**Palestine and the Question of Archives in Anthropology**

“Historical narratives are a result of a set of silences that happen in four moments: silencing in the making of sources; silencing in the making of archives; silencing in the making of narratives; and lastly silencing in the making of history.”

Trouillot, 2015, p. 26

\*\*\*

**Introduction**

This essay seeks to explore the question of archives in anthropology and to critically examine in what ways anthropologists —particularly those working with archives—make use of archival materials rooted in conflict-laden contexts. I ask whether studying the case of Palestine—suffering from continuous colonial practices, ongoing dispossession, and identity erosion (Eghbariah, 2022; Rouhana & Sabbagh-Khoury, 2019; Zureik, 2015)—can produce critical insights about the assumption of many anthropologists that archives are merely sites of evidentiary knowledge about the past (Dirks, 2015; King, 2012; Zeitlyn, 2012).

I look first at how Israel’s preoccupation with archives resulted in large national pre- and post-state investments in establishing highly detailed archives, asking how and why perpetrators of violence create copious and impressively detailed archives. Along with this, I also highlight Israel’s constant destruction of any Palestinian archive.

Referring to critical scholarly works written in the context of Israeli archives, which illustrate the epistemological problem of the lack of balance in power, this essay calls on anthropology —the discipline devoted to understanding human lives—to critically investigate the prevailing conception that archives simply provide us with evidentiary knowledge about the past. This essay, therefore, offers an alternative ontological position, which, once implemented, will enables anthropologists to reread colonial archives “against their grains,” as Ann Stoler (2002) puts it. Thus, rather than normalizing the archive in a way that maintains the status quo, anthropologists can transform it into a site of resistance, allowing change over time and joining ongoing scholarly efforts to establish decolonial archives (e.g., Hartman, 2008; Navaro, 2020; Sela, 2022).

This alternative ontological position suggests: (1) first, rather than perceiving archives only as repositories of evidentiary knowledge based on the presence and availability of materials, attention should be given to the absences, erasures, and silences in these same sites; (2) and, second, rather than focusing exclusively on the past when working with archival materials, the perspective should be forward-looking toward the future, observing people’s agency and actions within this colonial space.

**The Establishment of Israeli Archives and the Destruction of Palestinian Archives**

Even before Israel’s establishment in 1948, Zionist organizations attributed considerable importance to gathering and archiving information in Mandatory Palestine. One well-known example is the 1940 Village Files project, compiling military intelligence documents containing detailed information about every Palestinian village in Mandatory Palestine (Jawad, 2016; Sela, 2013; 2022). This project was carried out by the Shai, the intelligence and counterespionage arm of the Haganah that would become the core of the Israel Defense Forces (IDF).

Similarly, since its establishment in 1948, Israel has continued to be increasingly preoccupied with creating and developing its archives, storing thousands of manuscripts, files, and other documentary evidence (Hochberg, 2021). The National Library of Israel (NLI), dedicated to collecting the cultural treasures of Israeli and Jewish heritage and holds millions of books, photographs, newspapers and maps. While the NLI was originally conceived primarily as a repository of Jewish manuscripts and a national institution of memory for the State of Israel, today it is also notable for its extensive Islamic and Middle East collection, one of the library’s core collections, enjoying international recognition (Blumberg & Ukeles, 2013). This collection contains vast resources on various aspects of Islamic law, theology, philosophy, history, cultures, languages, and literature. In 2021, The NLI launched a new initiative, The National Library Newspaper Collection, making public access to this collection possible with a new digital archive containing Arabic newspapers published in Mandatory Palestine. Many saw this archive as facilitating the flow of knowledge. However, many Palestinians were suspicious of it (e.g., Othman, 2017), focusing not only on what is present, but also on what is missing and erased from it. By referring to the methods of silencing these archives have, especially in relation to Palestinian refugees and their lands and properties, these critics warn that such documents, especially Palestinian documents, may have a completely different meaning in the context of these Zionist archives.

Israel is also known for its extensive police and military archives. The Israel Defense Forces’ (IDF) Archive (n.d.), for example, is the main historical archive of the Israeli military, established in 1948, serving Israel’s Defense Ministry and the IDF as a storage center for their daily work, research, and legal purposes. While this archive includes documentation on a wide variety of issues related to Israeli society, it also includes valuable files related to Palestine (Cohen, 2011).

Along with creating and controlling its own archives, Israel has devoted substantial efforts to destroying any Palestinian archive (Desai & Shahwan, 2022; Sela, 2018; Sleiman, 2016). During the Palestinian Nakba in 1948, Israel was responsible for looting a sizeable amount of valuable private Palestinian materials, including private collections of Palestinian books and manuscripts, which now belong to the NLI. A documentary film, *The Great Book Robbery*, initially released in 2012, explores Israel’s looting of 70,000 Palestinian books from private Palestinian libraries during the war (Brunner, n.d.). While these books are now accessible to all, they remain the property of the NLI. Moreover, the documentary shows that 6,000 books in Arabic in the NLI are now marked now as “AP”–Abandoned Property. These books were private belongings of Palestinians who fled or were forced out of their homes in 1948. *The Great Book Robbery* asks whether this appropriation of Palestinian books is a case of cultural theft or cultural preservation. By trying to understand why thousands of books appropriated from Palestinian homes are still in the NLI and why they have not been returned to their owners, the movie portrays a story of a robbery, not of cultural preservation.

Israel was also responsible for the destruction of the Palestine Liberation Organization’s (PLO) archives in Beirut during the invasion of 1982, raiding the offices of the Palestine Research Center (PRC), confiscating and seizing the archives that had been established in 1965 to gather, conserve, and analyze books and materials relating to Palestine (Sleiman, 2016). In addition to seizing the PRC archives during the 1982 invasion, the IDF also took over the Palestinian Cinema Institute (PCI), including its professional film archive (Sela, 2017). Currently, the films are managed and controlled by the IDF, which conceals much of the information about their origins (Desai & Shahwan, 2022).

Israel’s approach to archives, its long-standing national effort to build vast and detailed archives along with its policies, regulations, decisions regarding the release or lack of release of materials, and its constant attempts to destroy Palestinian archives, seems puzzling, perhaps even suspicious. Why are perpetrators of violence and those involved in conflicts so preoccupied with documenting and creating archives? Why do colonial archives tend to be very detailed archives? What might explain the tendency to restore and archive materials in this capacity? In which circumstances does Israel make the decision to keep its archival documents classified, censored, and out of reach? Conversely, in which circumstances does Israel decide to allow access to its archival documents, even leading initiatives and creating digital archives to enhance public access and knowledge, such as the recent digital newspaper collection mentioned earlier?

In recent years, the academic interest in archives, their politics, and the ways in which they were built or destroyed in the context of Palestine has been increasing, leading to a growing body of literature on the subject. Rona Sela (2018) for example, traces the genealogy of colonial plunder and erasure in the context of Israeli control over Palestine. Examining Israel’s colonial archives holding plundered Palestinian materials, Sela provides deeper insights into Israel’s colonial mechanism of looting and truth production. By focusing on the two archives plundered by Israel in Beirut in 1982, she traces how Israel as a colonial state, first looted the colonized Palestinian archives and then controlled the materials in its own colonial archives. Sela shows how Palestinian archives were erased from the public space using repressive means, including censorship and various restrictions. She further traces the ways in which Israel restricted the exposure and the use of Palestinian looted materials, altered their original identity, regulated their contents, and subjected them to its laws and terminology.

Similarly, Hana Sleiman (2016) details the silencing that Israel imposed. Sleiman’s study discusses the various powers that tried to silence the PLO archive and alter its accounts. Her article shows how Israeli soldiers systematically looted the contents of the library and pursued the center’s workers around the city, an action that, according to Sleiman, “was not an anomaly but part of a broader Israeli imperative to seize documents from PLO offices during raids in the south of Lebanon” (p. 48). Furthermore, Sleiman presents different examples to show how the looted documents were used later by Israeli research institutions and researchers. One of her examples is that of a historian at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem who, having been given access to the looted documents, selected and curated them to create a narrative depicting the PLO as a “terrorist organization at the nexus of international rogue actors, emphasizing its connection to the Eastern bloc, Arab and Islamic counties, and other countries that allow subversive groups to operate, like many countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America” (p. 49). Sleiman notes the irony behind Israel’s claim that its narrative is authentic because it is based on the PLO’s own documents and records. In fact, according to Sleiman, Israel’s claims to be fully faithful to the documents’ hidden script is simply putting into words the truth that the colonial archive is demanding.

A recent article by Chandni Desai and Rula Shahwan (2022) is another example of work that reflects the growing interest in the politics of Israeli colonial archives. Focusing on visual archives in the post-Oslo period, the authors posit that “the displacement, loss, and seizure of Palestinian visual archives did not result from the perceived threat they posed to Zionism alone” (p. 470). Instead, they suggest that “the politics surrounding archives are imbricated in the broader social relations of settler colonialism, neoliberalism, and the neoliberal agendas that bourgeois national interests have produced in Palestine, as well as in the ideological differences between Palestinian political factions” (p. 470). They thus identify the ways in which archival violence maintains Israeli hegemony by erasing the Palestinian historiography to generate and support its settler narratives.

More works by Palestinian scholars have been published in recent years questioning the neutrality of Israeli archives and their politics, and tracing the ways in which the Palestinian story has been re-narrated.

Orouba Othman (2017), a Palestinian scholar, examines how Palestinians have been portrayed and presented. One example she brings is that while Palestinians have been depicted as simply having given up their spiritual and material possessions during the 1948 war, the staff of the NLI has been portrayed as having risked their lives for these neglected documents. According to Othman, this imagery highlights what is conventionally considered the abyss between the Oriental, purportedly lacking the basic capacity to protect its culture, and the Western Zionist, always able to overcome obstacles. To further illustrate this, Othman quotes Shlomo Shunami (1897‒1984) writing about the collection of Palestinian books: “During the War of Independence, Israel’s National Library organized an extensive operation to save books from damage in deserted Arab neighborhoods.” Othman then traces the process these books underwent, a process she calls “Easternization,” whereby Zionism went through struggles over the right to represent the Eastern, allowing it to determine who has the right to speak and represent the Eastern, and who will remain silent, without a voice or possibility to represent themselves. In this way, the moralistic-heroic Israeli narrative of the 1948 war was constructed, according to Othman.

The case of Palestine thus offers a retrospective view that enables us to learn about the archive, its politics, and its influences. Palestine, I argue, challenges the idea of the archive as an essential arena that can simply provide reliable information about the past. It also demands that we pay attention to the role of archives in shaping historiography and historical-based writing and research. How, then, should we, as anthropologists, think—both methodologically and theoretically—about archives that comprise a history, when our research is rooted in conflict-laden contexts and ongoing settler-colonial contexts, such as the case of Palestine? How should anthropology, as a discipline, think about the rich historical archives that indigenous communities have produced and which have been subjected to displacement, destruction, theft, and neglect? How should we think about the power of archives to create narratives that can either legitimize certain narratives or threaten the legitimacy of others?

The Palestinian case shows how political actors, perpetrators of violence, and victors in conflict-laden zones destroy historical narratives that threaten to undermine their legitimacy, narratives, discourses, and political interests. Which kind of efforts should anthropology engage in to overcome the absences, erasures, silences, and “black holes,” using Yael Navaro’s words (2020, p. 161)? And how should we capture these erasures ethnographically, without abandoning the idea of empiricism, the core of our ethnographic method?

Bearing these questions in mind, I turn now to Yael Navaro’s (2020) concept of negative anthropology, and build on it to suggest an alternative ontology, one that extends beyond the imagination of those who are still assuming evidentiary knowledge and those whose focus remains fixed on the past, conceiving of archives solely as a repository of history. As outlined in the introduction, this proposed ontology consists of two shifts

**Toward an Alternative Ontological Position**

In recent years, some scholars—anthropologists included—have been addressing the question of history and archives in academic research and in the production of knowledge processes, suggesting new ways to conceptualize and think about them (e.g., Basu & Ferdinand, 2016; Navaro, 2020; Odumosu, 2020; Sabbagh-Khory, 2022). This question has become extremely salient in anthropology today, not only due to the increasingly extensive incorporation of primary historical records in anthropological research and its analysis, known as “the historical turn,” but also because of the importance of such questions in the contexts of conflict-laden zones, settler-colonial relations, erasure of histories and narratives, cultural demolitions, and dispossessions. When archival gatekeepers are still there to control, narrate, and charge material with new meanings to benefit and strengthen their own agenda, it becomes essential to address this issue.

One notable example of such work is Yael Navaro’s article “The Aftermath of Mass Violence: A Negative Methodology” (2020), in which she problematizes the idea of methods in anthropology in the contexts of the aftermath of mass violence, positing the impossibility of research “when the witnesses have been exterminated and are not there to bear testimony, when the material remains of the sites of atrocity have been manipulated or washed over by perpetrator regimes and their citizens, and when denialist states place barriers before the study of their culpability” (p. 162).

Navaro refers to the case of Palestine to highlight the pioneering scholarly work that has proven significant in the development of new research practices and methods for the study of spaces suffering from dispossessions, mass violence, expropriations, and transformations. In the Palestinian contexts, Navaro shows how this line of research has been conducted by Palestinian scholars—Palestinian historians in particular—who have had to think creatively about alternatives due to the hardships, difficulties, restrictions, and complications they have confronted in order to gain access to Israeli archives with Palestinian historical records and vast documents on Palestine. These research conditions, therefore, have compelled them to develop other methods for working on erasures and disappearances. A seminal work on Palestine to which Navaro refers is: *All that Remains: The Palestinian Villages Occupied and* *Depopulated by Israel in 1948* (Khalidi, 1992). Navaro describes how this work illustrates the negative methodological approach she is developing and shows how Khalidi and his team “render erasure a component of the conceptualization of their research methodology,” thereby revealing how the authors study erasures by working within erasures. Erasure, Navaro observes, is “both the object of their analysis and the medium of and for their research practice and methodology” (p. 196).

By referring to sites of extermination, dispossession, and annihilation, she thus challenges the set of assumptions behind historical research’s perception of archives and the material they contain as a source of knowledge that can provide us with evidentiary materials and information. Calling on scholars to take seriously the “black holes” that emerge in the study of mass violence, Navaro introduces the concept of “negative methodology,” challenging the idea of methods, the availability and presence of evidence, and the existence and tangibility of materials. Navaro’s negative methodology assumes absences, erasures, denials, and misappropriations rather than presences and accessibility. She advocates adopting the former as a starting point and as a precondition for field research rooted in conflict-laden zones and settler-colonial contexts.

In addition, Navaro refers to Afro-pessimist and Black scholarship on the limits of documenting the experience of slaves and slavery to argue against the *empiricist approach* characterizing many ethnographic works. One example of Black scholarship Navaro cites is the work of Saidiya Hartman (2008), which identifies the epistemic violence of slave owners embedded in all the records that were hidden, erased, and cannot be known. Navaro (2020) points out Hartman’s approach which aims to challenge the empiricist approach of documenting slavery through archival research, by showing how she starts first with “imagining what cannot be verified, rather than with “what would aim to give voice to the slave” (p. 164).

In light of Navaro’s analysis, one critical question emerges. How, then, do we research and write about spaces of erasure, dispossessions, settler colonialism, and genocide, if evidence has been concealed, effaced, and erased? Highlighting absences and erasures, we are posing questions about evidentiary practices. Does that mean we should be totally anti-empiricist, and that we should abandon empiricist methods that try to look for evidence? Is there a balanced empiricist approach we should seek to adopt, instead? The alternative ontological position I suggest here does not neglect empiricism nor does it suggest casting aside empiricism. Instead, it advocates for a rebalancing in our disciplinary methodology, whereby decolonization works through attention to and privileging the occluded and omitted perspectives and creations of the “other.” In addition, the alternative ontological position suggests that instead of digging in the archive, looking for evidentiary knowledge in order to fill in the gaps to write a coherent, complete narrative, we incorporate people’s future imagination in our ethnographic work with archival materials. That is, building on Navaro’s work, I suggest we also look at absences in a temporal sense, i.e., the absence of a future imagination from the archive, an imagination that is beyond the bounds of the colonial spaces.

In her recent book *Becoming Palestine: Toward an Archival Imagination of the Future* (2021), Hochberg examines the ways in which Palestinian artists and activists use archives in radical and creative ways to imagine Palestine. Referring to a series of contemporary Palestinian artists’ works and the ways in which these artists make use of archeology, musical traditions, archival films, and cinematic footage, she shows how they reimagine the archive, approaching it not with the goal of unearthing hidden knowledge but of severing the identification of the archive with the past. These ways of imagination, she argues, enable artists to envisage a Palestinian future unfettered by the bounds of colonial space and time rather than controlled by it. Thus, Hochberg posits a fundamental reconceptualization of the archive by advocating for the activation of the archive by what she calls “archival imagination,” and by thinking about the archive as a break from history rather than as history’s repository.

Drawing on Walter Benjamin’s call to look at history through the time of the now, the archival imagination Hochberg (2021) suggests means to interact with the archive in a new way, turning to the archive not for the purpose of obtaining evidentiary knowledge about the past, but for the purpose of re-situating the past in the present; that is, taking the present as the starting point from which to conduct archival investigation. According to Hochberg, insisting on returning to the present and recognizing that an archive is filled not only with history but also with the future, is to liberate the archive from the grips of history, enabling the archive to become part of a future-oriented political social force of a newly emerging political reality.

I find common ground in Navaro’s (2020) and Hochberg’s (2021) approaches. Both offer valuable insights into conceptualizing archives and rethinking our assumptions about what should be our starting point when we use archival materials. Navaro suggests that erasures, absences, and gaps should be our starting point, rather than evidentiary knowledge, and Hochberg submits that the present should be our starting point, not the past. Both Navaro and Hochberg are focusing on what is absent, that which readers and researchers have overlooked. Navaro refers to the stories that have not been told, to the material and records that have been demolished. Hochberg refers to the temporality—i.e., both the present and the future—that has been neglected in the archive when it is perceived only as a historical repository.

My proposed alternative ontological position seeks to combine these two approaches. It calls to shift our current ontology to render it more sensitive and attentive to what is missing, erased, absent in both actual and temporal senses. This understanding rejects the perception that archives represent merely an extractive enterprise. Rather, as Ann Stoler observes, it offers a view of the archive as a vivid space to engage in ethnography (Stoler, 2002). This understanding would also allow us to pay attention to changes happening in the present that emphasize the agency and the subjectivity of the colonized and liberate the colonized from the restraints of the colonizer. In the Palestinian context, it means paying greater attention to Palestinian insistence on the preservation of the Palestinian heritage and history, notwithstanding ongoing Israeli destructions and erasures. That is, this approach is not blind to the rebuilding and reconstructing of alternative archives, and it looks at these forms of resistance as an object of research to highlight the Palestinian agent, rather than only the Palestinian victim.

**Conclusion**

I opened this essay with Michel-Rolph Trouillot’s quote from his *Silencing the Past*, in which he outlines how silences infiltrate historical production’s processes through the making of sources, archives, narrative, and history (Trouillot, 2015). Focusing on the archival component, this essay starts with the premise that archival materials are inevitably political, despite often claiming to be apolitical. The history of the establishment of archives, the ways in which archival materials have been collected and organized, and the decisions regarding their accessibility or lack thereof to the public, profoundly influence the ways in which research is conducted and the ways in which knowledge is produced and circulated.

Anthropology as a discipline frequently draws on history and historical methods, seeking, rightfully, to historically locate its objects of research. Many hundreds of anthropological monographs have been written incorporating extensive historical records from archives—including colonial archives—as a primary resource for analysis. This essay seeks to challenge the purported neutrality of these archives as well as their role and the extent of their credibility and integrity, discussing archival politics and influences, especially when rooted in conflict-laden contexts, such as mass violence, genocide, and settler colonialism.

The case of Palestine strongly illustrates the importance of examining plausible counter-narratives and calls for adopting decolonial approaches in our ethnography and research. This does not lead to the conclusion that archives should be dismantled or that anthropologists should abandon empiricism, so fundamentally rooted in anthropology as a discipline; rather, I suggest a balanced approach that should lead to improved instrumentalization of archives in ethnographic research in a way that advances the discipline forward, enriching it with more holistic and useful insights.
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