

Unspectacular spaces of slow wounding in Palestine

Mikko Joronen 

Tampere University, Tampere, Finland

Correspondence

Mikko Joronen, Tampere University,
Tampere, Finland.

Email: mikko.joronen@tuni.fi

Funding information

Academy of Finland (Grant numbers:
308228, 322025).

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to develop a notion of violence based on the ability to wound slowly. It starts by exploring everyday events in a strangulated West Bank site struggling with Israel's colonisation and settlement policies, thus painting a nuanced picture on how slowness and slow proceedings wound through unspectacular events and mundane spatialisations. The spatially manifold picture of “slow wounding” is thus offered, one that not only helps in showing how ordinary spaces and unspectacular events can wound, but that also forces us to ask how wounding through slowness becomes possible in the first place. In the latter regard, it is shown how the power of slowness remains embedded in what consists of our fundamental exposure to a wound of living. Such exposure doesn't merely name the woundedness of life to power, but also the woundedness of power itself. On the one hand, slow wounding is enabled by the woundedness, while on the other hand it is fundamentally limited by it. While this ambiguity is shown to unfold in the inherent incapacity of power to ever fully force Palestinian lives under the established orders of governing, most notably it unearths the way in which particular ways of wounding are complexly entwined around life's incurable proneness to a wound – to a wound of being a living being.

KEY WORDS

event, Palestine, slow violence, vulnerability, wounding

1 | INTRODUCTION

Visible lines on a map can sometimes foreclose obvious conclusions. The Bantustans of Palestinian cities and villages surrounded by the chains of growing settlements; the Separation Wall coiling within the West Bank; restricted areas, fences, settler-only roads – all made visible with lines that point towards the key Israeli endeavour to colonise Palestinian land without its inhabitants (see Gordon, 2008; Said, 1980; Zureik, 2016). Within the Bethlehem governorate, the area under focus in this particular study, E1 and E2 plans for settlement expansion have defined the directions taken in the north and south, the Gush Etzion settlement block in the West containing more than 75,000 settlers, all settling illegally (according to Fourth Geneva convention) West Bank and Palestinian lands. Here in particular the lines of existing and emerging conditions make visible, even mappable, the spatial patterns of occupation – the way it consistently proceeds to colonise the West Bank through settlements, barriers, walls, fences, checkpoints, and separated roads that consequently strangulate Palestinians' communities and villages in what Palestinians often refer to as the “human warehouses” (see also Alkhalili, 2017; Falah, 2003; Joronen, 2019). At the same

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The information, practices and views in this article are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Royal Geographical Society (with IBG).

© 2021 The Authors. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of Royal Geographical Society (with The Institute of British Geographers)

time, significantly more fine-textured landscapes of violence are being painted by spatial techniques less noticeable in their slow, often unspectacular way of mundane appearance. Slowly expanding settler claims and enclosures, mimetic and bodily forms of appropriation, unnoticeable small re-borderings, changing restrictions on mobility, slow hampering and incapacitation of everyday life, and so on, are all exemplary of how such mundane and unspectacular violence operates.

This paper is an attempt to explicate these mundane and unspectacular forms of violence by paying particular attention to how they operate as ways of slow wounding. In order to do so, the paper proceeds through two closely related routes. First, a close attention is paid to the manifold ways in which slow wounding operates through everyday spatialities in one particular West Bank village (Beit Sakariya) and its surroundings. Second, it is asked under what (ontological) conditions can slow and mundane events wound in the first place. Within the current works on Palestine slow forms of violence have been closely connected to more apparent spatialities of power – to checkpoints, queues, detours, and so on – which “steal time” by limiting and slowing down everyday mobilities (Hammami, 2006; Kotef, 2015; Peteet, 2017; Pullan, 2013; Tawil-Souri, 2017). Alternatively, slowness has been approached in terms of purposefully opaque and inefficient bureaucratic violence, and so in terms less closely related to questions of mobility (e.g., Berda, 2017; Joronen, 2017b). Less attention, however, has been paid to those forms through which slowness has been mobilised to impose harm through spaces that are mundane and events that seem utterly unspectacular. In this regard it is suggested that slow wounding should be traced through the ways it endures as ordinary spaces of wounding. And yet, slow wounding should never be approached merely as a power that is capable of wounding, but as an inherently wounded power – as a power not only incapable of fully capturing what it aims to govern, but also constantly cracked open to counter-wounding. It is this ambiguity that is used here to further show how power is always entwined around life’s incurable proneness to a wound – that is, around the wound of being a living being (see also Joronen & Rose, 2020).

The paper starts by bringing into conversation some of the existing works on slow and ordinary violence (e.g., Christian & Dowler, 2019; de Leeuw, 2016; Davies, 2018; Nixon, 2011; Povinelli, 2011). Here particular attention is paid to the relationship between the event (that induces slowly emerging violence) and slowness (that wounds without anything spectacular happening). The following subsections then move on to discuss numerous spatialities that exhaust, wither, disable, and strangle Palestinian life by turning unspectacular and mundane events into spaces that slowly wound. By drawing on the fieldwork in the West Bank, the two subsections (2.1 and 2.2.) show in detail how different modalities of slow wounding – the slowing down of Palestinian life; the slow encroachment of everyday colonisation; slowly withering insecurities; and the increasing uncertainties – operate with ways closely related to different spatialities of governing – to imitating landscapes and tacit spatial claims; to re-borderings done with tree plantings, outposts, and fences; to arbitrary accessibilities and restrictions on mobility; to bodily claims and violence of settlers; and to uncertain spaces of water use, cultivation, and future livelihood. These spatialisations of slowness, however, are not merely acknowledged to offer a detailed case study from a site surrounded by settlements at the highly vulnerable part of the West Bank. Rather, these spatialisations are shown to open up an entirely different problematic that forces us to think anew the relationship between slowness, woundedness, and power – namely, their ontological constitution. This rethinking, which forms the third section of the paper, leads to particular outcomes: while the power of slowness is shown to be epiphenomenal to life’s elementary woundedness, such power is also considered to be no more than a “wounded power,” a limited aim to mobilise life’s exposure to time and wounding. Such ambiguity of woundedness as a “limit that enables,” shows how ordinary events can on the one hand wound – disable, hamper, harm, wither, erase, force, maintain, and so on – Palestinian bodies and communities to the extent of making life insecure and vulnerable, even close to unbearable. On the other hand, these events are shown to offer situated avenues for counter-mobilising slowness and durability. It is in this latter regard that the paper shows how slowness can also offer ways for counter-temporalising the wounds and cracks of “wounding power.” This ambiguity, the paper concludes, helps in comprehending how slowness can be used as means of power by mobilising the existential woundedness of living, but also in acknowledging the woundedness of colonial projects themselves – that is, their ontological nature as ever-incomplete and fragile processes in making, and thus their incapacity to ever reduce Palestinian life under the established orders and techniques of power (see also Stoler, 2016).

2 | EXAMINING SLOW WOUNDING: QUASI-EVENTS AND ORDINARY SPACES

Focus on a particular site – Beit Sakariya – in the midst of expanding settlements in the West Bank may seem deliberate, to some extent even tendentious. And yet, the case under scrutiny bears hardly any exceptionality. According to the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics, the number of settlers has quadrupled in the occupied West Bank since the Oslo “Peace” Agreements in the mid-1990s (MEMO, 2018; for exact numbers, see ICBS, 1996; ICBS 2018). These developments have mostly taken place in the West Bank “Area C,” where Israel holds full control of security and administration, and which comprises over 60% of the

West Bank land area. This has meant that several, predominantly rural, Palestinian “Area C” communities have become targets of land seizure, often followed by, or proceeding through, restrictive re-zonings, expulsion of farmers from their lands, forced displacements, demolitions, apartheid policies regarding the use of roads and other infrastructure, and the violence of settlers inhabiting Palestinian lands. As an outcome, several Palestinian households, even entire villages, have become systematically isolated and strangled into sites and pockets of intensified colonial extremity (see Alkhalili, 2017; Allegra et al., 2017; Joronen, 2019). Certainly, as Cohen and Gordon (2018) recall, Zionist leaders have long understood that effective control and seizure of Palestinian lands requires a significant civilian presence in the occupied territories. Since the start of the occupation in 1967, they argue, settlements have functioned as ways of implementing racialised spaces of colonisation, where the colonising population is explicitly relocated to the lands violently seized from indigenous inhabitants. As suggested by others, construction of settlements has played several other roles as well, including the normalisation of occupation, the hampering of Palestinian movement, the purposeful blurring of Israel's borders and the destruction of conditions for establishing a territorially coherent Palestinian state (e.g., Allegra et al., 2017; Ghanem, 2020; Pullan, 2013; Yiftachel, 2002).

Although these views have all been important for understanding key rationalisations and trends behind the accelerating settler-colonisation, they give at best a rough picture on how such colonisation proceeds as part of the landscapes that seem altogether mundane and unspectacular. Rather than looking at the occupation through the eyes, intentions, and rationalisations of the “governor” (e.g., Gordon, 2008; Hughes, 2017; Veracini, 2006), it is my aim here to focus on how this settler-colonisation takes place through slow and less sensational processes constitutive for the sites of everyday dwelling – namely, through what I call the “unspectacular spaces of slow wounding” (see also Hammami, 2006; Harker, 2009; Joronen, 2017b). I argue, first, that this is not merely another way of duplicating the footsteps set in classic postcolonial works of authors such as Edward Said (1980), Franz Fanon (1963), and Gayatri Spivak (1999), all underlining the ethical need to recognise the indigenous self-representation, the perspective of “victims,” and the voice of the subaltern. Neither is it a way of merely looking at the Palestinian experience of internalising and embodying the “visceral” (de Leeuw, 2016) forms of slow violence, as opposed to violence “out there,” in the land, resources, and territories (see Griffiths, 2017). Rather, it is a way of approaching colonial power through those mundane spaces, where Palestinians confront, enact, express, and embody the slowly wounding effects of settler-colonisation. Such mundane spaces are not only sites where the “extensions of power are both undermined and enacted” (Wilson, 2017, p. 464); these unspectacular spaces also offer ways to grasp slow and less visible colonial woundings as they come to the fore through the lives of those living with their consequences (see Shalhoub-Kevorkian, 2009).

Second, such “ordinary harm” is shown to offer an avenue for thinking through how “slow wounding” functions in scales that are subtle, mundane, and unspectacular, even banal in nature. While this echoes the work of several feminist scholars, who have long paid attention to intimate and routinised forms of violence (e.g., Christian & Dowler, 2019; Koopman, 2011), this is not to suggest mobilisations of slow wounding are small-scale or intimate processes alone. As several scholars have argued, during the post-Oslo years Israel has systematically adapted a slow-motion tactic, particularly in the West Bank, to gradually appropriate Palestinian spaces and to slowly populate them with settlers (e.g., Falah, 2005; Joronen, 2017b; Peteet, 2017). The focus on ordinary ways of wounding rather paints a significantly more fine-textured view of how this slow-motion colonisation operates as a set of unspectacular, spatially imminent processes. My use of one village as a locus of study is precisely to offer not only an example on the spatial intensification of colonial extremity but above all a narrated and more embedded take on the spatial logics of slow wounding. Such is a way – a method – of approaching spaces of occupation through the wounds that slowly emerge in and through the ordinary spaces and unspectacular events, where Palestinians themselves not only become wounded but also act on wounding conditions.

Finally, and most importantly, I want to carefully separate ways of slow wounding from articulations that simply contrast slow, mundane, gradual, and unspectacular violence with the abrupt events of extraordinary violence. While there are works that carefully differentiate, for instance, between “spectacular violence,” where physical force against objects and bodies is visibly detectable, and “suspended violence,” which remains insinuating and intimidating and so less visible in nature (Azoulay & Ophir, 2005), they often end up posing binaries that miss the more fundamental dynamics at play between slowness, event, and woundedness (see also de Leeuw, 2016; c.f., Christian & Dowler, 2019). In this regard, Rob Nixon's (2011) much-cited book, *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*, offers a helpful starting point. While also framing “slow violence” as a gradual and unspectacular process in contrast to “an event or action that is immediate in time, explosive and spectacular in space” and so “erupting to instant sensational visibility” (similar uses in geography, see Davies, 2018; Pain, 2019), Nixon also pays attention to events, such as the Chernobyl nuclear powerplant explosion, which might have been spectacular, extraordinary, and catastrophic when first emerging, but came to contain a long shadow of slowly emerging harm and suffering. Elisabeth Povinelli's discussion of what she calls “quasi-events” – events that abide without anything really happening – further blurs the distinction between the event and the slow violence. Quasi-events, Povinelli writes, are “chronic” and “cruddy” rather than “catastrophic or crisis-laden,” thus happening through the “ordinary sufferings” camouflaged and hidden in mundane,

slow, and less visible proceedings (2011, pp. 13–14). While Povinelli's interest lies specifically in the nature of late modern power, her work helps in understanding “slow wounding” as a particular kind of event (i.e., “quasi-event”) closely entwined to mundane proceedings, chronic conditions, and ordinary harm.

By drawing on Povinelli's insight, I hence approach quasi-event as a way of engendering mundane and unspectacular spaces, through which various ways of slow wounding can be installed, enforced, and maintained. With the notion of quasi-event the focus is thus turned to those modalities through which unspectacular events, unnoticeable proceedings, and camouflaged normalities become spaces that wound slowly. Quasi-events, I thus argue, are events that camouflage their violence to different phases and ways of emerging: to gradual proceeding, to mundane landscapes, to slowness that constantly incapacitates life, to abiding insecurities that do not have an end or a solution in view – to events where nothing spectacular happens. In short, what I call the “quasi-event” refers to an abiding of spaces that slowly wound through the scenes that seem ordinary, unspectacular and uneventful in nature. It is precisely in this regard that slow wounding should be seen, not as something opposed to events, but as a peculiar kind of event – as a quasi-event of ordinary harming, which doesn't necessarily have a start, a phase, or an end that is spectacular, event-like, or instantly visible in nature, but which nevertheless can be connected to such qualities in various ways.

What I wish to suggest through these three points is that by paying attention to the ordinary Palestinian spaces it becomes possible to unfold ways in which slow wounding operates by turning these often highly mundane spaces into forms of colonial violence. Mundane, in other words, is not a simple obverse of violence, something that the violence interrupts, but something that, in itself, can function as a chronic and camouflaged quasi-event premised on the power to slowly wound. While the dynamics between the slow harming and more instant and spectacular violence are naturally important for understanding how wounds are inflicted and how wounding operates, what I am more interested in here is how the mundane things – the nothing spectacular happening – can wound through the ordinary spaces they engender. It is through the unspectacular events (which slowly wound) and the ordinary spaces (where wounds come to the fore through the ways Palestinians embody, confront, enact, mitigate, and counter them) that I approach the spatial functions of mobilising slowness (sections 2.1 and 2.2), and eventually, the ontological question of woundedness they are predicated on (section 3).

2.1 | Encroachments, disguises, incapacities

In May 2019, I was travelling to visit Beit Sakariya, a Palestinian village with a population of 227, surrounded by several Israeli settlements that were part of a massive settlement block named “Gush Etzion.”¹ As we approached our destination, my local assistant, who has for several years paid routine visits to the area as part of his job in a local organisation, started to explain the situation. “This all used to be Palestinian land,” he began, “now it is settlements on the top, and settler fields, trees, greenhouses, even industrial compounds,” which constantly expand to Palestinian lands down the hills. “There is no room for Palestinian farmers and fields anymore,” he added, articulating what the landscape in front of us made visible. Such colonisation and annexation of Palestinian lands, however, operates also through ways that are more hidden and subtle in nature. We continued to travel towards the village along the dirt road when several newly built brick wall terraces, typical in traditional Palestinian farming, came into view on one side of the road (on the history of terrace farming in the region, see Ra'ad, 2010). “Settlers are mimicking the traditional Palestinian style,” my guide says – “you cannot directly tell these are done by settlers to steal the land, unless you know the area well.” Such imitation game is not only a way of eliminating Palestinian presence and history from the landscape (e.g., Wolfe, 2006), but a colonisation of landscape through spatial marking and materialisation of settler sovereignty. Claims here are tacit, grounded on the imitation of surrounding landscape and history, nonetheless containing a different way of coming-to-being – a more hidden mode of spatial “presencing” clearly understandable for the local Palestinian farmers and landowners. Such mimicry, therefore, should not be understood as a mere appropriation of culture, history, and landscape (see Ra'ad, 2010), less in terms of mere preservation of ancient landscapes (see Braverman, 2021). It is rather a form of plagiarism and theft – a colonial disguising of ab-normalisation to the everyday landscape, which subsumes, rather than credits, those it imitates. In other words, it operates through spatial claims that require tacit understanding of the landscape. Its visible forms might not constitute signs that are obvious and apparent, but they are, nevertheless, violent in a more impudent and cruel way that not only marks and claims, but also steals and veils.

To further underline his point, my guide pointed towards the newly planted trees on the other side of the road – the work of a settler organisation calling themselves the “Women in Green.” In their website, the organisation openly supports the colonisation and complete Israeli sovereignty in the West Bank, even celebrating the violent annexation of Palestinian lands. Here the organisation, with a hallmark of wearing green hats, comes as a group to Palestinian lands and slowly expands the vigilant borders of settlements with simple acts of planting trees. With these trees, accompanied with yellow sticks on the ground, the organisation openly states to “plant Judea [West Bank]” to “safeguard the lands for future [Jewish] generations” (Women in

Green, 2019). Slowly parts of the land are allocated for settler use, again tacitly, and with ways that mark their spatial claim in more hidden ways. The fine-textured architecture of occupation, with its small hints of re-bordering and subtle forms of separation, thus creates spatialities that not only rely on tacit knowledge about the surrounding landscape, but also slowly enforce – tree by tree, brick by brick – violent colonisation. It is, to re-frame the notion of Asef Bayat (2010), not a slow encroachment of everyday, but a slow encroachment made gradually through the disguise of everyday.

For the local Palestinian farmers, however, these marks create more belligerent signs, which install more insecure and vulnerable spatialities. We got an immediate reflection from the Palestinian side of the story, as a man, in his 50s, approached us on foot. My assistant stopped the car and greeted the man by his name. It was a particularly hot day during Ramadan, the time of year most Palestinians fast during the daytime, and the man, a farmer from Beit Sakariya, was visibly exhausted. He wiped sweat and sighed that he needed “to move out of this place,” further complaining about the ridiculous situation that it takes around 40 minutes to walk from the village to the closest bus stop, as the villagers are no longer allowed to walk along the main road (passing through the settlements), which leads to another bus stop significantly closer to village. As another farmer explained later on, the villagers now sarcastically call the unreachable bus stop at the “Gush Etzion roundabout,” “the roundabout of death”: heavily guarded and too dangerous for them to try to enter. A mere visit outside the village has thus become time-consuming, as exemplified by the words and the sweat of this farmer.

The very road we were using to enter the village thereby creates another space for mobilising slow wounding: the way of slowing down life with restricted mobility. The detour slows down everyday life through a spatial form that might restrict mobility, but by doing so hampers precisely the everyday life in the village (see also Kotef, 2015; Medien & Puar, 2018). Most of the Palestinian farmers, for instance, don't own cars and are forced to take 90-minute-long back-and-forth walks just to reach the closest accessible bus stop, or alternatively, have to pay for a private taxi, which remains expensive for a farmer who lives mainly off the land (with constantly diminishing acreage). As one of the farmers from Beit Sakariya explained, this creates a vicious circle, where reaching the outside markets often “costs you more than what you get out of it.” Restricted mobility is hence not merely a question of more time-consuming accessibility, but part of the political economy of the occupation that slowly wounds the very possibility to dwell, stay, and earn a living in strangled villages like Beit Sakariya. Such slow incapacitation, I thus argue, offers a second modality of slow wounding. As the mundane movements of life become slowed down, it is the woundedness of living that is mobilised as a political asset to harm – to wound life.

2.2 | Engendering spaces of insecurity: arbitrariness, uncertainty, impunity

Ways of wounding, the discussion above shows, are tied up with different modalities of slowness, on the one hand, and different spatial forms on the other. As life slows down due to spaces of restricted mobility, mundane opportunities to practice professions, sell products, or take care of everyday dealings – even to visit relatives, a grocery store, or a doctor – become uncertain and time-consuming efforts. Tacit marks of expansion and annexation, in turn, emerge slowly, tree by tree, stone by stone. Yet, as banal as these forms of slow wounding might seem, they should not be understood as separate from the broader political order of the state. This can be exemplified with a seemingly unremarkable scene we witnessed when approaching the village: a jogging settler, bypassing us in running gear with a bottle of water in his hand. “This used to be Palestinian agricultural road, now settlers use it for sports,” my guide says after the settler had passed by, and adds, “but it is not just about the settlers. It is the state policy that allows them to be here, even the road sign is planted by the state.” Commonplace acts like renaming a road can thus help underline how everyday settler presence, acts, and movement are fundamentally enabled and encouraged by state policies that open up avenues for more informal and mundane techniques of violence, erasure, and colonisation. Renaming is thus not only about annexing, erasing, or restricting – of folding – Palestinian spaces through mundane means (e.g., Long, 2009; Said, 2000), but also part of opening up a horizon of insecurity, where the landscape becomes more receptive to slowly increasing settler uses, claims, and bodily presence. “Today settlers may seem less violent here,” my guide ends, “but only because they have managed to get almost everything they wanted. Sometimes no violence means they just don't have any reason for it.”

These spaces of insecurity, however, are not only embedded in the prevalent structures of political order through the unremarkable markings of everyday embodiment; they are also complexly connected to more belligerent and spectacular events of colonial violence. Near the village, for instance, we spotted several settler caravans along the dirt road. These outposts pose one of the most hostile signs of settler vigilantism: a violent attack to seize Palestinian lands that is accompanied with cutting of Palestinian olive and fruit trees, and adding of barbed wire that blocks farmers' access to their lands.² Settlers “just come and take what is not theirs,” one of the farmers bluntly summarised, further addressing how Israeli military, acting as a sovereign (in Area C), intervenes only to prevent clashes if Palestinian landowners choose to protest (more on settler vigilantism and the

state, see Gazit, 2015). It is precisely through the military protection (of “security”) and slow and “effectively inefficient” bureaucratic and legal processes that the outpost caravans are allowed to stay in place and to gradually become part of the official settlement structures (see Berda, 2017; Joronen, 2017b). Such slow formalisation has also been the case in Beit Sakariya (ARIJ, 2004; Badil, 2019), where not only the violent annexations induce everyday insecurities, but where the continuing presence of an outpost offers a constant reminder of uncertainties related to accessibility, income, safety, and further annexation. The presence of an outpost thus installs vulnerable spaces that villagers and farmers of Beit Sakariya need to confront and navigate through in their daily lives. Unformalised outposts, destroyed trees, and barbed wired fences all underline how slowly expanding annexations are not merely camouflaged as small everyday hints in the landscape (as it was with the terraces and planted trees), but also operate as abiding quasi-events enabled by the state-supported acts of settler violence.

The slow accumulation of insecure spaces was further illustrated by the events explained in full detail by the farmers I interviewed in the village. We sat down with two of them on a stone wall under a tree whose shadow offered some relief from the scorch of the sun. The fields in the valley opened up widely in front of us, the landscape eventually crawling up towards the outposts and settlements in the horizon. “I like sitting here – it’s cool, it’s quiet and you have a nice view of the valley,” one of the farmers started, while the other gathered an extra plastic chair from a nearby house. I asked about the marks one can clearly spot on the landscape – the outposts, barbed wire, settlers, and the settlements themselves. After a short pause, one of the farmers replied, “it is unusual freedom that they gave us here: a restricted freedom. We cannot walk around the fields without being afraid we would get shot or offended by the settlers or the military.” “Recently,” he then continued, “a settler gathered broken glass and threw it into my lands. It is risky for the animals to now move there. Some of the pieces were big enough to harm the small tractor we have in the village.” As the other farmer added, “often the best way is to just avoid the settlers.” Such events, then, have not only directly harmed farmers and their everyday life, but have also promoted a sense of danger and threat, which slowly turn the matters of everyday life – the movement in and cultivation of lands – into insecure and wounded spaces.

The farmer continued by underlining the disturbing impunity such forms of settler violence enjoy. “I tried to contact the police,” he said, “but they didn’t care, even though I had a good look at the settler who did this [threw the glass]. Three months ago, I had some rubbish from renovating the inside of my house. The police quickly came to give me a fine for littering, although all the rubbish was on my land, in small piles and plastic bags!” Such sense of injustice was widely shared, not just among the villagers of Beit Sakariya, but in the neighbouring sites and villages similarly strangled by the numerous settlements of Gush Etzion block. As the other farmer sitting with us under the tree aired his frustration:

We cannot do anything here. Even if we put up a shade [under which to relax], they will come and order us to take it away. For settlers everything is allowed. Their farms and gardens keep blooming, they can freely move around and jog on the roads and fields. Outposts are built without any permits, and they become part of the settlement and its services. They have all sorts of life, while we can only stay.

These expressions of impunity and injustice were followed by a series of examples on specific effects that Israeli administrative restrictions had placed on Palestinian construction, water use, accessibility, and the use of agricultural tools in the village. “We need to follow technological changes to bring living to the family,” one of the farmers started, and continued “but we are allowed to use only basic agricultural tools. We don’t have things such as green houses, tractors, or proper irrigation.” As another farmer described the situation, “it would only take two hours to plough the field with proper machinery. But they would only confiscate the machines, and we would have to make an appeal, go to courts, and so on. It would take time and money and it is not worth it.” It is not only the economic insecurity, the interviewees stressed, that thus prevents improving farming practices, but also the arbitrariness of restrictions. Agricultural machinery, for instance, has been confiscated simply for the sake of it being used too close to settlements, or due to the alleged lack of registration by Israeli officials (see also Ma’an, 2015). As another farmer added, arbitrary regulations are something villagers need to constantly deal with: “every day they come up with new rules. One day we are allowed to work in our lands, but not the next day, even the same officer is giving these orders. [...] I try to tell them, ‘you gave us the permit yesterday,’ but that doesn’t matter.”

Together the constantly changing arbitrary regulations, malicious restrictions, and the systematic impunity regarding settler vigilantism seem to engender a prevalent sense of everyday uncertainty – another way of slow wounding – among the inhabitants of Beit Sakariya. This is particularly the case in areas Rema Hammami (2016) pointedly calls “hyperprecarious” – namely, in those mostly rural parts of the West Bank Area C where Israel holds both security and administrative control over the land and its inhabitants, so that the Palestinian communities and farms, whose livelihoods are constantly threatened, need to seek protection from the same state that often engendered these threats in the first place. Here Israeli military, security, and administrative officers can act as sovereigns with a knowledge they have a very thin chance of facing consequences regarding their arbitrary and unjust decisions over daily matters, such as access to fields. Arbitrariness becomes an imminent feature of

everyday power that not only gradually installs a sense of insecurity, but also slowly removes conditions for practising farming. As one of the farmers described, some of the regulations in the village seemed unashamedly malicious: “we cannot get permits to build water reserves here, or to dig holes to store rainwater. The water would not even come from the state, but from the sky, but even that is not allowed.” Here irrigation and cultivation, like the access to farmlands, become sources of everyday wounding, where arbitrary decisions on accessibility, storing of rainwater, confiscation of machinery, and so on, gradually erode the livelihood of the entire village (for more on these, see also ARIJ, 2004, 2011).

Eventually such everyday vulnerabilities become a matter of playing against time. As one villager explained, “we are not allowed to have any room for natural growth here. We cannot build or add extra rooms to our houses. I have two rooms and two sons living under the same roof. How we are all supposed to continue living here when they have families?” Restrictions, hence, never merely prevent construction; they also make the future everyday life – the economic situation of families, the livelihood of entire communities – increasingly vulnerable. As another interviewee underlined, “it is already hard to cope with the existing situation, but the next generation will have a hard time in finding their living out of the land. They cannot even build here without getting demolition orders!” Here, the future itself becomes a key condition of slow wounding. Restrictions force people to wait – “we can only stay,” to repeat the words mentioned above – under the continuous precarisation and decline of livelihoods, which engender ever-gloomier future prospects that slowly push the next generation to consider the ultimate option of leaving. In other words, the future becomes a debilitating force that slowly wounds the present through the negative anticipations and prospects it engenders. Slow wounding withers away the hopes for intergenerational livelihoods.

Arbitrary state regulations, malicious restrictions, and impunity, the examples above show, engender uncertain spaces that make everyday life, and its future, not only vulnerable to spectacular events of settler and military violence but above all to a slowness that in itself wounds. Uncertainties related to accessibility, construction, water availability, use of agricultural tools, or growth of families hence all lead to a slow wounding that gradually eats away possibilities to stay and earn a living in the village. And yet, despite all the insecurities, restrictions, arbitrariness, and violence that try to slowly push Palestinians to leave “by their own will,” there was a strong awareness among the villagers that they need to struggle to remain, otherwise their lands will be permanently lost to the occupiers. As one farmer put it: “We are the landowners here, but if we abandon the land, it becomes state land,” thus referring to Israel’s reinterpretation of an old Ottoman-era law code that connects land ownership to cultivation, hence allowing a legal pretext for the state to confiscate uncultivated Palestinian lands in the occupied territories (under the military law). Such is the case despite the fact it might be the state that disabled the cultivation in the first place by preventing farmers’ access to their fields, for instance (for more, see Joronen, 2017a). It is such “durability of staying,” and of taking whatever the occupation might bring, that I show next to crack open the power of slow wounding, not only to counter-temporalisations of slowness, but to what conditions the ability to wound in the first place.

3 | FROM WOUNDING TO WOUNDEDNESS: DURABLE AGENCIES AND LIMITS OF POWER

The discussion in the previous section has shown how slow wounding operates through various ways closely related to different spatialities of governing: the small-scale re-borderings done with trees, outposts, and fences; imitating landscapes and tacit spatial claims; arbitrary accessibilities and restrictions on mobility; bodily claims of jogging settlers; uncertain spaces of water use, cultivation, and future livelihood; intimidating spatial marks of violence; and so on. All these forms further exemplify the spatial embeddedness of various modalities of slowness – the slow encroachments done under the guise of everyday; the slowness that incapacitates life; slowly accumulating insecurities; and the looming futurelessness. In this section I want to turn back to consider the original connection between slowness, woundedness, and power; that is, the capacity of slowness to wound. Slowness, I show, is not just a time turned into a tool of power – a weaponised abuse of time that produces slow wounding. Slowness rather remains effective and capable of wounding only in so far as we remain fundamentally vulnerable beings – beings prone to different mobilisations of power. It is such exposure – the ontological woundedness – that slow wounding, on the one hand, mobilises to wound us, but that, on the other hand, always sets a limit to its power, thus turning it into what remains inherently a wounded claim to power. It is by acknowledging this double binding of wounding to woundedness that, I argue, we can properly set the question of slow wounding.

Perhaps the most pivotal paradox in understanding woundedness as something conditioning the power of slow wounding is the form of enabling at play. Woundedness, though something that defines and conditions life and aims to govern it, never merely “enables” slow wounding; it rather enables by disabling. Woundedness names the possibility to inoperationalise and take away, not only our aims to remain ungovernable, but also the very efforts to govern life. It cannot give an ontological ground for life, or aims to governing it, but rather does the opposite: it exposes them to what I call the “wound of living.” Such

a wound, as Derrida aptly reminds, is a wound that “does not heal”: it is a wound that cannot be “sutured” but only replied to (Derrida & Grossman, 2019; see also Derrida, 2002; Harrison, 2008; Joronen & Rose, 2020). Woundedness, in this regard, names the inherent fragility of living, a fundamental limit installed by the fact that life is intrinsically finite, vulnerable, and open in nature. It is in this regard that woundedness also precedes power: by un-powering and incapacitating it. Woundedness is not an ontological condition of possibility, but a limit condition, which elemental function is to incapacitate and unpower relations of power, forms of life, and eventually life itself.

How then can such un-powering “limit condition,” which undoes and disables all aims to ground life, enable the governing that slowly wounds? How does something that disables enable? As several authors, Heidegger in particular, have hinted, limit conditions are never solely negative ones, something capable of only showing the inherent incapacity to grasp or secure life with pervasive manners. Experience of one's own fundamental limitedness – in Heidegger's case, the mortality of *Dasein* – can, for instance, release new potentialities through the momentary openness it discloses for life through the possibility of its own absence (see Heidegger, 1996; Joronen, 2013; Ziarek, 2013). In the same way woundedness can enable through its way of disabling. It enables governing by unfolding our inherent vulnerability to power, while also making power a wounded power, something that functions are always cracked and open to undoing. But unlike Heidegger's momentary experience of limits, woundedness abides. It exposes us, not to eye-opening mortal moments (*Augenblick*), but to the inherent vulnerability of living, which we become part of, not through our death, but through our facticity of being born – our “natality,” as Hannah Arendt (1958) aptly puts it. In doing so, woundedness names the very exposure of life to a condition that, on the one hand, constantly aims to undo, disable, limit, and take away its prevalent forms, and on the other hand, all acts of wounding utterly lean on.

This un-abling relation of possibility between power and woundedness opens up several traits that I argue are pivotal for scrutinising the nature of slow wounding. First, political power should not be considered as an origin of woundedness, as something capable of defining whether or not woundedness abides (see Butler, 2015; Joronen & Rose, 2020; Rose, 2007, 2014). Power to wound is rather an epiphenomenal condition, something defined by, and so dependent on, the existential woundedness of living. Power might contain capacities to wound, as the examples in previous section show, and yet such capacities could never remain effective without the proneness of those it targets – that is, without the exposure of those whom the Israelis' uses of power aim to wound. It is in this regard that the woundedness of living can become transformed into a quasi-event of slow wounding – that is, through a power that uses our exposure to wound us with ways that are unspectacular nature. Colonial politics might thus enforce conditions and events that wound slowly, but their very capacity to affect, the powerfulness of their power, remains always epiphenomenal to the intrinsic woundedness of living. “Slow wounding,” in other words, wounds by mobilising the woundedness of living, by turning it into a duration that gradually wounds.

Second, as several authors have argued, vulnerability is not merely something that exposes us to wounding powers; it also makes life dependent on the care, support, protection, help, healing, and solidarity of others (see Baraitser, 2017; Butler, 2015; Cavanero, 2011). Our woundedness hence means we are always exposed to various means of harming and caring, wounding and protecting. To be sure, domination can work as much by caring as it does by wounding, or by doing both at the same time, as Foucault's discussion of biopolitical racism exemplifies (namely, that biopolitical care and protection of life can turn into immunisation that excludes elements that are seen as impure and/or hostile for the protected life; Foucault, 2003; see also Esposito, 2008). What these ambiguities of exposure thus highlight is the manifoldness in responding to woundedness: the way that those encountering wounding can mitigate, counter, cancel, inoperationalise, transform, or simply remain indifferent to different aims to wound. Perhaps more importantly, I argue, these ambiguities show how power is not merely capable of wounding life through its vulnerability to power but a wounded and limited power – a power fundamentally unable to completely subsume Palestinian life under its logics of domination (see also Joronen & Rose, 2020). It is such incapacity and vulnerability of power that helps in understanding why slowness and its mundane quasi-events are not only embodied to processes of submissive wounding, but also capable of engendering what I call “durable agencies.”

The notion of “durable agency” sheds further light on the twofold sense of duration referred to at the end of the previous section – namely, that Palestinians of Beit Sakariya often felt they were left with nothing but the power “to stay.” As one of the farmers put it succinctly, “I just try to remain here, there is not much else I can do.” Such aspiration is often connected to Palestinian political discourse on steadfastness (*sumud*), of staying in the occupied lands to prevent mass expulsion similar to 1948, while naturally for some staying might be the only conceivable option or form of agency left to lean on (see Aruri, 2013; Leshem, 2015; Yiftachel, 2002). Most notably, however, such aspiration “to stay” exemplifies how the woundedness of (colonial) power can be mobilised to counter-temporalise slowness. The crux here is the mode of countering at play. Slow wounding is not merely a duration of violent temporality, where governing powers block the eternal becoming of things, and hence something that can be countered only by doing the opposite, by releasing and speeding up the latent forces of becoming (see Baraitser, 2017; on temporality and resistance, see Jamal, 2016). Slowness can rather operate as a form of temporality that can be used to counter-temporalise the very means that situated the action in the first place.

In Beit Sakariya, and the broader Gush Etzion area surrounding it, such counter-mobilisation of slowness was evident in the way farmers continued to exist in their lands by encountering fractures of occupation with ways that were often small in scale. This meant various everyday ways of detecting the wounds and cracks of colonial power, but also ways of adapting legal means to freeze and slow down implementation of Israeli demolition, displacement, and annexation orders. In the hilltop right next to Beit Sakariya, for instance, an isolated farm (officially part of the village of Nahhalin) had struggled for three decades in Israeli courts to freeze demolition orders and to prevent the ICA (Israeli Civil Administration) from confiscating their lands under the pretext of a break in the cultivation cycle (more on such legal logic, see Bhandar, 2018; Kedar et al., 2018). During these processes, under which permits for construction were completely frozen, the family used several alternative farming cooperation and energy-production methods to keep the place running without electricity, road connection, or tap water (for more on these, see Joronen, 2017a; Meneley, 2020). Although slow legal and inefficient bureaucratic processes also engender violence by keeping Palestinians waiting under highly vulnerable living conditions (e.g., Berda, 2017; Joronen, 2017b), the example shows how these processes can be used to slow down immediate threats of demolition and expulsion,³ and also how vulnerabilities installed by these slow processes can be mitigated, evaded, and undone through collaborative practices of “staying.” To give another example: as Israeli-issued building permits are rarely granted for construction in Israeli-controlled Area C, Palestinians around the strangulated communities, such as the ones in Gush Etzion, have started to extend and repair their existing premises slowly and unnoticeably, which is altogether a highly vulnerable effort often destined to fail (see Joronen & Griffiths, 2019). Such is not to suggest there prevails a symmetric relationship between the forms of slow wounding and their countering, but rather to highlight those practices and spatialities, where slowness is mobilised to creatively mine the cracks of governing. In this regard the examples further underline the ontological woundedness of power – that is, power's incapacity to ever fully govern life through the orders it aims to incorporate.

It is through these elaborations of woundedness that we can return to think the power of slow wounding. Capacity to wound is not simply a trait of power; ways of wounding rather mobilise woundedness as their asset, while simultaneously becoming cracked by it. Woundedness is what conditions wounding, not merely by enabling and empowering it, but by setting a limit for it by making forms of wounding unable to get rid of what fundamentally disables them – namely, their own woundedness. As a specific form of wounding, slow wounding is a modality of temporalising woundedness with ways that are mundane and unspectacular in nature. It means not only enforced acts, conditions, and regulations that slowly wound, but also wounding omissions, impunities, and various ways of maintaining insecure and vulnerable conditions. Here mundane events and ordinary spaces become conditions through which slow wounding operates, but also where it ultimately hides itself. Slow wounding operates as a camouflaged and unspectacular quasi-event, which simply wounds through its mundane abiding – by engendering slow temporalities that draw their power from woundedness, often simply by letting it prevail or by doing nothing to conditions that perpetuate the wound (e.g., Davies et al., 2017; Rose, 2014). And yet, such abiding is always limited in nature. As a limit condition, woundedness unpowers and incapacitates wounding, but precisely as such it opens up a realm for mobilising woundedness through the counter-acts that, not only wound, but also work to heal, support, and care.

4 | CONCLUSIONS

Slow wounding, I have shown, operates through the mundane events and spatialities – by being able to wound those set under its slow temporalities. While existing works have been keen to look at the relationship between power and slowness in terms of “slow violence” (Nixon, 2011), “visceral violence” (de Leeuw, 2016), “waiting” (Joronen, 2017b), “effective inefficiency” (Berda, 2017), “stuckedness” (Hage, 2009), “checkpoint time” (Tawil-Souri, 2017), “occupation time” (Meneley, 2008), or as a “weaponisation of time” to dominate Palestinians' daily rhythms of life (Peteet, 2017), they have been less keen on showing how the power of slowness is not only a “power to wound” but a “wounded power” – a limited power mobilising the woundedness of those for whom the prolonged time turns wounding. In this paper, I have approached slow wounding, first by teasing out its spatial forms in Beit Sakariya and second by asking how slow wounding was simultaneously conditioned by woundedness. With regard to the latter point, I have argued that woundedness is not merely what conditions slow wounding by making it possible, but also a limit condition that makes forms of wounding utterly incapable of overcoming what constantly shakes, cracks, and unpowers them – their own woundedness. The ontological discussion of woundedness thus gives a more thorough insight into what makes slow wounding possible in the first place, while further unfolding how such wounding can function through ways that are unspectacular, mundane, gradual, and unnoticeable in nature. Moreover, it offers a further view to ways of counter-mobilising slowness, particularly on how such mobilisations are not mere traits of heroic action but wounded claims playing with the intrinsic inability of power to ever reduce Palestinian life under its prevalent functions. To

assume life could become entirely protected and secured, or governed without a residue, is ultimately, as Isabel Lorey puts it, a “fantasy of omnipotence” (2015, p. 20) – a “love affair to power” (Taylor, 1991, p. 67; see also Harrison, 2008; Hannah, 2019; Joronen & Rose, 2020; Rose, 2014). Woundedness might mean life is constantly exposed and in need of protection, care, and support, but at the same time no support can ever have the power to choose whether or not life remains vulnerable and open to wounding. The exposure, and so the need to respond to what no power can ever get rid of, simply persist. Such recognition of the close relationship between power and woundedness might further help in rethinking some of the recent notions on power, particularly the way of framing power as fixated on “capacity,” “force,” and “affective abilities,” just like the notion of durable agencies might put in question the ways of understanding the agency and force of becoming as the sources of world-making (e.g., McCormack, 2007; Ruddick, 2012). Ultimately, power is not affective or defined by its capacities, but a wounded power, something that can only ever have its power under the prevalence of woundedness. It is by acknowledging this reliance of power on woundedness that we can properly understand slowness as something that, although capable of wounding through time, remains always incapable of exhausting life under its prevalent orders, and so open to creative mining of the cracks it contains.

With regard to the first point, the paper has shown how the modes of slow wounding – slowly encroaching colonisations, slowly accumulating insecurities, slowly approaching realities of futurelessness, and the slowdown that incapacitates life – can be related to different ways of making space. Tree planting and terrace construction slowly colonise by mimicking and becoming disguised in landscapes, while sabotage and outposts (accompanied with fencing and destruction of trees) contain more belligerent ways of spatial erasure and colonisation that also mark and slowly engender insecure spaces. Jogging and other leisure activities on Palestinian-owned lands and roads, in turn, carry the bodily presence of settlers as markers of colonisation via less visible bordering. Detours and other restrictions to mobility slow down Palestinian life, while arbitrary regulations, harsh restrictions, and impunity create uncertain spaces that slowly erode the prospects of everyday life. Certainly, slow wounding also operates through numerous other forms not discussed herein, for instance when treatable diseases cause prolonged and unnecessary suffering, or become fatal due to the hampered accessibility to medical treatment caused by detours, checkpoints, slow processing of entry permits, and complete lack of access to treatment (see Hammami, 2015). In fact, the spatially delicate approach to wounding is precisely what helps to show, not only how in the context of settler colonialism everyday life becomes constantly structured through spatially differentiated “colonial ab-normalities” (Fanon, 1986, pp. 111–118), but also how colonial violence works by turning the mundane itself into a form that slowly wounds through (quasi-)events, where nothing spectacular seems to happen. And yet, the power to wound cannot ever be more than a wounded power – a power which wounds can be always used to counter and counter-mobilise slowness. Such counter-temporalisation, I have exemplified, can be founded on “durable agencies,” which find new ways of staying and slowing down the violence of occupation by mining the cracks of colonial power. Such agencies are thus not so much based on a power to resist (Rosol, 2014), whether this is understood as a capacity to act on (Griffiths, 2017), react to (Gordon, 2008), laugh at (Bhungalia, 2020), slowly observe (Davies, 2018), or remain resilient against the coercive forms of power (Bracke, 2016), but rather on a temporalisation of more constitutive woundedness of/to power. Slow wounding, to conclude, functions by mobilising time through space and space through time, thus allowing a way to look at spatial distribution and politics of woundedness through the encounter with a wound that never heals: the wound of being a living being.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the residents of Beit Sakariya and other communities for making this research possible, two research assistants (who wish to remain anonymous) for provided help in the field and all the organisations that generously offered additional materials. I would also like to thank members of the Space and Political Agency Research Group and Mark Griffiths, who (in 2019) gave feedback on the early draft of the paper.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

This paper uses several data sources: materials provided by partner organisations, key documents, and newspaper sources, and participatory and interview materials collected from the field, including personal fieldnotes and diaries of the researcher. Materials in the first two categories are available in several archival sources. These sources are indicated in the in-text citations, and their accessibility opened up in the list of references. Materials in the third category are available in the author's personal archives and are not made publicly available due to ethical issues related to the anonymity of the informants. This is particularly important given the focus on a small community and the highly precarious situation of its inhabitants.

ORCID

Mikko Joronen  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4051-2348>

ENDNOTES

- ¹ The materials used herein are part of a broader project of studying vulnerable Palestinian communities strangled by settlements in the south and west of Bethlehem. They were gathered through interviews (walking interviews, expert interviews, non-structured interviews), participatory research, and more informal encounters following the lines of ethnographic study, and were carried out during four periods of fieldwork, 2–6 weeks long, in 2017 and two periods in 2019. The decision to narrate the paper through the events in one particular site reflects the overall understanding of the processes on the ground, particularly as the site under focus here contains several key aspects of slow wounding. Materials related specifically to Beit Sakariya were collected either at the site with a local research assistant who wished to remain anonymous (interviews of farmers and villagers), or through expert interviews, fieldwork diary notes, and archival materials collected by partner organisations and other relevant organisations operating in the area.
- ² Israel differentiates between authorised settlements and unauthorised outposts, though both are considered illegal under the fourth Geneva Convention.
- ³ As an example of the continuity of this matter, in 2018 Israel passed a law that aims to speed up legal processes related to Palestinian claims against outposts and land grabbing by moving jurisdiction over petitions filed by West Bank Palestinians from the Israeli High Court of Justice to the (Jerusalem) District Court. As the then Justice Minister of Israel, Ayelet Shaked, said, “the High Court petition party of Palestinians and extreme left organisation against the settlements in Judea and Samaria [West Bank] is over” (Haaretz, 2018, n.p.).

REFERENCES

- Alkhalili, N. (2017) Enclosures from below: The Mushaa’ in contemporary Palestine. *Antipode*, 49(5), 1103–1124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12322>
- Allegra, M., Handel, A. & Maggor, E. (2017) *Normalizing Occupation. The politics of everyday life in the West Bank settlements*. Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.
- Arendt, H. (1958) *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- ARIJ. (2004) 9.3.2004: *Land Grab continues in Bethlehem District*. <http://poica.org/2004/03/land-grab-continues-in-bethlehem-district/>. [Accessed 10th October 2020].
- ARIJ. (2011) 6.7.2011: *Kherbit Beit Zakariya clobbered by the Israeli occupation Demolishing residential house and water wells*. Bethlehem, Palestine: Applied Research Institute in Jerusalem. Available from: <http://poica.org/2011/07/kherbit-beit-zakariya-clobbered-by-the-israeli-occupation-demolishing-residential-house-and-water-wells/>. [Accessed 10th October 2020].
- Aruri, N. (2013) Ramallah: From *sumud* [resilience] to corporate identity. *Planum. The journal of Urbanism*, 26(1), 1–13.
- Azoulay, A. & Ophir, A. (2005) The monster’s tail. In: Sorkin, M. (Ed.) *Against the wall: Israel’s barrier to peace*. New York, NY: The New Press, pp. 2–27.
- Badil (2019) *Israeli annexation. The case of Etzion colonial bloc*. Bethlehem, Palestine: BADIL Resource Centre for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights.
- Baraitser, L. (2017) *Enduring time*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- Bayat, A. (2010) *Life as politics. How ordinary people change the Middle East*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Berda, Y. (2017) *Living emergency: Israel’s permit regime in the occupied territories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bhandar, B. (2018) *Colonial lives of property. Law, land, and racial regimes of ownership*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bhungalia, L. (2020) Laughing at power: Humor, transgression, and the politics of refusal in Palestine. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 38, 387–404. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2399654419874368>
- Bracke, S. (2016) Bouncing Back: Vulnerability and Resistance in the times Resilience. In: Butler, J., Gambetti, Z. & Sabsay, L. (Eds.) *Vulnerability in resistance*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Braverman, I. (2021) Nof kdumim: Remaking the ancient landscape in East Jerusalem’s national parks. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 4(1), 109–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2514848619889594>
- Butler, J. (2015) *Notes towards the performative theory of assemblage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cavanero, A.C. (2011) *Horrorism. Naming contemporary violence*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Christian, J. & Dowler, L. (2019) Slow and fast violence. A feminist critique of binaries. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies*, 18, 1066–1075.
- Cohen, Y. & Gordon, N. (2018) Israel’s biospatial politics: Territory, demography, and effective control. *Public Culture*, 30, 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-4310888>
- de Leeuw, S. (2016) Tender grounds: intimate visceral violence and British Columbia’s colonial geographies. *Political Geography*, 52, 14–23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2015.11.010>
- Davies, T. (2018) Toxic space and time: Slow violence, necropolitics, and petrochemical pollution. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 108, 1537–1553. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24694452.2018.1470924>
- Davies, T., Isakjee, A. & Dhesi, S. (2017) Violent inaction: The necropolitical experience of refugees in Europe. *Antipode*, 49(5), 1263–1284.
- Derrida, J. (2002) Force of law: The “mystical foundation of authority”. In: Anidjar, G. (Ed.) *Acts of religion*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 228–298.
- Derrida, J. & Grossman, É. (2019) The truth that hurts, or the corps à corps of tongues: An interview with Jacques Derrida (translated by Mercier TC). *Parallax*, 25, 8–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13534645.2019.1570603>
- Esposito, R. (2008) *Bios. Biopolitics and philosophy*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Falah, G.-W. (2003) Dynamics and patterns of the shrinking of Arab lands in Palestine. *Political Geography*, 22, 179–209.

- Falah, G.-W. (2005) Peace, deception and justification for territorial claims: The case of Israel. In: Flint, D. (Ed.) *The geographies of war and peace. From death camps to diplomats*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 297–320.
- Fanon, F. (1963) *The wretched of the earth*. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books.
- Fanon, F. (1986) *Black skin, white masks*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Foucault, M. (2003) *Society must be Defended. Lectures at the Collège de France 1975–1976*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Gazit, N. (2015) State-sponsored vigilantism: Jewish settlers' violence in the occupied Palestinian territories. *Sociology*, 49, 438–454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038514526648>
- Ghanem, A. (2020) The deal of the century in context – Trump's plan is part of a long-standing settler-colonial enterprise in Palestine. *The Arab World Geographer*, 23, 45–59.
- Gordon, N. (2008) *Israel's occupation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Griffiths, M. (2017) Hope in Hebron: The political affects of activism in a strangled city. *Antipode*, 49, 617–635. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12301>
- Haaretz (2018). *Israel Passes New Law Limiting Palestinians' Access to Court*. Haaretz, Available from: <https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-knesset-advances-bill-barring-palestinians-from-petitioning-high-court-1.6271237>. [Accessed 17th July 2018].
- Hage, G. (2009) Waiting out the crisis: On stuckedness and governmentality. In: Hage, G. (Ed.) *Waiting*. Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne University Press, pp. 97–106.
- Hammami, R. (2006) On the importance of thugs. In: Misselwitz, P., Rieniets, T., Efrat, Z., Khamaisi, R. & Nasrallah, R. (Eds.) *City of collision*. Basel, Belgium: Birkhäuser, pp. 256–280. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-7643-7868-9_20
- Hammami, R. (2015) On (not) suffering at the checkpoint: Palestinian narrative strategies of surviving Israel's Carceral geography. *Borderlands*, 14, 1–17.
- Hammami, R. (2016) Precarious politics: The activism of “bodies that count” (aligning with those that don't) in Palestine's colonial frontier. In: Butler, J., Gambetti, Z. & Sabsay, L. (Eds.) *Vulnerability in resistance*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 167–190.
- Hannah, M.G. (2019) *Direction and socio-spatial theory: a political economy of oriented Practicex*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Harker, C. (2009) Spacing Palestine through the home. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 34(3), 320–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2009.00352.x>
- Harrison, P. (2008) Corporeal remains: Vulnerability, proximity, and living on after the end of the world. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 40, 423–445. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a391>
- Heidegger, M. (1996) *Being and time*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Hughes, S. (2017) With a wink and a nod: Settlement growth through construction as commemoration in the occupied West Bank. *Geopolitics*, 22, 360–382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2016.1216981>
- ICBS. (1996) 2.5. *Sources of Population Growth, by district, area and population growth 1995*. Statistical Abstract of Israel 1996. Israeli Bureau of Statistics. Available from: https://old.cbs.gov.il/reader/shnatonenew_site.htm. [Accessed 7th November 2019].
- ICBS. (2018) 2.13. *Sources of Population Growth, by district, population group and religion 2017*. Statistical Abstract of Israel 2018. Israeli Bureau of Statistics. Available from: https://old.cbs.gov.il/reader/shnatonenew_site.htm. [Accessed 7th November 2019].
- Jamal, A. (2016) Conflict theory, temporality, and transformative temporariness: Lessons from Israel and Palestine. *Constellations*, 23, 365–377. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8675.12210>
- Joronen, M. (2013) Heidegger, event and the ontological politics of the site. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 38(4), 627–638. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2012.00550.x>
- Joronen, M. (2017a) 'Refusing to be a victim, refusing to be an enemy'. Form-of-life as resistance in the Palestinian struggle against settler colonialism. *Political Geography*, 56, 91–100. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2016.07.005>
- Joronen, M. (2017b) Spaces of waiting: Politics of precarious recognition in the occupied West Bank. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 35, 994–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263775817708789>
- Joronen, M. (2019) Negotiating colonial violence: Spaces of precariousness in Palestine. *Antipode*, 51, 838–857. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12518>
- Joronen, M. & Griffiths, M. (2019) The affective politics of precarity: Home demolitions in the occupied West Bank. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 37(3), 561–576.
- Joronen, M. & Rose, M. (2020) Vulnerability and its politics: Precarity and the woundedness of power. *Progress in Human Geography*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132520973444>
- Kedar, A., Amara, A. & Yiftachel, O. (2018) *Emptied lands. A legal geography of Bedouin rights in the Negev*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Koopman, S. (2011) Alter-geopolitics: Other securities are happening. *Geoforum*, 42, 274–284. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.01.007>
- Kotef, H. (2015) *Movement and the ordering of freedom. On liberal governance of mobility*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Leshem, N. (2015) “Over our dead bodies”: Placing necropolitical activism. *Political Geography*, 45, 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2011.01.007>
- Long, J. (2009) Rooting diaspora, reviving nation: Zionist landscapes of Israel-Palestine. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 34, 61–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2008.00327.x>
- Lorey, I. (2015) *State of Insecurity: Government of the precarious*. London, UK: Verso.
- Ma'an (2015) *Donkeys the only means of transportation for Palestinian farmers*. Ma'an News, June 7, 2015.
- McCormack, D. (2007) Molecular affects in human geographies. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 39, 359–377. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a3889>
- Medien, K. & Puar, J.K. (2018) Thinking life, death, and solidarity through colonized Palestine. An interview with Jasbir K. Puar. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 14(1), 94–103. <https://doi.org/10.1215/15525864-4297141>

- MEMO. (2018) Report: Number of Israel settlers quadrupled since Oslo Accords. *Middle East Monitor*. Available from: <https://www.middleeastmonitor.com/20180914-report-number-of-israel-settlers-quadrupled-since-oslo-accords/>. [Accessed 14 Sep 2018].
- Meneley, A. (2008) Time in a bottle: The uneasy circulation of Palestinian olive oil. *Middle East Report*, 248, 18–23. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25164860>
- Meneley, A. (2020) Hope in the ruins: Seeds, plants, and possibilities of regeneration. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space*, 4(1), 158–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2514848620917516>
- Nixon, R. (2011) *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. London, UK: Harvard University Press.
- Pain, R. (2019) Chronic urban trauma: The slow violence of housing dispossession. *Urban Studies*, 56, 385–400. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098018795796>
- Peteet, J. (2017) *Space and mobility in Palestine*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Povinelli, E. (2011) *Economies of abandonment*. Durham, NC & London, UK: Duke University Press.
- Pullan, W. (2013) Conflict's tools. Borders, boundaries and mobility in Jerusalem's spatial structures. *Mobilities*, 8, 125–147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2012.750040>
- Ra'ad, B. L. (2010) *Hidden histories. Palestine and the Eastern mediterranean*. New York, NY: Pluto Press.
- Rose, M. (2007) The problem of power and the politics of landscape: Stopping the Greater Cairo ring road. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32(4), 460–476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2007.00268.x>
- Rose, M. (2014) Negative governance: Vulnerability, biopolitics and the origins of government. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 39, 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12028>
- Rosol, M. (2014) On resistance in the post-political city: Conduct and counter-conduct in Vancouver. *Space and Polity*, 18, 70–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562576.2013.879785>
- Ruddick, S. (2012) Power and the problem of composition. *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 2, 207–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2043820612449300>
- Said, E. (1980) *The question of Palestine*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Said, E. (2000) Invention, memory, and place. *Critical Inquiry*, 26, 175–192. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448963>
- Shalhoub-Kevorkian, N. (2009) *Militarization and violence against women in conflict zones in the Middle East. A Palestinian case-study*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Spivak, G.C. (1999) *A critique of postcolonial reason: Toward a history of the vanishing present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stoler, L.A. (2016) *Duress. Imperial durabilities in our times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Tawil-Souri, H. (2017) Checkpoint time. *Qui Parle*, 26(2), 383–422. <https://doi.org/10.1215/10418385-4208442>
- Taylor, C. (1991) *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Veracini, L. (2006) *Israel and settler colonial society*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Wilson, H. (2017) On geography and encounter: Bodies, borders, and difference. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41, 451–471. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132516645958>
- Wolfe, P. (2006) Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8, 387–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240>
- Women in Green (2019) *About us*. Available from: <https://womeningreen.org/about-us/>. [Accessed 11th May 2020].
- Yiftachel, O. (2002) Territory as the kernel of the nation: Space, time and nationalism in Israel/Palestine. *Geopolitics*, 7, 215–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714000930>
- Ziarek, K. (2013) A vulnerable world: Heidegger on humans and finitude. *SubStance*, 42, 169–184. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sub.2013.0033>
- Zureik, E. (2016) *Israel's colonial project in Palestine: Brutal pursuit*. New York, NY: Routledge.

How to cite this article: Joronen, M. (2021) Unspectacular spaces of slow wounding in Palestine. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 00, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/tran.12473>