

Palestine Informative Exhibit

This informative exhibit moves through six periods of Palestine's art and history. On one side, you find history drawn from Rashid Khalidi's *The Hundred Years' War on Palestine*, Norman Finkelstein's *Gaza* and Enzo Traverso's *Gaza Faces History*. On the other, you find art.

The six periods follow Khalidi's mapping of six declarations of war on Palestine with one adjustment: we display the fourth and fifth declarations together as a single period marking the years of the first Intifada. In the sixth period we continue into *Gaza*. Gaza receives its own chapter as the most extreme expression of Palestine's history, a concentrated and ongoing assault that has exceeded the accumulated weight of everything that came before it.

The pairings of different forms of artistic expression to each period is not random. Each form of expression was chosen because it is what that period called for.

Photographs answer a colonial claim of a barren land. Clothing answer displacement with what the body carries. Paintings and literature answer exile with the flourishing of a diaspora culture that refused to forget. Symbols and posters resemble the broad popular mobilisation. Graffiti answers a wall with a wall. Expressions of solidarity from around the world answer Gaza with the only thing left: the refusal to be silent. The exhibit ends with music and an invitation: to add your own piece, a contribution to the living record of international solidarity.

Thank you for being a witness to Palestine - its history and its today. As we carry this moment with us, unable to unknow what we know, we find ourselves on the same side of history, living the Global Intifada.

Pre-Israel, 1917-1939

“A people without a country; even as their own land, which had been given unto them by the promise and the gift of God, is in a great measure **a country without a people.”**
— Alexander Keith, *The Land of Israel*, 1843

Zionist leaders systematically promoted the idea that Palestinians did not exist. More than denial; it was a political strategy: by erasing the people, their objections could be ignored, and the morally appealing narrative of “a land without a people for a people without a land” could be sustained.

But Palestine at the time was far from empty. It was a land undergoing significant social and economic transformation. Cities and villages were modernizing; railways, telegraphs, and electricity were becoming more common. Agriculture thrived with exports like wheat and oranges, while education expanded through a growing school system and a flourishing press. Palestinian identity was taking shape, rooted in emerging ideas of nationhood, social justice, and women's participation in public life.

Jewish communities living in Palestine before the rise of Zionist colonization were deeply integrated into local society. Most were non-Zionist Mizrahi or Sephardic Jews who shared language, culture, and urban life with their Muslim and Christian neighbors.

The Balfour Declaration of 1917, a pivotal document cementing British support for Zionism, was driven by a mix of geopolitical calculation, biblical romanticism, and antisemitic hopes of reducing Jewish immigration to Britain.

British colonial rule in Palestine followed familiar imperial patterns: political exclusion, censorship, and limited investment in native welfare. What made Palestine distinct, however, was that it was not merely ruled but turned into a site of settler colonization. Mass immigration was not framed as ordinary migration but as a state-building project, one that required the displacement of the Palestinian population and the uprooting of entire villages.

In response, Palestinians began mobilizing politically in the 1920s. They convened nationwide congresses, formed grassroots coalitions, organized prolonged general strikes, and took to the street in widespread demonstrations. These actions reflected a coordinated, national attempt to resist colonial rule and assert Palestinian sovereignty. But as their demands were ignored and Zionist expansion escalated, frustration grew. In 1937, armed revolt broke out.

The British responded with overwhelming force, deploying one soldier for every four adult Palestinian men. Over two years, their campaign left 10% of the adult male population killed, wounded, imprisoned, or exiled. Repression included mass executions, tying prisoners to armored vehicles, demolishing the homes of suspected rebels and their families, and detaining thousands without trial. Many were exiled or confined to camps the British themselves called concentration camps, such as the one in Sarafand.

Palestinians found themselves in a triple bind, with no institution to appeal to and no authority to hold accountable. While Britain and the Zionist movement legitimized their actions through the League of Nations Mandate, the League of Nations treated Palestine as an exception and deflected responsibility, placing the burden on Britain and the Zionist movement as the local actors.

By the mid-1940s, as World War II ended, Britain's hold on Palestine began to collapse. In an effort to quell Palestinian resistance, it had restricted Jewish immigration, provoking armed Zionist militancy. Underground groups within the Yishuv attacked British officials and military targets, one instance of which was the 1946 bombing of the King David Hotel. Combined with mounting economic strain and the broader unraveling of the empire, Britain could no longer maintain control. In 1947, it handed its Palestine project over to the United Nations.

Nakba, 1947-1948

“In the course of the past twenty years, the Jewish people have awakened and transformed their ancient homeland; from 50,000 at the end of the last war, their numbers have increased to more than 500,000. **They have made the waste places to bear fruit and the desert to blossom.** Their pioneering achievements in agriculture and in industry, embodying new patterns of cooperative endeavor, **have written a notable page in the history of colonization.**”

— *The Zionist Executive, Biltmore Program 1942*

As the horrors of the Holocaust unfolded, Zionist leaders intensified their efforts to build political support, especially in the United States. With the British Empire in decline, they shifted their focus to U.S. politicians and public opinion. Hajj Amin al-Husayni, the most prominent Palestinian figure at the time, damaged his international and regional credibility through his wartime alliance with Nazi Germany. This alignment alienated Western powers and weakened Palestinian diplomacy, while also drawing criticism from younger Arab and Palestinian political circles seeking more modern and collective forms of leadership. His leadership style, rooted in an hierarchical tradition, could not match the organized, institutional momentum of the Zionist movement.

The United Nations proposed a formal resolution in 1947: UN General Assembly Resolution 181. The resolution called for the partition of Palestine into two states, allocating over half of the Palestinian land to the European Jewish population, most of whom had immigrated within the preceding three to four decades, and constituted 31% of the population. Jerusalem was to be placed under international administration. While Zionist leaders accepted the plan, Palestinians rejected it as a fundamentally unjust division of their homeland to European occupiers.

Zionist paramilitary groups had already begun preparations. On April 1, 1948, they launched Plan Dalet, a coordinated military campaign targeting major Palestinian cities like Yafa, Haifa, and Jerusalem. Though designated for the Arab state under the UN plan, Yafa - now Tel Aviv - was besieged and overrun in May, forcing most residents to flee. No international actors intervened.

Over the course of a few months, Palestinian society was shattered in two major waves of expulsion. Before May 15, Palestinians from urban centers were forced to flee amid escalating attacks, bombings, and neighborhood sieges. After Israel's declaration of statehood, Palestinians from rural villages were expelled through a coordinated campaign of military assaults, massacres, and psychological terror. Hundreds of villages were depopulated or destroyed and mass graves dug. Return was made impossible, severing centuries-old ties to land, livelihood, and place.

The scale and violence of the attacks on Palestinians spurred widespread outrage across the entire region. In response, several Arab governments mobilized military forces, aiming to halt the extermination and displacement of the Palestinians. Though there were seven Arab states involved in theory, only five had standing armies, and just four entered Palestine. Many of these countries were still recovering from decades of colonial rule, which had deliberately stunted their military capacity and political coordination. Jordan's Arab Legion was led by British officers. Others, like Lebanon, barely participated. In practice, Israel held significant military and organizational advantages transferred from the British army, while Arab states faced external interference and fragile post-independence structures among the lasting effects of colonial occupation.

Meanwhile, support for Israel in the U.S. deepened. U.S. public sympathy for Jews fleeing Europe, combined with political lobbying and Christian Zionist support, helped solidify U.S. backing. Over time, Israel came to be seen not only as a moral project but also as a strategic ally, especially as Arab oil producers like Saudi Arabia continued close relations with the U.S., choosing stability over confrontation.

For Palestinians, the Nakba became a defining trauma; a shared memory across generations. Yet it also fragmented the Palestinian people into separate, unequal experiences depending on where they ended up.

About 160,000 Palestinians remained within the new borders of Israel, living under martial law until 1966 and facing systemic discrimination. Those who were internally displaced to the West Bank and Gaza lived under Jordanian and Egyptian rule, respectively, governed by separate laws and divided from each other. The majority became refugees, scattered across camps in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and beyond.

Conditions varied sharply by country. In Lebanon, Palestinians were denied citizenship and faced legal and economic restrictions, although UNRWA services enabled many to become highly educated. In Syria, refugees could access public services and integrate socially but were denied citizenship and voting rights. In the Gulf, many Palestinians played key roles in public sectors and education systems, but their residency remained precarious, tied to employment and vulnerable to political shifts.

The Nakba did not end in 1948. It has only expanded and still continues to this day.

Naksa, 1967

“I appeal to you to enable our people to establish national independent sovereignty over its own land. Today I have come bearing an olive branch and a freedom-fighter's gun. **Do not let the olive branch fall from my hand.** I repeat: do not let the olive branch fall from my hand. **War flares up in Palestine, and yet it is in Palestine that peace will be born.**”

— Yasser Arafat's 1974 UN General Assembly speech

After the Nakba, Palestinian refugees across the region were trapped in systems that denied them basic rights. In Lebanon, they were excluded from citizenship and most professions. In Syria, they lacked legal status. In the Gulf, their presence was tied to precarious employment. Dispossession was not a historical memory: it defined their legal, political, and economic reality.

As for regional stability, Israel diverted the waters of the Jordan River from Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan - one of the most water-scarce countries in the world - undermining agricultural viability and threatening livelihoods across the region. The move provoked widespread outrage. Egypt, already stretched thin by its military engagement in Yemen, took symbolic steps to reassert regional leadership.

In response to Egypt, Israel launched a preemptive war in June 1967. Though framed as a defensive move, Israel's military was significantly stronger than the Arab armies combined. This marked the beginning of a defining element of Israeli military doctrine: deterrence through the use of overwhelming force. By striking preemptively, Israel seeks to establish a strategic environment in which both Palestinians and neighboring states are disincentivized from responding, even or especially when their sovereignty or civilian populations are directly targeted.

Israel struck first and destroyed much of the Arab air forces while their aircraft were still grounded. Within six days, Israel had seized the Sinai Peninsula and Gaza Strip from Egypt, the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. This sweeping territorial expansion, at a human expense of 800 Israeli soldiers and not less than 15 thousand Arabs, redrew the region's map. What followed was U.S. diplomatic efforts to legitimize Israel's newly captured terrain.

Drafted under U.S. leadership and presented as a roadmap for peace, UN Resolution 242 legitimized the new status quo by tying Israeli withdrawal to the establishment of “secure and recognized boundaries.” The ambiguity of the Resolution left the extent and timeline of withdrawal open to Israeli interpretation, providing diplomatic cover and enabling continued military and settlement expansion under the guise of defense and security.

Even more revealing was what the resolution omitted. Palestinians were not mentioned at all, not as a people, a political actor, or even as refugees. Their right of return was ignored, and the conflict was reframed as a border dispute between states. This approach erased Palestinian claims and elevated Israel's narrative of absence, setting a precedent for future negotiations in which Palestinians would continue to be excluded from determining their own fate.

At the diplomatic front, the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) began secret talks with the U.S. in the 1970s. However, Israeli efforts and targeted assassinations repeatedly disrupted any moves toward Palestinian diplomatic inclusion. This period ultimately culminated in the Egypt-Israel peace treaty signed in 1979. For Egypt, the treaty secured the return of the Sinai Peninsula. For Israel, it neutralized the largest Arab military threat and solidified its hold over the territories occupied in 1967.

For the Palestinians, it marked yet another diplomatic exclusion. The PLO was left out of the process, and Palestinian demands for self-determination were ignored, further deferring the question of Palestine in the emerging regional order. This period, known as the Naksa - or more precisely, a setback and a second wave of dispossession - was marked by the near-total sidelining of Palestinians in international diplomacy.

Following Egypt's defeat and regional withdrawal, the balance of power in the Arab world shifted. Saudi Arabia emerged as the new regional heavyweight, and Palestinians became increasingly isolated diplomatically. Yet at the cultural level, an opposite transformation was underway.

While global discourse remained shaped by Zionist narratives, Palestinian writers, poets, and artists in exile gave rise to a cultural and political renaissance. Their work reasserted Palestinian identity and connected the experience of exile to broader global struggles. It was during this time that Palestinians began to reclaim what Edward Said later described as the “permission to narrate.”

The First Intifada, 1982-1995

"To us, to liberate our country, to have dignity, to have respect, **to have our mere human rights is something as essential as life itself.**"

— Ghassan Kanafani, on Palestinian liberation

As international diplomacy moved forward without them, Palestinian organizing shifted elsewhere. By the late 1970s, Beirut had become the political and cultural heart of the Palestinian national movement.

Until 1982, Beirut was a key center for Palestinian politics, journalism, and cultural life. It allowed for diverse voices – even critiques of the PLO – to coexist. This ended with Israel's invasion of Lebanon, backed by the U.S., under Cold War pretexts. After a brutal siege on Beirut, the Israeli army forced the PLO to evacuate, and despite promises of civilian protection, Israeli-backed militias entered the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps and carried out a three-day massacre, one of the most memorable massacres in the modern history of the region. The consequences were far-reaching: Hezbollah gained strength, and Israel's image was damaged worldwide.

As the PLO was expelled from Lebanon, popular resistance shifted to the West Bank and Gaza. Throughout the 1980s, Palestinians under occupation faced increasing repression: political expression was criminalized, settlements grew, and tactics like house demolitions and arbitrary arrests became routine.

In December 1987, a deadly military vehicle collision in Jabalya refugee camp sparked a spontaneous uprising: the First Intifada. It quickly developed into a widespread, organized movement led by the Unified National Leadership, rooted in local networks. Though the PLO was absent, the movement carried its goals forward.

The First Intifada relied largely on nonviolent tactics: strikes, boycotts, tax refusal, alongside strong Palestinian voices inside and outside Palestine that highlighted the realities of daily life under occupation. Women played leading roles, as many men were imprisoned.

Israel suppressed the First Intifada through systematic brutality, following Rabin's orders to "break their bones". This deterrence strategy of overwhelming and preemptive force was carried out by soldiers who were shaped by deep societal indoctrination which portrayed Palestinians as an irrational, hostile population whose resistance could only be controlled through violence. This was rooted in the belief that Arab antisemitic hostility was uncontrollable and threatened Israel's existence.

Graphic images of violence circulated globally. For nine years, one Palestinian was directly killed by Israeli forces nearly every other day, one in five of whom were children. The scale and visibility of the violence further shifted global perceptions and challenged Israel's narrative in Western media.

From exile in Tunis, the PLO struggled to remain relevant. Its leadership was weakened by internal divisions and targeted assassinations. Meanwhile, Hamas – initially supported by Israel to divide Palestinian leadership and resistance – began gaining influence.

Peace talks began on unequal terms. Palestinians were included only as part of a Jordanian delegation approved by Israel, excluding anyone linked to the PLO or from the diaspora. Core issues such as self-determination, refugee return, and expanding settlements were deferred indefinitely.

Several shifts weakened the Palestinian position further. Egypt's peace with Israel sidelined Palestine diplomatically. The fall of the USSR removed a balancing power. Arafat's support for Iraq during the 1990–91 Gulf War alienated Arab states, leading to mass expulsions of Palestinians from Gulf countries and deepening the leadership's isolation.

Despite this, negotiations moved forward. Israel refused to halt illegal settlement building and refused to return illegally seized land. In 1993, the Oslo Accords marked the first agreement between Israel and the PLO.

The implementation of the Oslo Accords deepened inequality. East Jerusalem was sealed off. The West Bank and Gaza were fragmented into zones with limited Palestinian administrative control, while most land and strategic resources remained under Israeli authority. Checkpoints, fences, and walls created isolated enclaves.

The new Palestinian Authority (PA) had limited power, lacking control over borders, natural resources, and even its own tax revenue, which Israel collected. Under Israeli and U.S. oversight, the PA's main role became internal security coordination. This shifted the cost and burden of managing the occupied population from Israel to the PA, while Israel retained its dominance.

The Second Intifada, 2000-2014

“When they arrived in Palestine, the Zionists said they were coming to a land without a people, and they continued to make this claim for decades. But look around you at these beautiful homes. This is just one of many Palestinian neighborhoods occupied by Israelis. Many of those homes were built before the Zionists came. Before the Nakba, Palestine – particularly Jerusalem – kept its doors open to people of all ethnic groups and creeds who wanted to pray or settle here. We Palestinians are proud to be part of a multi-ethnic, multi-religious society. **We are here to stay. We, the survivors of the Palestinian Nakba.**”

— Mona Hajjar Halaby *In My Mother's Footsteps: A Palestinian Refugee Returns Home*

By the 2000s, the consequences of the Oslo Accords had reshaped Palestinian life in deeply unequal and often devastating ways. Movement became a privilege, not a right: while select PLO and Palestinian Authority individuals were issued VIP passes, the vast majority of Palestinians lost any real freedom of movement. They were confined to special road systems with military checkpoints, while Israeli settlers traveled undisturbed on a separate network of modern highways.

In Gaza, isolation came in stages, turning the strip into an enclosed space under siege. Movement in and out was strictly controlled by heavily militarized border crossings, and permits were rarely granted. Goods could not flow freely, leaving a population once reliant on cheap labor in Israel and export trade slowly strangled by economic suffocation. Meanwhile, East Jerusalem, long a central hub for Palestinian life, was cut off from its surrounding West Bank hinterland. Barriers at neighborhood entrances and a restrictive permit system severed ties with the rest of Arab Palestine. Institutions that once served Palestinians across the territories, such as schools, clinics, and cultural centers, found their audiences and clientele cut off. Even those who obtained rare permits faced hours of waiting and humiliation at checkpoints. The result was economic devastation: East Jerusalem's contribution to Palestinian GDP dropped by half between 1993 and 2018, a decline the EU attributed directly to isolation and Israeli restrictions.

Amid these deteriorating conditions, the Oslo process lost legitimacy in the eyes of many Palestinians. The PLO leadership appeared increasingly out of touch, with some benefitting from privileges while remaining largely silent on the mounting hardships. In contrast, Hamas gained traction by vocalizing widespread frustrations. It openly rejected Oslo and framed the diplomatic route as a failure, positioning itself as the alternative through armed resistance. Support for Hamas was also bolstered by regional disillusionment with secular nationalist movements such as the PLO, and by indirect Israeli policies that allowed it to grow in strength to further undermine the PLO.

These internal tensions deepened as the Camp David negotiations in 2000 collapsed. The Israeli proposal in those negotiations was to cement permanent Israeli control over key areas: the Jordan Valley, which is rich in water and agricultural land, airspace, and water resources. Additionally, it would have left the West Bank fragmented into isolated blocs through annexation, rendering statehood impossible. When Arafat rejected the proposal, Israel and the U.S. claimed he had walked away from peace. The offer, in reality, was an extension of Israeli occupation.

Tensions exploded into the Second Intifada, triggered by a combination of worsening economic despair under Oslo, the growing rivalry between Hamas and the PLO, and the provocative opening of an Israeli tunnel beneath Jerusalem's Old City, threatening the architectural integrity of entire neighborhoods of Palestinian residents. Mass protests erupted, marking the start of a new phase of resistance.

Israel capitalized on the internal Palestinian divide, particularly the split between Fatah and Hamas after Hamas took control of Gaza. It launched a series of devastating assaults on the strip in 2008, 2012, and 2014. With Gaza isolated and politically fragmented from the West Bank, resistance was easier to crush. The toll was staggering: while most Israelis killed were soldiers, the overwhelming majority of Palestinian casualties were civilians. The destruction of entire neighborhoods and refugee camps underscored the asymmetry.

This approach aligned with what is known as the Dahiya Doctrine. Named after the Dahiya district in Beirut, it advocates for disproportionate force against civilian areas perceived to harbor resistance. Entire neighborhoods are treated as enemy bases, justifying their destruction. This doctrine was evident in the 2014 Gaza war, where over 13,000 Palestinians, mostly civilians, were killed or wounded, and hundreds of thousands lost their homes.

In such scenarios, international law draws a clear distinction between occupying powers and armed groups under occupation. While both must respect the laws of war, the imbalance in power is key. Palestinian groups often used unguided rockets – illegal due to their imprecision – but their scale and impact were limited. Israel, however, deployed advanced weaponry in dense civilian zones, resulting in mass casualties and destruction, while their high-precision weapons were readily available. This imbalance informs how potential war crimes are assessed.

Gaza

“Enemies might triumph over Gaza
the storming sea might triumph over an island
they might chop down all its trees
they might break its bones
they might implant tanks on the insides of its children and women.
They might throw it into the sea, sand, or blood.
But it will not repeat lies and say “Yes” to invaders.
It will continue to explode. It is neither death, nor suicide.
It is Gaza’s way of declaring that **it deserves to live.**”

— Mahmoud Darwish, from “Silence for Gaza,” (1973), translated by Sinan Antoon

After the establishment of Israel in 1948, a quarter of a million Palestinian refugees were internally displaced to the Gaza strip, which had previously housed eighty thousand Palestinians. This sudden concentration of population caused lasting damage to Gaza’s infrastructure and contributed to the conditions of confinement that have shaped the history of Gaza until the modern day. Since 1967, Gaza has been subject to Israeli occupation, which did not end but rather changed modalities over time.

The nature of this control is described as military presence in addition to a broader system of combining force, surveillance, and structural constraint. Under Israeli occupation, mechanisms of domination included the cultivation of dependency, prolonged curfews, collective punishments, and the destruction of homes and agricultural land, serving both immediate security functions and longer-term goals of control. The practice referred to as “thinning out” refugee camps, meaning bulldozing Palestinian homes and infrastructure to facilitate military access, illustrates how spatial reconfiguration became a tool of domination.

Although Israeli settlements were withdrawn from Gaza in 2005, human rights organizations and international legal bodies have continued to regard the territory as occupied. This assessment is based on Israel’s ongoing control over Gaza’s borders, airspace, and territorial waters, as well as its regulation of the population registry and its ability to re-enter the territory militarily at will. Large portions of the population face unreliable access to electricity, unsafe drinking water, food insecurity, and restricted medical care. These conditions are not described as temporary disruptions but as structural features of life in Gaza, shaping everyday existence over an extended period of time.

Across several military operations, a recurring structure emerges: Israel provokes, Hamas retaliates, and the retaliation becomes the headline. The actual trigger disappears, and collective punishment is laundered as Israel's "right to defend itself". Underlying all of this is a legal, logical, and humanitarian contradiction: an occupying power cannot invoke self-defense to sustain an illegal occupation, and Palestinians under that occupation retain the right to resist it.

Edward Said once wrote that Palestinians in Gaza were imprisoned, unable to move or work, exposed to bombardment from above and machine gun fire from below. He was writing about the Second Intifada. But the conditions he described did not end with it. Gaza, a territory of nearly two and a half million people, has been under Israeli blockade since 2007, sealed off by land, sea, and air, and bombarded periodically. What has changed since October 7, 2023, is scale: an already besieged and impoverished population now faces a campaign of destruction that international legal scholars, UN officials, and human rights organizations describe as a genocide. Not a war between armies, but a technologically superior military systematically eliminating urban centers and the civilian populations within them.

Ahmad Abu Shaban, Associate Professor and Dean at Al-Azhar University in Gaza, describes Palestinian resilience as practiced, organized, and ongoing — a refusal to be reduced to victimhood even under conditions designed to produce it. When bombardment destroyed every university in Gaza, displacing thousands of staff and interrupting the education of tens of thousands of students, the response was not to wait for reconstruction. An online program was launched mid-conflict, expecting perhaps a thousand enrollments. Over ten thousand signed up. This is one example of a broader pattern: a people who have spent generations living under occupation building institutions, maintaining continuity, and insisting on a future through the destruction.

International Solidarity

You have just walked through decades of dispossession, injustice, violence and resistance. That history, however, is not over.

We are participants in a world that is being remade daily, badly and beautifully. People are waking up to the slow erasure of conditions that make dignified life possible. Multiple thresholds of tolerable humane living have been crossed, and the impacts are tangible.

The solidarity around Palestine, in streets and in sea, in classrooms and courtrooms, in song and in disruption, is not charity. It is recognition.

We are not being idealistic when we say “none of us are free until all of us are free”. The man who benefits from patriarchy is also diminished by it. The country that profits from occupation is also corrupted by it. A green transition that robs and rapes Africa is also eating away at the sustainability of our human race. These are not separate causes loosely allied. They are the same struggle seen from different angles.

Those systems are designed to exhaust us into compliance, to make exploitation feel inevitable, and collective desire feel naive. But they depend on our active participation. We cannot go on sustaining systems built to serve capital and racial hierarchy against our own collective desire to live purposeful, humane lives.

While it's sometimes difficult to be optimistic, optimism is only a prognosis. Our part is in hoping, in not giving in to despair. Hope is made easier to access once you involve yourself in the evidence, no matter how small of a role you choose to play. What other choice do you have anyway? Do you abandon love when the prognosis is dark?

You stay in the room. You keep showing up. And here you are, subscribed to hope. This is a lifetime contract.

And if love fails you, do it in spite.

You are now invited to participate in the last chapter of Palestinian liberation. Share a poem, a story, a video or a picture, a beautiful striking memory of international solidarity. This last chapter is for us to create together.