

Review of: "Reflections on Bordering, Micropolitics and Everyday Life in Peacebuilding Processes: Revisiting the Lingering Legacy of the 1949 Armistice Agreements"

Nassima Kaid¹

¹ Université de Sidi-Bel-Abbès (Djillali Liabès)

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The Essay has interesting points regarding the relationship between borders and peace-building after the 1949 Armistice agreements but needs clarification and revision prior to being acceptable for publication.

The article **may be published with the recommended corrections** regarding:

1. Style and formatting

Style, correctness of expression, notes and bibliographical references. It seems obvious that the authors have chosen APA 7th edition; yet, a lack of consistency has been noticed. The two footnotes are found by the end of the article right before the references. Unlike endnotes, footnotes are usually placed at the bottom of the same page. Page numbers are missing in some in-text citations.

For instance in page 05, **For Massumi, 'affect exceeds individuality. It resides in, and circulates within, material bodies. As he has observed, "the impersonal and transindividual dimensions of affect unsettle the notion of subject-centeredness, one that is traditionally seen as ontologically detached from matter' (2002, 10).** The first citation is incomplete and not referenced.

2. Content and argumentation

- The essay has dealt with interesting points regarding the establishment of borders between Palestine and Israel under the 1949 Armistice Agreements. It has significant potential and posits the core of an interesting connection between the concept of borders and peace-building. Talking about the discourses of war was compelling. The discourses of war do not comply with the situation in Palestine because of the unbalanced power and the non-existence of a Palestinian army as opposed to the Israeli army which is considered the fourth powerful army in the world.
- In page 03, the theory of Anzaldua's Borderlands is used in the literature review. The part seems lacking more clarifications because Anzaldua considers borders as unpleasant places to be as they reproduce "a shock culture, a border culture, a third nation, a closed country." Thus living in the Borderlands is being in a constant state of non-belonging, difference and alienation i.e. living constantly in a place of contradiction, violence and exploitation (Al-hayali & Atallah, 2022, 52). The authors have somehow failed to explore this idea and connect it to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

- In page 04, the authors move from discussing Israeli separation wall as a way of Palestinians' subjugation and limitation of movement to Transnational feminism without making a clear connection between the idea of borderlands and the different types of feminism mentioned in that part. What seems less worked out throughout are the specifics of the connection that the authors bring up.
- In page 08, a footnote on the bi-lateral Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement might be need to inform readers about its objectives.
- The Armistice Agreement talks at Rhodes were mainly violated by the Israeli who did not respect any of the agreements signed from their invasion of Palestine by taking away lands from its original inhabitants. The Palestinians were devoid of all political and human rights and the best exemple is the war of October 7th where no one have succeeded in stopping the genocide of Israelis and bringing help to the Palestinian civilians. Sometimes it is like the research is a bit biased especially when the authors have chosen to rely on Löwenheim's (2014) analysis on the way human beings and their daily lives are marked by the disparate positions created by the geography of conflict (p.10). Is there any specific reason for this choice? Does his experience and trip reflect reality as it is lived by both parties?
- In page 09, the authors underlined this fragment a wider strategy of reinforcing Jewish control. Is there any reason for that?
- In page 11, the authors mentioned the Arab-Israeli conflict; however, we generally refer to the Arab-Israeli wars as a broader conflict while the focus at this point is on the borders set between Israel (the occupier) and Palestine (the occupied).