Stuart Hall Foundation in partnership with Duke University Press supported by Esmée Fairbairn Foundation and Barry Amiel and Norman Melburn Trust:

Reading the Crisis episode one: 'The West and the Rest' with Ilan Pappé & Priyamvada Gopal

7th May 2024. Part of 'Catastrophe and Emergence' – learn more here.

Transcription assisted by https://goodtape.io

Aasiya Lodhi

Hello, everyone, and thank you for joining us. I'm Aasiya Lodhi, a trustee of the Stuart Hall Foundation and a senior lecturer at the University of Westminster. I'm so pleased to welcome you all to the inaugural event of the Stuart Hall Foundation's conversation series, Reading the Crisis, part of our 2024 programme, Catastrophe and Emergence.

Catastrophes, as we know, signal a crisis of survival, knowledge and power, but they can also herald destruction and renewal, political closures and openings, the demise of old ways of knowing and the emergence of new ways to relate to our ever-changing world. So in this series, we ask you to join us in thinking about what kinds of tools and strategies we need for this moment, for some of the many crises we currently face. From the horrors unleashed on Gaza to the jarring disconnect of rhetoric and action in Western liberal democracies, from attacks on protest to the defence of confected culture wars, from the deepening of austerity and neoliberalism, to the slow creep of diversity optics and the hollowing out of long histories of solidarity. This, we could argue, is a snapshot of our conjuncture, to use the richest and perhaps thorniest of Stuart Hall's terms. Reading the Crisis aims to dig into the knottiness of our current predicaments and to springboard off the work of Stuart Hall – critic, writer, theorist and more – to help us think through some of our social, cultural and political formations.

In today's conversation, we'll be hearing from two of our most exciting thinkers, Priyamvada Gopal and Ilan Pappé, about Hall's 1992 essay, The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power, and how we might use it to make sense of the conflicts we're witnessing today. I'll introduce them very shortly, but first, just to say we hope you were able to read this essay and that you're sharing the conversation and put forward your

thoughts. Our speakers will be in dialogue for about 45 minutes. And then we'll turn to your questions in the second half, so please submit any questions or comments using the Q&A box at any point during the event, and we'll try to get to as many as we can. Automated live captions are available if you need them. Please click the CC button in the Zoom bar.

So without further delay, I'm just seeing lots of messages coming in. Hello, everybody. Without further delay, I'd like to welcome our guests. Professor Ilan Pappé is the Director of the European Center for Palestine Studies at the University of Exeter. From 1984 to 2006, Ilan taught at the University of Haifa in Israel, from where he resigned after various failed attempts to expel him due to his ideological positions. Ilan has written 22 books to date, among them The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine, The Ten Myths of Israel, The Biggest Prison on Earth: A History of the Israeli Occupation, On Palestine, co-authored with Noam Chomsky, and most recently co-authored with Ramzy Baroud, Our Vision for Liberation.

Priyamvada Gopal is Professor of Postcolonial Studies at the University of Cambridge and the author of, among other books, Insurgent Empire: Anticolonial Resistance and British Dissent. Priya has written widely for newspapers and magazines in Britain, India, and the United States, in addition to contributing to programmes on the BBC, Channel 4, NDTV, Al Jazeera, and Democracy Now!. She's currently on a fellowship at the Institute of Advanced Study at Princeton University and where she's working on a project tied to decolonisation.

So welcome both. It's wonderful to have you here. And I want to jump right in by asking you about the relevance of Hall's concept of 'the West and the Rest' right now. What Hall outlines in this essay, which he wrote some 30 years ago, is in part the myth-making that builds ideas of civilisational superiority, with the West placing itself at the top. But he was writing this, of course, just after the end of the Cold War. How much do you think it still resonates? It feels like a very live question today on this very day where all eyes are on Rafah and where myth-making of various kinds might be at work. I wanted to come to you first, Priya. What are your thoughts on that?

Priyamvada Gopal

Thank you, Aasiya. I just want to say before I answer your question, my thanks to the Stuart Hall Foundation for inviting me to speak. I think it's tremendously important at this historical conjuncture to be able to further the public dissemination of ideas of education given that a very significant aspect of the conjuncture is anti-intellectualism and attacking universities in Britain and elsewhere, attacking professors, attacking students, so I think it's very important that the Foundation is carrying on the work of

public education, the public engagement with ideas. And I'm very grateful to be part of it.

Re-reading this essay, I was really struck on the one hand by how very much it was of its time, 1992, in the few years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the rise of Thatcherism. There is something, and not very long after the publication of Orientalism, there is that kind of very specific moment where cultural studies is engaging with formations such as the West, the common sense that is put in place in the wake of these formations. And I initially thought, okay, this is very much of its moment. But as I was reading, I also thought there was something about our moment, which yes, it's quite far, it's 30 plus years on from the time of the writing of this essay. But there was also something very crude about our moment. There's a kind of resurfacing of tropes and ideas and policies and actions around the idea of the West, which make the essay in many portions seem like it was written just the other day. And we have seen an aggressive resurfacing of the idea of the West in discourse in Britain and elsewhere in the Anglosphere. I'm thinking of just two books, you know, Liz Truss's Ten Years to Save the West, Douglas Murray's, I forget what it's called, I think it's called The War on the West. And this kind of obsessive invocation of the idea of the West, this obsessive invocation of a kind of panic around the decline of the West. But I think one thing that marks a shift from perhaps the time that Professor Hall was writing about is the sense of a panic around the decline of the West. And that panic is not actually — it's rooted in a degree of truth that the centers of power are shifting and that there are new formations which will likely supersede the West, but not necessarily in an oppositional way. And I mean, I think maybe that's something to discuss later on in this discussion. But I think reading this essay, I was struck by the fact that, yes, the West is not a geographical referent. It is a set of ideas. It is a set of images and metaphors. But actually there it is something that is of its moment, but also something that is quite relevant to ours.

Aasiya Lodhi

Brilliant. Thank you so much. I want to come back to that idea of centers of power shifting because you both bring very interesting, different sort of contexts that you have sort of expertise in. India, which may be perhaps not challenging necessarily much of those narratives. But I want to put to you, Ilan, what your thoughts were on this essay, returning to it 30 years after it was written. And yes, I mean, as I said, all eyes on Rafah, that's very much a question directed towards you.

Ilan Pappé

Yeah. Thank you again. I want to share Priya's thanks to the Stuart Hall Foundation. And thank you so much for having me in this very important webinar. And I enjoyed rereading the chapter, which probably for the first time I read many, many years ago. So it was a pleasure actually to revisit it and to see its relevance really to our time. I think that what really strikes me in the second reading of the chapter which I don't think I was fully aware when I first read it was how much Stuart Hall relies on historical knowledge in order to provide us an understanding of the nature of the discourse which he calls the West and the Rest and with all the other explanation where he simplifies for us, which is very helpful, it was very helpful at the time, I think it's even helpful today, simplifying for us more complex ideas put forward by Michel Foucault about discourse and so on. Edward Said did the same with the example of Orientalism. I think that was very helpful because Foucault could be very confusing at times and not always coherent and everybody is entitled to extract from him whatever they want. I mean this is not a sacred text and and it's an inspirational text and I think both Said and Hall use it [as an] inspiration text but I think apart from that it is this idea that the way constructs such as the West influence the actual life of people, in fact they can influence your right to live or to die, to immigrate or not to immigrate, to be colonised or to fight against colonisation. I mean this is a long way from what sounds like an intellectual you know discussion about words and statements as Foucault would call them to the actual life people are experiencing.

And what Stuart Hall does I think he wants first of all to say it affects your life in 1992 and it affects my life in 2024. Because of its longevity. It has been there for ages. He begins in the 15th century and he is convinced that the way the West expanded, first of all geographically, politically, economically, affected the way knowledge was produced and the way non-Western individuals and collectives and cultures and civilisation were framed and I think that the strength of Said and Hall, and by this I think they have an advantage over Foucault, is it's only through their writings that you can see that it is relevant beyond the ivory towers, if you want, of academia, that if you are in this kind of field of knowledge that Foucault is talking about, if you are on the negative, you know, pole of the field of knowledge, because you are a woman, because you are not white, because you are not European, or you're not Western, this has huge implications for your chances in life. Yours, your next generation, and the generation after, and for me, as someone who deals all his life with Palestine and Israel, it was very clear from the very beginning that the same kind of genealogy, the very general genealogy that Stuart Hall does in order to convince us that there's a long history there, for the way the West is framed and the rest is framed, and the implications for real life for human beings has a similar genealogy, maybe shorter in time, but which is an offshoot for this general genealogy.

Namely, you cannot understand, and if I may, I will just take a sentence, too, if you don't understand, that the way Palestine and the Palestinians were framed as being the rest

and the Zionists were framed as being part of the West, if you don't understand that this kind of framing goes back to evangelical Christianity in the 17th century, goes back to British and European imperialism of the beginning of the 19th century, if you don't understand that this longevity, this historical roots are at the basis of the effectiveness of this discourse today, in the way that Israel still enjoys immunity as we speak, when it violates the world's plea to it, its friends' pleas to it not to invade Rafah, and it does. It explains the way the students are defamed in the United States as being ignorant, pro-terrorist, and just Hamasniks and so on. All of this is not born out of the blue. This is not something of our time. I don't agree. This is not our time. This is a part of a long, historical structure that we have to appreciate. Its rootedness, its longevity, because we are not just observing this, because we are also fighting against it, we're also struggling against it. But you have to appreciate how deep its pillars are planted in the soil of history in order to understand what is needed to uproot it, to change it and to challenge it.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thank you so much. I'm just trying to think about how to connect it to this idea of struggle and the fight because I don't know if in this chapter Stuart Hall goes into that much detail but you know I suppose there's always in his writings and also in the writings of Said that when we trace the kind of dominant frame, there's always alongside it and against it and pushing and shaping it, is the story of resistance, it's the story of the fightbacks, the pushbacks and you know that's that's an enormous aspect that we mustn't overlook and I wanted Priya now that you're sitting in a place where the student protests have just started, for example, which you mentioned just earlier, in what sense can we see that resistance also changing shape in some ways? Because I wanted to ask you both really about this idea of terminology, the West and the rest which, also to me seems very much of its time. Other terms have more currency perhaps these days like Global North/Global South, and south-to-south solidarity or south to north flows, are student protests a sign of south-north contraflow perhaps?

Priyamvada Gopal

That's a lot to take on, let me see if I can start by where Ilan left off, you know one thing to say about the question of - and I take Ilan's point very much that these have very real consequences and the West is a category that people have brushed up against and bled or died from in the way in which it operates. And its mobility is very important. And one of the things that, again, strikes me is both rupture and continuity. So what you have in the formation of Israel and the state of Israel and its actions today is very, very clearly the kind of the last and latest iteration of the 1492 project, that this is the West pushing

out into other lands and taking land. And in fact, just to slightly add to something Ilan said, there are other areas that are not decolonised, and that is the Fourth World, that is the indigenous peoples of the Americas, for instance, of Australia, of New Zealand, who still remain, you know, corralled onto reservations, certainly in North America, deprived of land. And so on. So, you know, you can see these very clear continuities. There is a reference somewhere in Stuart Hall's essay to, you know, Jews as the internal others. And what is very interesting there is that in 1492, you have the, you know, that is the moment also of the expulsion of the Jews and the horrific kind of creation of the idea of Europe as Christian, you know, expelling internal others. But that today, those others have now been picked up and turned into part of the West. So you can very much see the mobility and the kind of changing contours of racialisation and the consequences that that has. And I think, you know, very often there is there is a kind of undercurrent of of tension around the racialisation of Israel and the ways in which it is now a White nation and a Western nation. And that is something I think that we probably need to think about. And maybe Ilan will have have more to say on that. In terms of thinking about resistance, the other important thing to say is, and this is something that Said ended up walking away from, you know, he acknowledged that one of the weaknesses of Orientalism was not thinking about how those who were Orientalised or who were turned into the East responded to that.

And what we know is that the colonised, whether in the Americas or whether in, you know, in in Asia or Africa responded to colonisation in a variety of ways, including resistance. And the fact is that the Foucauldian framework did not enable a recognition of those who were being colonised, those who were being racialised, who were always pushing back and who were always talking. I mean, I think of this one text by a 16th century Quechua nobleman, you know, Poma de Ayala or Waman Poma, as he's sometimes called, where he actually talks about the experience of colonisation as the world in reverse. And, you know, one moment your world is is around you and the next moment everything has been reversed and criticism and pushback, you know, is always ongoing. And in that criticism and pushback is a reading of the West from the point of view of its victims. And I think we need to insert that into our understanding of the West. How did those who were subjected to this formation read and respond to this formation?

I think of another text, the Haudenosaunee Address to the Western world, which is produced by a group of indigenous leaders in North America in 1974. And one of the things that they do in that address, which is really to the United Nations, is to say, you know, we actually feel sorry for the West. Let me just read you a little quotation. "It is the people of the West ultimately who are the most oppressed and exploited. They are burdened by the weight of centuries of racism, sexism and ignorance, which has rendered their people insensitive to the true nature of their lives." So it's also thinking about those in the West as, in a sense, also the victims of the formation of this idea of

the West. So I think resistance is quite central. The resistance of those who were subjected to these formations.

The student protests, I think, are interesting because they remind us that the West was never a homogeneous category and that it has always been characterised by its own lines of dissent and its own heterogeneity. And you can see how fiercely the monolith of the West pushes back when it is challenged from within, and that is the way in which I read what is happening with the student protests and the incredible, shocking ferocity of the state and the establishment in relation to being even very slightly challenged. So another question I think we need to put on the table is who speaks for the West, who acts for the West and who within the West is actually challenging that formation? Because I think that that is incredibly important.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thank you. Yes. So state apparatus and then who's, you know, who's constructing and circulating ideology. We might want to talk about media in a minute. We'll come back to that. I just wanted to pick up that point, Ilan, about which Priya touched on about Jews being the sort of internalised other, you know, right throughout history of Europe. But I think that's something also that Edward Said writes about, isn't it? When the victim moves to the position of the victimizer. You know. How is that taking place now? What are the sort of various fragments of dissent and resistance within Israel at the moment?

Ilan Pappé

Yeah. Yeah. I think it's a valid point, of course, when the victim becomes a victimizer and this is kind of transferring our knowledge on the individual within psychology and so on and kind of imposing it on societies, ideological movements and settler-colonial situations. But I think it is valid. It shows that while the rest, the West and the rest was a common feature for so many centuries, it also had a dynamic element to that kept changing. And in fact, your location within the West and the rest could easily change by circumstances sometimes that you were not yourself even responsible for so when Jews in Europe, which was a minority group of Jews, decided that to deal with the fact that they are not entirely part of the West, they realised, in the 19th century with the rise of anti-Semitism, and while some of them thought that correcting the West so to speak either through liberalism or socialism was the answer for anti-Semitism, a small group of them thought no, the best way is actually to accept what anti-Semites say about us: that we are a distinct race, we're a different race than European race, we are a different nation than the nations which we are. But we cannot be a nation in Europe so we have to be a nation elsewhere.

And Europe was very happy to build a) the idea of a Jewish nation which was really something Orthodox Jews founded as a heresy, but nonetheless, it served the imperialist wish to extend over the territories of the Ottoman Empire, and secondly, the Europeans also liked very much the idea that the nation, the Jewish nation state will not be in Europe. So immediately the question was a Jewish state in Palestine, is it part of the West or is it part of the rest? And that kind of paradox or conundrum, you can still see it today because if you look, for example, at the way the British mandatory authorities dealt with both the Palestinians and the Jewish settlers in the 30 years of British rule there in 1918 to 1948, it was there that the Palestinians were a typical case of colonised people in the British Empire with all the racist and typical attitude towards a colonised people within the British Empire at the first beginning of the 20th century. So there was nothing particular in the way the Palestinians were treated compared to the way Indians were treated or Egyptians. But what happened with the Jews? I mean how were the Jews treated, which we have some brilliant, actually, historical books about it. They were not the colonised people but they were also not part of the colonisers.

So they were kind of like maybe the colored people in apartheid South Africa, maybe a little bit like the early American Puritan settlers when Britain was still ruling what became the United States. There are subcategories that of course in the grand brush that Stuart uses cannot be seen because it's a big picture that he draws. So you don't see the innuendos and the innuendos are important because what happens next is that with the help of the American imperialism, Israel is being re-embraced, if you want, or the Jews that used to be the Jews of Europe are re-embraced into the West but with a particular role of defending the West against the rest. They are the bastion, that's why they get until today, why they get so much money, so much arms. Ukraine is now playing this role as well in Europe but then there's a demographic problem for the Jewish settlers after the Holocaust.

They're bringing a million Jews from the Arab world who are not part of the West, they're part of the rest, so what do you do with them? So they de-Arabize the Arab Jews and what they find in the process, actually, that the people who come from the Arab world and the Muslim world are really part of the rest, in the sense that they have different idea of the role of tradition, of religion in a society that the European Jews in Israel thought would be built like an American 53rd state. The clash has now become a terrible clash, almost a civil war in Israel today which many fear, probably with some modicum of truth in it, that the Hamas was allowed a relatively successful operation because without that operation the rift, the implosion, the social implosion in Israel would have been impossible to contain. So I don't know how much this conspiracy theory is correct but it definitely came in incredible timing for a society that lost its ability to be cohesive socially, culturally and and politically.

If you are on the boundaries of this discourse, you know, whether it's a geographical one, a cultural one, or ideological one, you are in a constant state of instability, of violence, and this is something that hopefully in the long run I hope the Israelis would internalise and would understand, and I'll put it in simple terms: if you are a tool for the Western imperialism that imposes you on the Arab world on the Muslim world, you cannot sustain your this kind of existence forever. You will have to be an organic part of the area you're in, even if the price given all your history and everything that happened until that moment of awakening is very high. And the price would be very high. Higher than the whites in South Africa paid for the end of Apartheid. The Israeli Jewish price for abolishing Israel - and they will have to abolish Israel, Israel doesn't have a chance of existing in the long run. The price would be very high. The sooner they do it, maybe there is a chance for a decolonisation which has learned from the negative sides of decolonisation, but it's exactly the location of Israel in this discourse that Stuart Hall is talking about. Which he doesn't relate to because he doesn't have time for that but he doesn't focus on those on the boundary between the rest and the West.

So it's not totally dichotomous you know, and that's what's so typical about the situation of Israel. The Palestinian situation in this respect is far clearer, far more coherent, if you want, and therefore their intersectionality with the rest, if you want, in their successful or less successful struggle for injustices from Native Americans, African Americans to the First Nation in Australia, their relationship with these groups and with trade unions and with governments in the global South are very clear. But what is the network of the settlers community, that's, half of them are coming from the rest and not from the West and have been there already for 120 years? That's the kind of reality that sounds academic because you'll never hear such an analysis from diplomats who are involved in the so-called peace process, but this is the heart of the issue. And that's why a contribution like Stuart's is so relevant I think, and informative, and inspirational, in this respect.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thank you, yeah, we'll come back to that. I think, you know, what you said that it's in its death row, is this the death rattle of Zionist ideology and, you know, the internal racialisations and how that plays into what has happened with Hamas and where we are up to now. But you mentioned Ukraine and I just wanted to ask you both really about the role of media because that's something that has come up so much again and we know that Stuart was a foundational theorist of media, he wrote about racist ideologies and mainstream media, but really reading this essay now, I felt that it really would have to have a much more focused analysis of Western mainstream media and the sort of double standards or the hypocrisy which is just writ large in so many ways and in that sense, there were parallels with Ukraine and then the contrasts and the dissimilarities - I

don't know, Priya, if that occurred to you at all? Or again, you're sitting in America, so perhaps American media looks very different?

Priyamvada Gopal

Well I mean I think the thing to say, you know, yesterday we got the news that the New York Times had been awarded the Pulitzer Prize for reporting and this is a paper that has explicitly forbidden its journalists to use words like genocide, and I think there is a list of words in relation to the Israel-Palestine situation that their journalists are not allowed to use and it is a form of inverted newspeak where certain kinds of words that speak to reality are taken off the table. I think that the hypocrisy is very clear whereby - and it's not especially restricted to the present situation - you know, the UK in the lead up to Brexit - so you know vast amounts of not just disinformation on social media but very, very inadequate challenging of xenophobia and migration etc. The media at best could be accused of abdicating its job and at worst of actually fabricating an alternative reality.

I just want to move away for one minute from the media in the West to just pick up on this question of the negative signs of decolonisation that Ilan referred to and the reason I'm moving to that is I'm thinking about India right now where elections are underway and which may very well provide a third term for an ethno-nationalist government and an ethno-nationalist, hard-right Hindutva-oriented Prime Minister Narendra Modi and that landscape, the Indian media landscape is beyond dystopian. There is no independent media except in very, very small corners of the internet. The media is completely bought up by large industrial houses and is almost entirely uncritical of what has been happening in the last 10 years.

And the reason I bring this up in relation to what Ilan rightly calls the negative sides of decolonisation is that actually we do need to have a conversation about what decolonisation has meant and the ways in which it has become a project very, very different from what might have been imagined in a more innocent, perhaps a more hopeful moment. Now both elements in Israel and elements in India are claiming decolonisation for themselves, right. You hear absurd claims that Israel is the most decolonised entity anybody could imagine. You've heard, quite recently, an Indian columnist writing a paper saying well whatever else might have happened under Narendra Modi, he has decolonised India. I think at this point we need to ask what does decolonisation mean and what is its relationship to Westernisation. Now on the one hand there is this belief that if you embrace so-called indigenous traditions or Hindu traditions, that's a way of not being Western. Actually, however, in the entities like India and in fact this is true for Brazil, Russia, China in a maybe slightly different way, the fundamental aspect of the 1492 project which defined the West: racialisation and

extraction and accumulation, right, and that is of course capitalism. The engine of the West is capitalism and the West is not readable without understanding this twinning of racialisation on the one hand, and extraction and accumulation on the other but in fact these so-called decolonising entities have not repudiated accumulation, have not repudiated extractionism, and they have embraced their own form of racialising, their own form of racism which is then wielded against minorities within.

And so actually as I think Ilan suggested earlier on these decolonising entities, so-called, are recolonising entities. It's just that they're recolonising a different population and doing it, you know, with a with different dress and a different skin colour. So I think that we also need to ask who is Western and very often I think it is the it is the people who claim to be anti-Western, who claim to be de-Westernising who are actually in some ways carrying the torch of the West. So when I see the media, I see, of course, a very, very desperate and false landscape in the United States but I also see this very clearly in places like India, abetting again a project of nationalism which is very, very dangerous in its own right and I think we have to grapple that nettle when talking about decolonisation.

Ilan Pappé

Yeah definitely, I think you're right you started with the hypocrisy with the coverage on on the war in the Ukraine and of course from the perspective of us who are totally engaged with the struggle of Palestine for liberation and independence the hypocrisy not only of the media but also the EU institutions, the sanction regime imposed in Russia, the way the Ukrainians defending themselves against Russian tanks were depicted and romanticised and the way even non-violent Palestinian resistance was immediately framed as terrorism in the mainstream media. All this, of course, is very important to discuss and is connected to Stuart Hall's idea of the discourse of the West and the rest, it's very clear that the European refugees are very different from Arab refugees and Muslim refugees in the way that they are received and the way that they are being aided. There's no danger for a Ukrainian refugee in Britain to be deported to Rwanda and the way supposedly universal ideas of human rights and civil rights are so racialised and so are imposed on different categories of human beings which fall very much into the way the West and the rest discourse has located them in our understanding.

But we should, and probably this was not so, Stuart Hall was not that alert to this in 1992, we should say that there are now alternatives to the mainstream media and the alternative media played a very important role in providing counter-narratives that, you know Priya mentioned, words that the New York Times is not allowed to use, where the language is free, and where the discourse is free from the fear from lobbies, whichever lobbies they are, whether it's the pro-Israeli lobby or any capitalist lobby. This is

something that I think in 1992 was not totally clear to Stuart Hall, so he doesn't mention it at all, if you notice. And I think we should mention it, because that enabled us, first of all, to vent our outrage. And of course, we always, as activists, we understand that it cannot remain in the cyber space. It has to be taken to the streets. It has to be taken to actual social protest movements.

I think that's coming back to your question about the students. This is the generation that everybody, since the Arab Spring, said they are too much glued to their screens, whether it's the computer or the smartphone. Well, apparently they're not just glued to screens. They're not just doing cyberspace revolutions. They are going to the streets. They are taking action. And the alternative media is a source of information for them, is a source, is a network of communication for them. So I think that we are in a much better place today than we were in 1992 with the hegemony of mainstream media. And I'm sure statistically one can show that from a generational point of view, there is less and less confidence in the information that mainstream media provides. And that is something that was not there in 1992. We are yet to see the implication of this in the future because we are just now beginning to see one or two manifestations of this lack of confidence. Exactly because the double standards you're talking about were so easily detected, and so easily challenged and outraged people.

And this is the whole, if I may say, there's a wider picture here, which I will end this answer, this thing is beyond the media. There is a gap between what for better word one can call the civil society's agenda of politics. That injects morality, talks about ecology, talks about poverty, talks about indigenous rights, gender rights, supports decolonisation where decolonisation has not occurred yet, criticises the decolonised world as Priya did just a few minutes ago. This is an agenda that is a political agenda and it hasn't made its way yet to the higher echelons of politics where policy is made, where there is a totally different agenda in terms of priorities, in terms of the division of the world to the good guys and the bad guys, to the the cynical approach to morality, the gaslighting. The gaslighting of morality is the worst, probably, part of politics today. And this gap is widening.

And the question is: what would it lead to? What kind of implosion would be created by this? Because the gap, again, is not an intellectual curiosity. It affects our life. And I always say that Israel and Palestine have found themselves, I don't know if on purpose or not, it doesn't matter, they are clearly located in this divide on these two agendas. These two agendas. You have global Israel, which I call it. Global Israel is connected strongly to all these elements that have an agenda that you can hear from the mainstream media, from multinational cooperations, for most of the governments in the global North, quite a few of the governments of the Global South. It's a clear agenda that enables us to understand why Israel gets international immunity, on the level of security, defence, diplomacy, media, or even academia, even academia.

But there's also global Palestine, and global Palestine is this agenda that the civil society has built as a counter-agenda to this hegemony of what you can call global Israel. And it's only recently that it found its intersectional connection with people in Mexico, or in North America, or in Australia, with different cultural groups, ethnic groups, gender groups and so on to create this kind of agenda that says, there's another way of doing politics. There's another way of dealing with the major crises and challenges of a world that is really on fire metaphorically, and also not metaphorically, is on fire. And I think that that's where I wish that the Palestinian national movement would seize the moment, because I'm not sure this moment would return. This is a huge moment in history where the Palestine struggle epitomises, for so many people, their own struggles against injustices. And in this very moment, for obvious objective reasons, so I'm not criticising, but we have to say it, we have a Palestinian national movement which is disunited, fragmented, doesn't offer us a vision for the future. They have to seize this moment. This is a huge moment in the history, and the world's attention is on them, not just because of the genocide in Gaza.

Because I really think there's so many hopes, I hope not too many hopes, that are being attached to a nation and a colonised people who are organically connected to all the East and the Mediterranean, to all the East and Mediterranean, and offers a new idea not only of liberation, but also of a nation-state, of a decolonised nation-state. It's very clear, and this I think relates to Priya's idea of what happens when you decolonise the country but not the people. And you get these kinds of regimes that we're talking about, and it's not just decolonising the land. It's decolonising the nation-state structure, the Westphalian nation-state structure, that European imperialism imposed and then kind of sold it as the post-colonial structure, whereas it was actually new colonial and not post-colonial. And I think that this is where we have our hopes, not only on Palestine, but also in the area around it, and possibly there are many other locations in the world we should look at, in this respect, where also the political structure would reflect the agenda, because agenda without a structure, without organisation, as we've seen with the so-called Arab Spring, the energy gets lost and there's a vacuum that is being filled by forces which are not necessarily part of the same agenda. So I think that's a very crucial moment in time.

Aasiya Lodhi

Yes, I just want to just make some references to the questions which are coming into the chat and some of which have also already been answered in some ways by all your really rich insights, but I wondered, Priya, if I could ask you to pick up from that and also take on this point that Sid Mohandas has made, which is I wanted if Priya could speak more about the parallels and the emerging connections between Narendra Modi's India and Israel and what that means for transglobal liberation projects. So on the one hand

we've got Ilan saying this is a moment like no other, in some ways, and really this is the time, now, that the Palestinian movement at least has to reshape itself, and yet then we've also got the kind of the neo-colonial, post-colonial state, if you like, of India and where it is, and these are the forces which work against any kind of breakthrough transglobal liberation possibly.

I think you're on mute.

Priyamvada Gopal

Sorry, there was a lawnmower outside. Look, Ilan is, I think, completely right in saying that the Westphalian nation-state which was presented as the only way out of colonisation actually has been, what I would call, a poisoned chalice. It was used as the vehicle, and in a certain sense you can understand the pragmatism of those anti-colonial leaders who then headed nationalist movements in order to create, in order to break free from colonialism, but they failed, I think, very fundamentally to challenge the terms on which so-called liberation from colonialism was offered. And one of the people I'm working on right now is the great anti-caste leader, Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar, and one of the things he does is really interesting, that in the 1940s, just as India is coming into being, he challenges the terms from the perspective of the oppressed castes, of this new nation-state which is coming into being, and he says, this is not decolonisation, this is just simply passing the baton from, you know, from the white men to upper-caste Hindu men, and this is not really decolonisation.

And there are people in all these contexts who are, kind of, challenging the Westphalian model as the basis on which we all find our liberation. I think that's very true. I think Ilan is right, you know, to suggest that Palestine has a kind of, you know, historical opportunity to envision something different. I saw another question in the chat. And one of the things I want to say is that when we talk about X or Y nation-state having to be abolished, we put on the question all nation states and the form in which they currently exist. Does the United States have a right to exist in the way it is currently sitting on the lands of indigenous nations? Does the union of India in its current form have the right to exist without addressing key questions of its own constitution and of its own marginalisation of peoples, of its own unwillingness to participate in questions of self-determination for other peoples? I don't think that any nation-state has the right to exist in some kind of God-given way. And I think that what Ilan says is right, that we need to use the moment to think about the vehicles in which we have envisioned decolonisation, which in most cases have not enabled real decolonisation. They have simply enabled a transfer of power from one set of elites to another.

In relation to Sid's question, now, look, the linkages between Zionism and Hindutva are very, very real. They take the form of knowledge exchange. They take the form of

weapons selling to the Indian state. They take the form of a very close relationship between Narendra Modi and Benjamin Netanyahu. And one of the tragedies of that particular linkage of Indian ethno-nationalism posing as decolonisation and Zionism is that it speaks to the profound failures of the Global South to emerge as a decolonising force. You know, every time I look at the situation in Gaza, I think, what would it mean if we actually had a truly united Global South/Third World that could, in fact, intervene in the situation where, you know, Israel's aggression and genocidal policies are being propped up by the erstwhile metropole, propped up by the West.

Where is the opposition to this? And the answer is, either there isn't an opposition or there is active collusion with the forces of the West. I mean, I fail to see how India can be decolonising while there are kind of official connections with the state of Israel and its ongoing project of colonisation. So I think, you know, I want to be hopeful in the way that Ilan is. But from where I stand, looking at the situation in India, I see the failures of the hopes of the mid-20th century moment of decolonisation and the failure of a truly progressive Global South to emerge out of the ashes of colonialism.

Aasiya Lodhi

Okay, thank you. Quite a few questions that are sort of overlapping. So I wonder if we can just put two of them to you, Ilan. One is by Ailsa Clark and one is by Smaran Dayal, which is about the vocabulary. I mean, we've sort of just been talking about that. But I wondered if you could go into a bit more detail, how to build a vocabulary that productively links the 1492 project, as it were, to our contemporary understanding of decolonisation. How can we also work to, you know, magnify our collective challenge to overarching oppressive structures? I think you pointed already to difficulties. One thing, I'm just going to throw a little curveball in here, I realise we haven't even mentioned China, for example, which is the other big kind of global force in the world at the moment, and which also cuts against and inter-crosses so many of these boundaries and these kind of intersections in very fascinating and complicated ways. Ilan, what vocabulary - I'll come back to the original part of my question, sorry, got a bad habit of asking these very long questions - can we tie 1492, have we basically got to develop a vocabulary about settler-colonialism and decolonisation and how far are we from doing?

Ilan Pappé

First of all I just want to add one thing about India and Israel which is also important I think and this is that India is involved in a settler-colonial project in Kashmir and not surprisingly those in Kashmir who oppose this settler-colonial project see a great

affinity with the Palestinian struggle. This is not just because they're Muslims, but because of the nature of the settler-colonial projects in those places. Now to your question, I think that we are in the process of building a new vocabulary. Some of it is old but sounds different in the present context. For instance when you talk about decolonisation at a time when most people would think that this is a chapter of the past, it's not only the need to find maybe a better word so that it reflects the 21st century vision that we have, it is our insistence which the modern capitalist media did not allow us to do, it's our insistence that we want space and time to explain entries in our vocabulary. I think this is far more important than the words themselves. If anything you learn from Stuart Hall's earlier work is exactly that, that you cannot be content by thinking that if you use a word everybody would understand it in the same way. If you say decolonisation or democracy people would understand it. It's going back to an era where we were more verbose but in a positive way, not because we talk too much and we don't say anything, but because we need the space and time to explain what we think, what our knowledge brings to the fore. I'll give you a very good example for this, talking about vocabulary. One of the major ploys that Israel uses, which Israel weaponises in order to suppress any criticism on Israel and Zionism is the accusation of anti-Semitism by equating anti-Semitism with anti-Zionism and even equating anti-Semitism with any critic now, criticism on Israel and lately it added to this, equated the denial of Holocaust with criticism of Israel and Zionism. And I'm asked a lot by activists, how do we face it?

And I say the one thing you cannot do is answer it with a sound bite. You cannot negate it by saying: oh no, anti-Semitism is not anti-Zionism. You need the space and time to to explain it and for that and again Stuart Hall shows it to us, you need the genealogy to explain how it came about. So we're respecting both the negative and the positive load that words have with them. They're not neutral they're not only not neutral in the sense of the discourse that Foucault is talking about and Stuart Hall and Edward Said is talking about. They're also not neutral in the historical package that they bring with them and that historical package has to be unpacked and be exposed and talked about. So maybe there will be a different word for nationalism, decolonisation. At this point I'm very satisfied if we are renegotiating the definitions, the explanation for what it is.

One final example: with all the negative aspects of the Ottoman Empire, and believe me there were a lot of them, one thing that this mega-structure enabled was a genuine coexistence, a live and let live, in a society that cherished collective identities, whether they were religious, ethnic or cultural, and as long as these identities did not challenge of course the authority of the Empire, they were left alone and the communities were left alone to work out the relationship between them. And the boundaries were porous, you know, very open between the communities. In Palestine, Christians, Muslims and Jews lived in the same villages. After the creation of Israel we only have these separate villages for separate communities. Sectarianism is an imperialist idea that this kind of

group affiliation is wrong and it gives you a way of pitting one group against the other. A political structure that would, I would call it, re-respect people's wish to be part also of smaller collectives, whether they are ethnic, religious, doesn't matter, re-respecting without of course violating individual rights is something that cannot work very well in the Westphalian nation-state.

So maybe the state has to be redefined, maybe nationalism and its relationship with these more local, more particular identities have to be negotiated. There's so much work to be done unfortunately because of the agenda that I was talking about that is dominating us, the West, as Stuart Hall would call it, the West and the rest, the West is determining an agenda that does not allow us to deal with these issues because certain political structures serve American imperialism, serve capitalism and there's no wish whatsoever for academics or activists or anyone in society to challenge the very basic of structure. So if someone says, I think that Israel is not going to exist in the future, not even as wishful thinking, as a fact, that you see that it's collapsing. That's my point by the way, it's not just kind of good news coming up, I'm not sure that collapse of states is good news, I'm not sure about that, but I'm sure that this state is going to collapse, I have no doubt about that. I cannot give you a date, I don't know, it's in the long term, I'm not saying that we are just seeing the beginning of this, but these are moments where you have to think about alternatives. Even if you like the reality you live in because you have privileges and you're strong you have to understand that this is a precarious moment and yes, redefining these entries to the vocabulary of the way we describe politics and futures and so on is a very crucial part of this.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thanks. Yes, Priya, I want to ask you to respond to that, in part because you are a scholar of literature, scholar of words and language, but several questions have touched on, is it possible to decolonise the nation-state? Obviously Western liberalism gives us certain infrastructures but I mean the nation-state in and of itself, we've been here before, it seemed like it had had its day, it's made a comeback. Are we going down the sort of abolition route which is another school of thought, is there a too wide a gap really between the project of decolonisation and the nation-state however you configure it. Ilan says that he's concerned about the collapse of nation-states. I want to ask you about that and really that question about language and all of that as well.

Priyamvada Gopal

Well, I mean, I think obviously collapse is a word that is scary, you know, that we would not want things where, there is so much catastrophic implosion or explosion that living

becomes impossible. But I suppose slightly differently from Ilan, I'm a little bit more skeptical of the idea of kind of communities. I mean, I take the point that communities in a sense are not states and we want to, you know, acknowledge the right of people to live in smaller communities and so on. But we also have to understand that communities have also been the focus of oppression, you know, including for women, for dominated castes, for sexual minorities. I think that alongside the question of communities, what we need is really models and and narratives of coexistence.

One of the things I've been struck by, because in the time that I've been at the Institute for Advanced Study, I've been thinking about land and I've been looking at a critical Native American engagements with land, and one of the things that really jumps out at you is a very different understanding of sovereignty from that produced by the Westphalian nation-state. And these are models of sovereignty which are not premised on borders. They're not premised on the hard difference between us and them. There are very strong ideas of, you know, community identity or even national identity. But they are, you know, visions of necessary human coexistence with each other and with the non-human. And these cannot be done through the imposition of boundaries.

So I think, you know, challenging the nation-state and challenging its idea of borders, its very kind of lethal idea of borders and boundaries is absolutely fundamental to decolonisation. And I think the question that decolonisation really puts on the table is: how do we live together as human beings but also as human beings in relation to land ecology and non-human entities? And that is a question of life and death at this point because as in fact many indigenous thinkers have been warning for nearly a hundred years, maybe longer, the way in which we live, the way in which we extract, the way in which we accumulate is going to kill us.

And I think we actually have to put the question of ecology of climate, of land, of nature squarely on the table. I think it is actually very much at the heart of the Israel-Palestine question but is very rarely discussed in those terms, but we have a murderous relationship with land. We have an extractive and accumulative and destructive relationship with land. By 'we' I mean, you know, the kind of larger consent to capitalism, larger consent to the world as it is currently running itself, and I think that unless we come up with models of coexistence - and here I do find indigenous thinking very, very generative - unless we come up with models of coexistence that are different from the nation-state, that are also different from some of the more reactionary formations of community, we are in very, very deep trouble. I think that it is high time that we put our mind to how we live together in the world and live with non-human entities in this world as well.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thanks, I want to ask for your comments Ilan, but very quickly, Priya, there's various comments saying thank you for bringing up different models of indigenous notions of sovereignty and people have asked you both that it's great to read Stuart Hall but can you recommend other writers that we should read in order to help us think through this conjuncture? Are there any indigenous scholars you want to mention at this point? You were actually making me think about various non-indigenous thinkers in decolonial studies but if there's somebody you'd like to mention? I was thinking about Jasbir Puar, for example, and scholars like that.

Priyamvada Gopal

I think there are a great many but in recent times I've been reading a Canadian intellectual by the name of Taiaiake Alfred and he works very much on the question of sovereignty, and I have found his work very interesting. I have found the work of the well-known ecological activist Winona LaDuke very interesting. There are also, I think that people who are working on India and working on decolonisation or similar topics should be reading anti-caste thinkers like Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar, for whom, you know, from the get-go the nation-state was a potentially laden weapon if it wasn't dramatically changed in the configuration which was presenting itself. So I think that these are just a couple of names but I think that there are, you know, multiple sites in which people have thought about how to live together and how to live differently after the hopeful end of the 1492 project and it is important to say there, that when we talk about the end of the West and we talk about the end of the 1492 project, that is also a moment that invites us to think about tyrannies, dominances, exclusions and oppressions in our own communities, and if we don't think about that then you have the danger of simply replacing Western oppression with a different set of oppression. So I think the moment is one where we are invited to rethink how we live and how we engage with each other.

Aasiya Lodhi

Ilan, do you want to respond to that? There are several questions in the chat asking as well about the very real concern of a normalisation with the Arab nations which some have said that was also what prompted the attack on the 7th October. And again this sort of grey area that's currently occupied by, let's say, the Gulf nation-sates. So what's your reading of that?

Ilan Pappé

Just a comment on what Priya says and I will immediately go to normalisation. I think actually it's important, I sort of caution against taking a too generalised view on this. I'm

not sure indigenous notions of sovereignty would be adaptable in the same way to a place like the Eastern Mediterranean for instance, it's a different history, it's a different situation, and therefore, for example, there's a great book by Ussama Makdisi [Age of Coexistence: The Ecumenical Frame and the Making of the Modern Arab World] that tells us about the forms of coexistence through group affiliation that also had ecological implications during the Ottoman period in the Eastern Mediterranean. For those who are interested, I just finished a book with conversations with my colleague Katherine Natanel which will come out with Haymarket I think in the next few weeks, and one of the conversations I had was with Gayatri Spivak and we talked about, because she became interested recently also in this Ottoman matrix of live and let live and its relevance to how we can live in the future in that respect. So I think its maybe communal affiliations have different meanings in different places. We have to be careful because on one hand we want a joint solidarity in the world to deal with this huge catastrophe of global warming, on the other hand there are these more particular kinds of features which are local, which are cultural, which are civilisational and not necessarily better or worse, but are different and this diversity sometimes is more powerful than the homogeneous idea of a joint agenda. So I think it's good to look at the Arab world a bit differently and at the same time remain intersectional, in intersectional mode with the others.

Now about the normalisation - yes, I don't think that the Hamas operation had much to do with Israel's normalisation in general, or the pending normalisation with Saudi Arabia, I think going back to my idea of a global Israel, of course global Israel needs some partners in the Arab world and therefore you need to demonise Iran more than one should in order to create this idea of a common enemy, which kind of has a shelf date to this, the idea that Israel is the key to a good relationship with the United States, I don't think that works that well anymore but it's part of it and of course there's a difference between regimes and societies. The societies understand that any act of normalisation is at the expense of the Palestinians and deepens the Israeli colonisation and oppression and recently ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians.

So I think that normalisation belongs to the West and the rest discourse. Whatever agenda was kind of coming out in what was called the Arab spring, whatever we want to call that particular period, was not surprisingly also directed against normalisation. And this is not surprising because any wish in the Arab world, which is not different from other parts of the world, to have this moral agenda, its own interpretation of politics which includes among others, different kinds of foreign policies, different kinds of relationships, different kinds of definitions of states, and so on, do identify a close relationship with Israel as challenging a better agenda, a better vision for the future. It's very easy, and I can see it done in American media, to claim that this is the classical anti-Semitism, this is a hatred of Jews and so on, and totally ignore the fact that this is part of or at least give respect that this is part of a far more comprehensive worldview of

how societies should unfold in the future - what should be the agenda, what should be the nature of politics. And that's where Israel and Palestine fits in. It doesn't have to do anything with anti-Semitism and so on. You can see it in the way Capitol Hill dealt with the slogan Palestine should be free, from the river to the sea, and kind of equating it as a kind of a call for the destruction of Israel or even the killing of the Jews. Whereas, God knows we want everyone who lives anywhere in the world between a river and a sea to be free, right? I mean this whole idea that you take tactical decisions by Israel, weaponisation by the Israeli propaganda and you take it as if this represents reality at the expense of paying attention and devoting time to understand the worldview from which these slogans come, what kind of aspiration they really entail. I think that's where anti-normalisation comes from and that's why normalisation will to my mind not succeed in the long term.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thank you. Priya, I think there's a question you want to answer here about the BRICs, is that right?

Priyamvada Gopal

Oh, sorry, I wasn't quite sure - they were coming up on my screen. Just to add to, just to come back to Ilan, I wasn't suggesting that we take models produced by one community in the Americas and then apply it to the Arab world, the point is that there are models for coexistence that are being theorised in multiple sites and we do live in a world, whether we like it or not, where we have to coexist on a planetary scale. And I think that ideas are generative, I mean whenever I'm asked, you know, who would you recommend for X or Y model, I'm always reluctant because readings and ideas are not models, they're starting points for thinking. And I do think that yes, there might be very, very interesting and there are very interesting ideas coming out of India, or the Arab world, or the Ottoman Empire or the Americas, and they have to be put in conversation for us to kind of generate models that are at some level going to have to be planetary modes of living with each other. But I certainly wasn't suggesting that you take model X and apply it to place Y.

On the question of the BRICs, look, the BRICs are doing, yeah in one sense you can say well they are facing up to the United States and they're providing an alternative polarity but the question is, does this polarity actually decolonise or is it simply transferring the power of capital arms in the nation-state to another set of powers? And I'm not seeing, you know, maybe with the honourable exception in a small way of South Africa, but again not really, a break from capitalism, of neoliberalism, or extractivism, I think these are all very much part of the ways in which the BRICs have risen to power and frankly, no

I don't see them as decolonising forces, I think they can mount a kind of challenge in its own language to the United States, but they are not currently forging a new language. I think that the sites where new languages are being formed are in fact these small counter-currents that we don't really know about in a global scale and that we don't really engage with.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thank you. There's literally about three minutes left so I wondered if we want to end on a hopeful note, and we've drawn a lot of hopeful threads together, although we're struggling to knit them all into a perfect pattern, I wondered, Ilan, if you want to just say briefly where you're looking to for new currents of thoughts, maybe on the margins somewhere.

Ilan Pappé

I think that there's a difference between the short term which is very bleak I think, talking now if we begin with Palestine, so maybe I'll go back to Palestine rather than talk about optimism or pessimism about the world as such but about Palestine in more particular terms. I think in the short term it's very worrying. One of the reasons is that I think that when colonial or settler-colonial regimes are feeling themselves or hearing already the noise of the cracks in the building and they are understanding, even unconsciously, that there is a collapse on the way, they become more ruthless and more fierce and more brutal. We have seen it in the last days of Apartheid South Africa.

So I think that that's very worrying in the short term, but in the long term, I do think that there is a hope for the end of the Zionist a project in a way that we still have time to replace it with something which, on all levels of humanity, is better. Better in terms of equality, better in terms of rectifying past evil, better in terms of economic and social justice, and also better in dealing with ecological challenges not only in the region but in the world as a whole. I do think that in fact talking about it is highly important because this would produce a thinking now. We have to protect this conversation, we have to protect this conversation from two enemies, so to speak, and with this I would end, and it's doable, to protect it, but we have to identify it: one is what one can call the peace orthodoxy about Israel and Palestine, which we heard from Biden again and again the two-state solution, the American ideas of business schools and political science schools in the ivory universities can contribute anything to pacification, reconciliation or even peace and decolonisation in Palestine. It's not easy because the peace orthodoxy is dominating so much but we can protect ourselves from this, especially with the help of alternative media.

And the second enemy that I think is there is to make sure that the despair, which is understandable, that accompanies us from the current savageness and catastrophe does not silence, does not cause us ourselves from thinking positively about the future. Because you can easily sink into a depression here. And maybe there's a distribution of labor here. You don't expect people who are starving in Gaza or being under the harassment of the Israeli settlers in the West Bank or dwelling in a refugee camp maybe to do this. Maybe it's too much to ask them to be involved in this, but there could be a distribution of labor here. And it's very important also to understand that you are changing the vehicles that push you into the new direction. For 75 years, it was Israel, the pro-Israeli lobby, the pro-Israeli Western lobby that decided what is peace, what is peace agenda, what should be discussed. The Palestinians have to lead kind of exclusively now. They have to lead the way in answering all the questions that are connected to the future of Israel and Palestine, including how would the Jewish community be defined in a post-colonial Palestine? Because definitely the Zionist definition of Judaism is incompatible with a free Palestine for everyone between the river and the sea. Thank you.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thank you. Yes. Priya, would you like to just come back?

Priyamvada Gopal

Yeah, let me just briefly say that I think, and I think on this, Ilan and I clearly agree that all cultures, all regions have, you know, ideas of coexistence that are different from the hegemonic ones, that there are traditions of, you know, counter-tyranny, anti-injustice everywhere. And I think we have to recover and draw on these traditions. And Edward Said said this very clearly in his posthumously published Humanism and Democratic Criticism, which we, of course, don't have democracy really anywhere. We have a kind of ballot box politics. In order for us to have real democracy, we have to draw on traditions of countering injustice and that these exist all over the world and they have to be put in dialogue. I firmly believe that. And he does this, you know, even as he says, I've left Foucault and Lyotard behind and this is what, you know, what I want to turn to.

Yesterday, I was at the National Museum of African American History in Washington, D.C. and it's a very, very difficult museum to spend the day in because it's, you know, it gives you this very painful history from the 15th century onwards. But I was struck in that, you know, the entirety of the exhibition, of the back-and-forth movement of oppression and resistance, and resistance does produce change. I think we should not underestimate, even in the face of the kind of monolith and the aggression and the

violence that is around us, that people have won victories through resistance. And I was looking at the ways in which, you know, Martin Luther King was described by the state as kind of, you know, producing violent disorder, and this is not the way to resist, and this is not the way to do it, which is exactly what students are being told, you know, in multiple places. But the fact is that we have to resist. There is actually no other choice. And that whatever happens, you have to meet it with resistance and with a determination to put justice and equality in the world in however we manage to do it. So I think we have to resist. And that is the hope that we get from the situation in Palestine, but also elsewhere.

Aasiya Lodhi

Thank you. Great note to end on. We can resist. That is the only way. So I'm afraid we've run out of time. We have to draw today's conversation to a close. Thank you so much to Priya Gopal and to Ilan Pappé for sharing such rich insights with us. Just going to run through some other thank yous. Thank you to Tayyab Amin and to Orsod Malik for their support in running this event. Thank you also to the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation and to Duke University Press for making this event possible. And of course, a massive thank you to all of you for joining us. You did ask in the chat, a recording will be made available in the next few weeks. Please sign up to our newsletter. Keep an eye on our social media channels to stay up to date. Do look at the Explore section of our website, which has a growing set of digital learning resources and where some of you also asked, could we please have the names of the scholars that were referenced. So we'll put those on there too. And we may also try to capture some of the comments because there were so many excellent comments and questions. And I'm sorry, we just couldn't get to all of them. That's stuarthallfoundation.org.

We are a small charity. Our programs would not be possible without support from our funders and friends. So if you enjoy our work, please help us continue building our program by making a one-time donation or by pledging a monthly gift to become a Friend. Please complete the donation form using the link in the chat box. Finally, please join us for the next Reading the Crisis conversation on the Neoliberal Revolution. That's on Monday, 24th June from 5.30pm UK time. Hope to see you there. Goodbye for now.