialism that shape encounters at Super-Israel. Settler development brings settlers closer into proximity with indigenous Palestinians, a proximity which fuels a pre-existing settler desire to experience a purely settler environment. This desire can appear as a mundane municipal matter of noise and neighbors, or as a matter of national borders.

Similarly, Israeli and international authorities have attempted to separate the two populations in ever more complex ways, at ever smaller scales (Weizman 2007). But sound, as a material process and a sensory experience, is a prime example of the futility of this exercise, for it does not respect arbitrarily drawn boundaries, and signals an excessive indigenous presence that can be regulated but not eliminated, and normalized only up to a point.[115]

[115] Flows of waste also escape this spatial regulation, albeit in a more material sense, as Weizman also shows.

In Jerusalem, the carrying of sound manifests a politics of dissonance between neighborhoods. This is because since 1967 Jerusalem has become a city divided not in half, but rather divided on the level of hills, with segregated Jewish-Israeli settlements on hilltops interspersed among Palestinian villages that were incorporated as neighborhoods when Israel vastly expanded the city lines. One can often hear amplified sounds carrying from one hill to the next, for example from concerts or weddings, and the adjacent hills can be very visible, very hear-able, even while feeling very separate.[116]

Since around the early 2000s, settler expansion has created even smaller-scale forms of partition with even more capacity for everyday friction and dissonance. Far-right Jewish-Israeli settler groups have engineered complex purchases of land, aided by state expropriations of land from Palestinians, and settler enclaves have popped up in the middle of Palestinian neighborhoods such as At-Tur, Sheikh Jarrah and Ra'as al-'Amud, with heavily armed private security paid for by Israeli authorities, mirroring the post-1968 development of a settlement in the middle of a Palestinian commercial and residential center in Hebron.

Sound is, of course, one way in which East Jerusalem settlers and security forces project their dominance, in ways that neither side mentioned in the Muezzin Bill debate. At least once or twice almost every night in Wadi Joz, I heard the semi-armored Israeli Border Police SUVs tap their horns (like ambulances in the U.S.), presumably to announce their presence as they patrolled the Palestinian neighborhoods. I could hear clearly whether they miles away or right on my street (when I could also see their flashing lights, which most Israeli police leave on all the

[116] There are exceptions to this segregation by neighborhood. For example, the French Hill is a Jewish-Israeli settlement overlapping with Hebrew University's Mount Scopus Campus; after long legal battles, a number of Palestinians have managed to remain in the area, hemmed in by the university's dorms. More Palestinians (albeit not nearly a demographically representative number) come annually to study at the university and live in those dorms. On Palestinians moving into other East Jerusalem settlements, see Yacobi and Pullan 2014.

time—a tactic to show presence that some U.S. police departments have adopted from Israel as part of Broken Windows tactics). And I could also hear, especially from adjacent at-Tur, which has two settler enclaves in its midst, the booms of teargas canisters and "flash bang" grenades, and pops of rubber-coated and live rounds being fired at Palestinian youth protesters, who had their own ways of announcing their power in sound and vision: fireworks which they shot at soldiers and into the air. (an escalation from stones, a sense of exhilaration and visual spectacle)

These forms of military and police sound – and visual performance – offer a more mundane account of the technologies of Israeli rule that are a common point of focus in critical theories of the occupation. Take Goodman's *Sonic Warfare,* a volume of critical theory, affect theory and musicology whose passing references to Israel/Palestine are to note Israel's use of sonic booms over Gaza to instill terror there, and its deployment of the LRAD (Long Range Acoustic Device) against protesters from military trucks. Goodman notes activists' and journalists' responses to the LRAD's use at West Bank protests, calling it a function of crowd dispersal. Perhaps we could think of the roving managers at Super-Israel, as less hi-tech, less tactical or coherent ways of dispersing Palestinian collective presence; and we could think of Palestinian mini-publics producing a broader counterpublic as one way of constituting the limits to such efforts.

Even if we remain at the urban scale (not the supermarket scale), we could consider further civilian announcements of Israeli settler presence through sound. After all, as I have noted throughout the dissertation, this civilian register is a crucial part of settler colonialism, and is the place we must go to explore how and to what extent settlement is normalized. During fieldwork, from my apartment in Wadi Joz, I could hear various kinds of settler sound that made the area feel much more actively contested than Ramallah (which has some small settlements

overlooking it, but at a slightly greater distance), speaking to what Jerusalemite Palestinians often speak of as their being especially hemmed in by occupation. For example, on Friday afternoons just before Shabbat, I could hear Orthodox Jewish dance music blaring loudly from the rooves of two Israeli hotels in Sheikh Jarrah.[117] In a less ongoing but more pointedly political vein, during protests against the settlements in Sheikh Jarrah in 2009, a few blocks from where I would end up living, the newly installed settlers played inflammatory right-wing Israeli music as a way of establishing their presence and taunting Palestinians.[118]

Considering the micro-politics of sound and space at Super-Israel alongside these broader, urban-scale and historical forms of sonic/spatial tension helps broaden my account here. The juxtaposition illustrates the broader historical and geographical conditions of settlement that shape encounters and struggles at Super-Israel, which a purely localized ethnography could miss. At the same time, my ethnographic account of Super-Israel has allowed me to flesh out the ongoing back-and-forth of mundane sonic and spatial practices that reproduce and test the boundaries between the normalization of settler control and its undoing, and between settler and indigenous space. I highlight here the ambiguity, the ambiguous audibility, that some larger-scale accounts such as Goodman's miss. These mundane, micro-level settings are crucial points of elaboration for the struggle over the normalization of settler dominance, in all its messiness and ambiguity.

---

[117] These were just east of Green Line and the highway that runs along it, and had been built years before the additional settler takeovers of homes in the neighborhood in 2009.

[118] This included a religious pop song praising Baruch Goldstein, the settler who massacred 29 Palestinians at a shared holy site in Hebron in 1994. Of course, Palestinians played their own very loud music from outdoor wedding parties that presumably reached adjacent settler areas; blasted militant anthems from car stereos on the highways bisecting the city; and broadcasted the call to prayer, which we know bothered settlers and became the locus of what I am suggesting is a much broader form of sonically mediated tension over settler/indigenous proximity.

WORKS CITED

Abu El-Haj, Nadia. 2001. *Facts on the Ground: Archaeological Practice and Territorial Self-Fashioning in Israeli Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 2010. "Racial Palestinianization and the Janus-Faced Nature of the Israeli State." *Patterns of Prejudice* 44 (1): 27–41.

Abu-Lughod, Lila. 1990. "The Romance of Resistance: Tracing Transformations of Power through Bedouin Women." *American Ethnologist* 17 (1): 41–55.

Algazi, Gadi. 2006. "Offshore Zionism." *New Left Review* 40 (August): 27–37.

Allen, Lori. 2008. "Getting by the Occupation: How Violence Became Normal During the Second Palestinian Intifada." *Cultural Anthropology* 23 (3): 453–487.

———. 2013. *The Rise and Fall of Human Rights: Cynicism and Politics in Occupied Palestine*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Anziska, Seth. 2017. "Neither Two States nor One: The Palestine Question in the Age of Trump." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 46 (3): 57–74.

Arafeh, Nur, Samia al-Botmeh, and Farsakh, Leila. 2015. "How Israeli Settlements Stifle Palestine's Economy." *Al-Shabaka, the Palestinian Policy Network*. December 15, 2015. https://al-shabaka.org/briefs/how-israeli-settlements-stifle-palestines-economy/.

Asad, Talal. 1975. "Anthropological Texts and Ideological Problems: An Analysis of Cohen on Arab Villages in Israel." *Economy and Society* 4 (3): 251–82.

———. ed. 1995. "Introduction." In *Anthropology & the Colonial Encounter*. Amherst, N.Y: Humanity Books.

Auge, Marc. 2009. *Non-Places: An Introduction to Supermodernity*. Translated by John Howe. New York: Verso.

Azoulay, Ariella, and Adi Ophir. 2012. *The One-State Condition: Occupation and Democracy in Israel/Palestine*. Stanford University Press.

Bachmann, Jan, Colleen Bell, and Caroline Holmqvist, eds. 2014. *War, Police and Assemblages of Intervention*. New York: Routledge.

Barghouti, Mourid. 2005. *I Saw Ramallah*. Translated by Ahdaf Soueif. London: Bloomsbury.

Beinin, Joel, and Zachary Lockman, eds. 1989. *Intifada: The Palestinian Uprising Against Israeli Occupation*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Beinin, Joel, and Rebecca L. Stein, eds. 2006. *The Struggle for Sovereignty: Palestine and Israel, 1993-2005*. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Benvenisti, Meron. 1984. *The West Bank Data Project: A Survey of Israel's Policies*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

Berda, Yael. 2017. *Living Emergency: Israel's Permit Regime in the Occupied West Bank*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Besteman, Catherine. 2017. "Militarized Global Apartheid." presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., December 1.

Bishara, Amahl. 2015. "Driving While Palestinian in Israel and the West Bank: The Politics of Disorientation and the Routes of a Subaltern Knowledge." *American Ethnologist* 42 (1): 33–54.

Bornstein, Avram S. 2002. "Borders and the Utility of Violence: State Effects on the 'Superexploitation' of West Bank Palestinians." *Critique of Anthropology* 22 (2): 201–20.

———. 2003. *Crossing the Green Line Between the West Bank and Israel*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Brown, Wendy. 2005. "Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy." In *Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

———. 2015. *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York, NY: Zone Books.

B'Tselem. 2015. "Your Responsibility for Permitting a de Facto Death Penalty," November 25, 2015. https://www.btselem.org/download/20151125_letter_to_pm_on_extrajudicial_killings_eng.pdf.

Çalışkan, Koray, and Michel Callon. 2009. "Economization, Part 1: Shifting Attention from the Economy Towards Processes of Economization." *Economy and Society* 38 (3): 369–98.

Carmeli, Yoram S, and Kalman Applbaum. 2004. *Consumption and Market Society in Israel*. New York: Berg.

Caton, Steven C. 2006. *Yemen Chronicle: An Anthropology of War and Mediation*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Clarno, Andy. 2017. *Neoliberal Apartheid: Palestine/Israel and South Africa after 1994*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, Hillel. 2009. *Army of Shadows: Palestinian Collaboration with Zionism, 1917-1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Collins, John. 2011. *Global Palestine*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Corbin, Alain. 1999. *Village Bells: Sound and Meaning in the Nineteenth-Century French Countryside*. Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: Univ Of Minnesota Press.

Deeb, Lara, and Mona Harb. 2013. *Leisurely Islam: Negotiating Geography and Morality in Shi'ite South Beirut*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Deloria, Vine. 1988. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Duffield, Mark. 2001. *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security*. New York: Zed Books.

Eid, Haidar, and Andy Clarno. 2017. "Rethinking Our Definition of Apartheid: Not Just a Political Regime." *Al-Shabaka, the Palestinian Policy Network*. August 27, 2017. https://al-shabaka.org/briefs/rethinking-definition-apartheid-not-just-political-regime/.

Fanon, Frantz. 2004. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press.

Farsakh, Leila. 2002. "Palestinian Labor Flows to the Israeli Economy: A Finished Story?" 32 (1): 13–27.

———. 2005. *Palestinian Labour Migration to Israel: Labour, Land and Occupation*. New York: Routledge.

Fennell, Catherine. 2015. *Last Project Standing: Civics and Sympathy in Post-Welfare Chicago*. Minneapolis, MN: Univ Of Minnesota Press.

Ferguson, James. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fraser, Nancy. 1990. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text*, no. 25/26: 56–80.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of Talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Goldstein, Daniel M. 2012. *Outlawed: Between Security and Rights in a Bolivian City*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.

Goodman, Steve. 2012. *Sonic Warfare: Sound, Affect, and the Ecology of Fear*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Gordon, Neve. 2008. *Israel's Occupation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Grassiani, Erella, and Lior Volinz. 2016. "Intimidation, Reassurance, and Invisibility: Israeli Security Agents in the Old City of Jerusalem." *Focaal* 2016 (75).

Gregory, Derek. 2004. *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, and Iraq*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1997. *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Haddad, Toufic. 2016. *Palestine Ltd.: Neoliberalism and Nationalism in the Occupied Territory*. New York: I.B.Tauris.

Hajjar, Lisa. 2005. *Courting Conflict: The Israeli Military Court System in the West Bank and Gaza*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hall, Kathleen. 2012. "Security and the Neoliberal State: British Political Imaginaries after 7/7." In *Ethnographies of Neoliberalism*, edited by Carol J. Greenhouse, 13–27. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hall, Stuart. 1988. "The Toad in the Garden: Thatcherism among the Theorists." In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 35–74. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Harker, Christopher. 2014. "Debt and Obligation in Contemporary Ramallah." *Jadaliyya* (blog). October 19, 2014. http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/19665/debt-and-obligation-in-contemporary-ramallah.

Helmreich, Stefan. 2015. *Sounding the Limits of Life: Essays in the Anthropology of Biology and Beyond*. Princeton University Press.

Hirschkind, Charles. 2006. *The Ethical Soundscape: Cassette Sermons and Islamic Counterpublics*. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 2003. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley: Univ of California Press.

Hroub, Khaled. 2010. *Hamas: A Beginner's Guide*. 2 edition. Ann Arbor, Mich: Pluto Press.

Human Rights Watch. 2017. "Israel/Palestine: Some Officials Backing 'Shoot-to-Kill': Calls for Extrajudicial Killings of Palestinian Suspects Proliferate." https://www.hrw.org/news/2017/01/02/israel/palestine-some-officials-backing-shoot-kill.

Husseini, Hiba I., and Raja Khalidi. 2013. "Fixing the Paris Protocol Twenty Years Later: Frequently Asked Questions for Diehard Reformers." Jadaliyya. February 6, 2013.

Jauregui, Beatrice. 2010. "Bluing Green in the Maldives: Countering Citizen Insurgency by 'Civil'-Izing National Security." In *Anthropology and Global Counterinsurgency*, edited by John D. Kelly, Beatrice Jauregui, Sean T. Mitchell, and Jeremy Walton. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Alix. 2016. "Paranoid Reading, Writing, and Research: Secrecy in the Field." Savage Minds. March 22, 2016. https://savageminds.org/2016/03/21/paranoid-reading-writing-and-research-secrecy-in-the-field/.

Kadman, Noga. 2012. "Employment of Palestinians in Israel and the Settlements: Restrictive Policies and Abuse of Rights." Tel Aviv: Kav LaOved.

———. 2015. *Erased from Space and Consciousness: Israel and the Depopulated Palestinian Villages of 1948*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Kanaaneh, Rhoda. 2008. *Surrounded: Palestinian Soldiers in the Israeli Military*. Stanford University Press.

Kelly, John D., Beatrice Jauregui, Sean T. Mitchell, and Jeremy Walton, eds. 2010. *Anthropology and Global Counterinsurgency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kelly, Tobias. 2009. *Law, Violence and Sovereignty Among West Bank Palestinians*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Khalidi, Raja, and Sobhi Samour. 2011. "Neoliberalism as Liberation: The Statehood Program and the Remaking of the Palestinian National Movement." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 40 (2): 6–25.

Khalidi, Rashid. 2010. *Palestinian Identity: The Construction of Modern National Consciousness*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Khalili, Laleh. 2012. *Time in the Shadows: Confinement in Counterinsurgencies*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Klein, Menachem, and Haim Watzman. 2014. *Lives in Common: Arabs and Jews in Jerusalem, Jaffa, and Hebron*. London: C. Hurst & Co. (Publishers) Ltd.

Kuntsman, Adi, and Rebecca L. Stein. 2015. *Digital Militarism: Israel's Occupation in the Social Media Age*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Lagerquist, Peter. 2003. "Privatizing the Occupation: The Political Economy of an Oslo Development Project." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 32 (2): 5–20.

Lakoff, Andrew. 2012. “The Generic Biothreat, or, How We Became Unprepared.” *Cultural Anthropology* 23 (3): 399–428.

Larkin, Brian. 2014. “Techniques of Inattention: The Mediality of Loudspeakers in Nigeria.” *Anthropological Quarterly* 87 (4).

Lockman, Zachary. 1996. *Comrades and Enemies: Arab and Jewish Workers in Palestine, 1906-1948*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

———. 2012. “Land, Labor and the Logic of Zionism: A Critical Engagement with Gershon Shafir.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 2 (1): 9–38.

Low, Setha and Neil Smith. eds. 2006. “Introduction.” In *The Politics of Public Space*. New York: Routledge.

Lutz, Catherine A. 2002. *Homefront: A Military City and the American Twentieth Century*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 2015. “Settler Colonialism: Then and Now.” *Critical Inquiry* 41 (3): 596–614.

Manning, Paul. 2012. *Semiotics of Drink and Drinking*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Marcus, George E, and James Clifford, eds. 2010. *Writing Culture: The Politics and Poetics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Masco, Joseph. 2014. *The Theater of Operations: National Security Affect from the Cold War to the War on Terror*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.

Mazzarella, William. 2013. *Censorium: Cinema and the Open Edge of Mass Publicity*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press Books.

Miller, Daniel. 1998. *A Theory of Shopping*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Misselwitz, Philipp, and Tim Rieniets. 2006. *City of Collision: Jerusalem and the Principles of Conflict Urbanism*. Boston: Birkhäuser Architecture.

Mitchell, Timothy. 1990. “Everyday Metaphors of Power.” *Theory and Society* 19 (5): 545–77.

Monterescu, Daniel. 2005. *Spatial Relationality: Urban Space and Ethnic Relations in Jewish-Arab Mixed Towns, 1948-2004*.

———. 2015. *Jaffa Shared and Shattered: Contrived Coexistence in Israel/Palestine*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Morgensen, Scott Lauria. 2010. "Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16 (1–2): 105–31.

Mouffe, Chantal. 1999. "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism?" *Social Research* 66 (3): 745–58.

———. n.d. "Agonistic Democracy and Radical Politics." *Pavilion Journal* (blog). Accessed March 18, 2016. http://pavilionmagazine.org/chantal-mouffe-agonistic-democracy-and-radical-politics/.

Muehlebach, Andrea. 2012. "On Affective Labor in Post-Fordist Italy." *Cultural Anthropology* 26 (1): 59–82.

Neuman, Tamara. 2000. "Reinstating the Religious Nation: A Study of National Religious Persuasion, Settlement, and Violence in Hebron." PhD Dissertation, University of Chicago.

———. 2018. *Settling Hebron: Jewish Fundamentalism in a Palestinian City*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Newman, David. 2006. "Colonization as Suburbanization: The Politics of the Land Market at the Frontier." In *City of Collision: Jerusalem and the Principles of Conflict Urbanism*, edited by Philip Misselwitz. Boston: Birkhäuser Architecture.

Ochs, Juliana. 2013. *Security and Suspicion: An Ethnography of Everyday Life in Israel*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

O'Neill, Kevin Lewis. 2015. *Secure the Soul: Christian Piety and Gang Prevention in Guatemala*. Oakland, California: University of California Press.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2011. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Pappé, Ilan. 2007. *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine*. London: Oneworld Publications.

———. ed. 2015. *Israel and South Africa: The Many Faces of Apartheid*. London: Zed Books.

Pearlman, Wendy. 2011. *Violence, Nonviolence, and the Palestinian National Movement*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Pratt, Mary Louise. 2007. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.

Rabie, Kareem. 2013. "Ramallah's Bubbles." *Jadaliyya*. January 18, 2013. http://www.jadaliyya.com/Details/27839/Ramallah%E2%80%99s-Bubbles.

Rana, Aziz. 2014. “Settler Wars and the National Security State.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 4 (2): 171–75.

Robinson, Shira. 2006. “My Hairdresser Is a Sniper.” In *The Struggle for Sovereignty: Palestine and Israel, 1993-2005*, edited by Joel Beinin and Rebecca L. Stein, 237–40. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

———. 2013. *Citizen Strangers: Palestinians and the Birth of Israel’s Liberal Settler State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Roy, Sara. 1999. “De-Development Revisited: Palestinian Economy and Society Since Oslo.” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 28 (3): 64–82.

Sa’di, Ahmad H., and Lila Abu-Lughod, eds. 2007. *Nakba: Palestine, 1948, and the Claims of Memory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Said, Edward W. 1979. *The Question of Palestine*. New York: Vintage Books.

Salamanca, Omar Jabary, Mezna Qato, Kareem Rabie, and Sobhi Samour. 2012. “Past Is Present: Settler Colonialism in Palestine.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 2 (1): 1–8.

Schatz, Edward, ed. 2009. *Political Ethnography: What Immersion Contributes to the Study of Power*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Schmitt, Carl. 2007. *The Concept of the Political*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Scott, David. 2004. *Conscripts of Modernity: The Tragedy of Colonial Enlightenment*. Durham, N.C.: Duke Univ. Press.

Scott, James C. 1987. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press.

———. 1990. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Shafir, Gershon, and Yoav Peled. 2001. *The New Israel: Peacemaking and Liberalization*. Westview Press.

———. 2002. *Being Israeli: The Dynamics of Multiple Citizenship*. Cambridge University Press.

Siegman, Jeremy. 2017. “Israel’s ‘Muezzin Bill’ and the Everyday Politics of Sound.” *Palestine Square* (blog). April 7, 2017. https://palestinesquare.com/2017/04/07/israels-muezzin-bill-and-the-everyday-politics-of-sound/.

Simpson, Audra. 2011. “Settlement’s Secret.” *Cultural Anthropology* 26 (2): 205–217.

———. 2014. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Simpson Audra and Andrea Smith, eds. 2014. *Theorizing Native Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Stein, Rebecca L. 2008. *Itineraries in Conflict: Israelis, Palestinians, and the Political Lives of Tourism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Swedenburg, Ted. 2003. *Memories of Revolt: The 1936-1939 Rebellion and the Palestinian National Past*. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.

Switat, Maha Shehade. 2015. "As Tensions Run High, Arab Workers Pay the Price." *+972 Magazine* (blog). November 5, 2015. http://972mag.com/as-tensions-run-high-arab-workers-pay-the-price/113633/.

Tamari, Salim. 1981. "Building Other People's Homes: The Palestinian Peasant's Household and Work in Israel." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 11 (1): 31–66.

Tamari, Salim. 2009. *Mountain Against the Sea: Essays on Palestinian Society and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tamari, Salim. 2013. "Normalcy and Violence: The Yearning for the Ordinary in Discourse of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 42 (4): 48–60.

Taraki, Lisa. 2008. "Enclave Micropolis: The Paradoxical Case of Ramallah/Al-Bireh." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 37 (4): 6–20.

Taussig, Michael. 1999. *Defacement: Public Secrecy and the Labor of the Negative*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Tawil-Souri, Helga. 2011. "Qalandia Checkpoint as Space and Nonplace." *Space and Culture* 14 (1): 4–26.

———. 2015. "Occupation Apps." *Jacobin*. March 9, 2015. http://jacobinmag.com/2015/03/occupation-apps-souri-palestine.

Verdery, Katherine. 2014. *Secrets and Truths: Ethnography in the Archive of Romania's Secret Police*. New York: Central European University Press.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2011. "Introducing." *Settler Colonial Studies* 1 (1):1–12.

———. 2013. "The Other Shift: Settler Colonialism, Israel, and the Occupation." *Journal of Palestine Studies* 42 (2):26–42.

Warner, Michael. 2005. *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York, NY: Zone Books.

Wedeen, Lisa. 1999. *Ambiguities of Domination: Politics, Rhetoric, and Symbols in Contemporary Syria*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2008. *Peripheral Visions: Publics, Power, and Performance in Yemen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2013. "Ideology and Humor in Dark Times: Notes from Syria." *Critical Inquiry* 39 (4): 841–873.

Weizman, Eyal. 2007. *Hollow Land: Israel's Architecture of Occupation*. New York: Verso.

Westbrook, Stephanie. 2013. "SodaStream 'Treats Us like Slaves,' Says Palestinian Factory Worker." The Electronic Intifada. May 9, 2013. https://electronicintifada.net/content/sodastream-treats-us-slaves-says-palestinian-factory-worker/12441.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford [Eng.]: Oxford University Press.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (4): 387–409.

———. 2012. "Purchase by Other Means: The Palestine Nakba and Zionism's Conquest of Economics." *Settler Colonial Studies* 2 (1): 133–71.

Yacobi, Haim, and Wendy Pullan. 2014. "The Geopolitics of Neighbourhood: Jerusalem's Colonial Space Revisited." *Geopolitics* 19 (3): 514–39.

Žižek, Slavoj. 1989. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. New York: Verso.