

Resistance and Rebellion: Philosophical Approach

Rezak Karima^{1,2}

¹University of Mohamed Ben Ahmed - Oran 2, Algeria.

^{1,2}Research Unit in Human Sciences: Philosophical, Social and Human Studies - University of Mohamed Ben Ahmed – Oran2, Algeria.

Keywords:

Free Will,
Freedom,
Memory,
Occupation,
Palestinian cause.
Rebellion,
Resistance,
Revolution,
Right.

Article History:

Received: 11 / 02 / 2026
Revised: 30 / 05 / 2026
Accepted: 17 / 06 / 2026
Published: 08 / 07 / 2026

Abstract. This reading examines the act of resistance as a human and intellectual experience that is founded first and foremost on refusal, understood as the initial moment from which human awareness emerges through the rejection of oppression and injustice. Hence, drawing on Albert Camus's paradox of rebellion as an expression of humanity's aspiration for a just and equitable order, it raises the question of the legitimacy of moving from refusal to revolutionary action, along with the debate surrounding the legitimacy of violence and its justifications within the struggle for dignity and liberation. The reading also highlights the profound relationship between resistance and memory, considering memory as the force that preserves the continuity of resistance and enriches it with meaning across time. Throughout the reading, the Palestinian cause is presented as a living example in which all these dimensions converge, where the concept of resistance regains its effectiveness and symbolic significance in the face of attempts at extermination, displacement, and the suffering endured by prisoners and refugees.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is undeniable that the intellectual and epistemological relationship between philosophy, rebellion, and resistance is a subject worthy of reflection and discussion. For, philosophy itself is a form of resistance, it represents an intellectual weapon that fosters awareness and free critical thinking among individuals by providing them with the intellectual capacity to understand, analyze, and ultimately act that is by encouraging them toward resistance and rebellion, whatever their point of departure or chosen path. As Albert Camus pointed out, even the simplest form of rebellion and disobedience, by virtue of a remarkable paradox, expresses an aspiration toward order. Rebellion is therefore a healthy sign within society and a means of seeking truth while exploring its possible paths and alternatives. It may also be regarded as a source of inspiration for philosophers and thinkers, motivating them to understand human impulses and the forces that shape and drive individual behavior. Thus, if philosophy inspires rebellion and resistance, then these in turn endow philosophical thought with depth and vitality, directing it toward liberation and change, which makes philosophy a cornerstone in the construction of just and free societies. Today, the concept of resistance retrieves its effectiveness and its symbolic and semantic power in light of the genocide, destruction, and displacement inflicted upon the Palestinian people. Since, the Palestinian prisoner, the refugee, the displaced person, the persecuted individual, the martyr in short, the human being has become an icon and an exemplary embodiment of resistance, that is understood as the preservation and protection of a right; it signifies the inseparable bond between a right and its rightful holder, a right that cannot be extinguished either by the passage of time or by policies that seek to impose a *fait accompli*. If this is indeed the case, how can an individual become a resister within the public sphere? How does resistance move from a moment of emotional reaction to the realm of duty and defense? And upon what stakes and resources can resistance rely in light of contemporary transformations and the new forms of domination that characterize our modern world?

Building upon this problematic, we hypothesize that resistance is neither a fixed act nor a single form of confrontation. Conversely, it is a continually evolving historical practice that changes in accordance with the transformation of its methods and instruments. We further hypothesize that contemporary political, technological, and media developments have broadened the concept of resistance, so that it is no longer confined to direct military confrontation but now encompasses cultural, symbolic, media, and economic forms of resistance. We also assume that the Palestinian experience represents a contemporary model that reveals the plurality of resistance practices, ranging from armed resistance to cultural and symbolic resistance, as well as media and digital resistance, among others. This demonstrates that resistance is not defined by a single form but by its capacity for transformation and innovation.

In discussing these hypotheses, we have adopted a critical analytical approach by deconstructing the concept of resistance and uncovering its various dimensions. We have also drawn upon the descriptive method, necessitated by the need to examine the manifestations of resistance in the contemporary context, as well as the historical approach, which enables an understanding of the transformations that have affected the tools, discourses, and strategies of resistance.

This study aims to demonstrate that resistance is fundamentally a human act associated with the defense of freedom and dignity rather than with any particular form of confrontation, and that its success depends upon its ability to continually reinvent its methods in response to changing realities. It also seeks to show that Palestinian resistance, despite its diverse forms and manifestations, constitutes a significant model of the continuity of resistance and its capacity to transform conditions of subjugation into a permanent possibility for action and change, thereby making resistance a horizon of liberation and an ongoing practice for the production of meaning and the affirmation of free human existence.

2. REJECTION AS A FOUNDATION OF RESISTANCE

Resistance and rebellion are quintessentially human acts, inseparable from the human condition itself. For, there can be no resistance except on the part of a living being, alive both in body and in spirit; whoever loses the capacity to resist has in a profound sense, lost life itself. If resistance is thus inherent to life, its earliest manifestation does not appear in organized or fully developed action but rather in the initial moment of refusal, when an individual declares an unwillingness to submit to what they perceive as unjust. It is therefore essential to understand the subtle relationship between resistance and rebellion and the way both are intertwined with the concept of right. What does it mean to be a rebel? Albert Camus maintains that "rebellion is the course of action of a person conscious of his rights." (Albert, pp. 5-7) In other words, rebellion does not arise from ignorance of one's rights but from awareness that these rights have been violated and denied. The first expression of such awareness is embodied in the very act of refusal, articulated through the word "No." Accordingly, Camus describes the rebel as "a man who says no... A slave who has taken orders all his life suddenly decides that he cannot stomach a new command." (Albert, p. 1) Resistance, therefore, begins with the ability to say "No" and is grounded in human awareness of the oppression and tyranny inflicted upon them. For, not every submission is destiny, nor is every silence a virtue. In this regard, Camus regards rebellion as an inevitable and necessary response whenever individuals become aware of and conscious of their rights, for "right is what is sought." (Collectivework, 2007, p. 47) Hence, the distinction between rebellion and resistance becomes clear, and rebellion is the initial moment of refusal, the declaration that the existing reality is unacceptable whereas resistance is the transformation of that refusal into organized action directed toward a specific objective. Seeing that rebellion begins with "No"; resistance adds to that "No" a vision of what must be defended and restored. Rebellion is therefore the foundational condition of resistance, for resistance can arise only where there is a consciousness of injustice. A person who does not feel the weight of tyranny, who does not perceive what has been taken from them in terms of freedom and dignity, can scarcely become a resisting subject. Correspondingly, as Abd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi observed, "A nation that does not feel the pain of despotism is a nation that does not deserve freedom." For, according to him, collective deprivation of freedom is what enables people to understand freedom and long for it, just as injustice teaches us the meaning of justice. This understanding of freedom extends to the rebel's exercise of free action throughout the journey toward liberation. Resultantly, the act of resistance cannot be understood apart from the system of values and concepts that confer upon it its meaning and legitimacy foremost among them freedom, liberation, justice, and equity, as well as rights and security. Resistance is not merely the rejection of injustice and oppression; it is also an aspiration toward a more just and dignified human condition. Indeed, "Resistance may well be the historical phenomenon, the event that unleashes the energies of peoples, corrects the course of history, and becomes the necessity that provokes nations to make choices, leading them to adopt alternatives other than those imposed by external powers, internal domination, and external oppression." (Collectivework, 2007, p. 41) Within this context, the values and standards governing the life of peoples can only be understood as expressions of a collective historical will embodied in a form of consciousness and triumph. This is affirmed by Nietzsche when he states: "The table of virtues hangs over every people. Behold it is the table of their victories. Behold it is the voice of their will to power." Is it not time, then, for the Arab peoples today to hang their own table of virtues? Is it not time for the Arab peoples to achieve victory? Can we, perhaps, reverse the Kantian question from "Are we worthy of happiness?" to "Are we worthy of victory?"

The equation of victory requires a hero capable of achieving what is difficult, exceptional, and sacred, as Nietzsche described. Be that as it may, this equation cannot be reduced to a single heroic figure; rather, it opens itself to diverse forms through which the act of resistance is expressed according to the context in which it is employed, which places us before multiple forms of resistance that permeate the public sphere: resistance against ignorance and fanaticism, resistance to extremist ideologies and imperial systems, resistance to epidemics, resistance to corruption, feminist resistance, resistance to political despotism, and resistance to the various forms of war. Despite their diversity, these forms of resistance share a common denominator: the defense of everything that threatens human life, regardless of the nature of that threat. This is what makes resistance both innate and profoundly human. For, resistance has always been present in human experience in a direct and spontaneous manner, its emergence as a philosophical concept came relatively late, and it became a philosophical problem only when debate arose concerning the individual's right to refuse and to withhold consent, giving rise to the question: Is resistance a legitimate right, or does it constitute a challenge to the established order? Consequently, the act of resistance was articulated within the framework of rights and legitimacy only in the modern period, particularly following the transformations inaugurated by the French Revolution of 1789, the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen recognized resistance as a fundamental right, alongside liberty, property, and security. Yet a concept as profound and consequential as resistance necessarily possesses historical, religious, and intellectual antecedents. Furthermore, since resistance to oppression is determined neither by religious affiliation nor by ethnicity or sectarian identity, but rather by the very nature of the human spirit, which rejects enslavement and strives for freedom, the history of resistance reveals numerous rebels and revolutionaries who became enduring symbols of resistance, among them is Spartacus, the Roman slave, who embodied one of the earliest historical paradigms of resistance against human enslavement, as well as figures such as Lalla Fatma N'Soumer and Emir Abdelkader, whose struggles likewise stand as enduring symbols of resistance. Rosa Parks, who's famous "No" became one of the most powerful in history, ignited the resistance of African Americans and helped bring an end to racial segregation. Equally, William Wallace became a national symbol of resistance and freedom in Scotland. Ernesto "Che" Guevara transformed refusal into organized revolutionary action, while Abd al-Rahman al-Kawakibi laid the intellectual foundations for resistance particularly resistance against the despotic state during the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid II through his book *The Nature of Despotism and the Struggle Against Enslavement*, in which he analyzed the nature of tyranny and justified resistance to it. As he wrote: "The despot is the enemy of truth, the enemy of freedom, and their killer. Truth is the father of all virtues, freedom their mother and the common people are orphaned children asleep, knowing nothing. The scholars are their mature brothers: if they awaken them, they will rise; if they call upon them, they will respond; otherwise, their sleep will continue until death." (Abdul Rahman, 2006, p. 17) Nonetheless, this characterization is intended not so much to define resistance as to analyze the conditions under which it operates within reality. What unites these diverse figures is that, in each case, "refusal" did not remain confined to the level of individual reaction but instead evolved along paths that oscillated between direct resistance and intellectual resistance, which clearly demonstrate that the history of resistance is, at its core, a history of the plurality and transformation of forms of rebellion. This becomes even more evident in the living historical experience of Palestinian resistance, which divulges a continuous transformation in the forms of resistance in response to the changing structures of domination themselves. For, during the period of the British Mandate, resistance was expressed primarily through popular uprisings and armed struggle, most notably during the Arab Revolt of 1936, which combined a general strike with direct confrontation. Following the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 and the displacement of a large portion of the Palestinian

people into exile, resistance increasingly assumed a Fedayeen and military character. Further, the First Palestinian Intifada (1987) marked a significant turning point by restoring the centrality of popular resistance through civil disobedience, economic boycotts, and grassroots community organization. Equally important, in subsequent years the forms of struggle expanded considerably to include cultural, media, and legal resistance, as literature, collective memory, and even artistic expression became means of confronting attempts at erasure and exclusion. Since its inception, the Zionist movement has made extensive attempts to reshape the historical narrative of Palestine by erasing the historical presence of the Palestinian people and minimizing the depth of their attachment to their land. It is here that art assumes a vital role, revealing what official narratives have sought to erase and conceal. As has been said, "Art is a truer witness to history, for many hidden historical truths have remained buried in the darkness of history, and it is art that has brought those truths to light, because art is the expression of a people by themselves, for themselves." (Collectivework, 2007, p. 380) In this sense, art constitutes a living archive that documents the Nakba and displacement, while serving as one of the foremost expressions of symbolic and cultural resistance. At the present time there are the digital revolution and the widespread use of social media, which have transferred the practice of resistance into new arenas; these platforms have enabled the documentation of violations, the dissemination of events as they unfold, and the exposure of the practices of occupation before global public opinion. In doing so, they have mobilized broad forms of cross-border solidarity, allowing resistance to transcend its geographical boundaries. In view of the fact that, harnessing technology in the service of the objectives of resistance shifts the sphere of resistance beyond its traditional geographical boundaries into a condition of deterritorialization and diffusion, it may also bring about a profound transformation in the very concept of resistance and in its quantitative and qualitative dimensions, including the nature of its objectives, the arenas in which it operates, and the extent of the impact it can achieve (Collectivework, 2007, p. 62). Resistance eventually remains an act of initiative and agency. Ergo, nothing is without value in the practice of resistance. Condemnation is resistance; speaking out and expressing refusal constitute contributions to the process of resistance. Boycott is resistance. Giving voice to the oppressed is resistance. Exposing the reality and practices of the tyrant, the occupier, and the aggressor is likewise resistance. Even refusing to become accustomed to injustice or to accept it as normal is itself an act of resistance. Thence, the Palestinian experience demonstrates with remarkable clarity that resistance has never been a single pattern or a fixed form. In fact, it is a dynamic practice that continually reinvents its methods as the conditions of struggle evolve, ultimately in defense of the fundamental human principle that "freedom is preferable to life itself." (Abdul Rahman, 2006, p. 45)

3. REVOLUTION AND THE LEGITIMACY OF VIOLENCE

The term revolution encompasses every act that brings about a radical, genuine, and comprehensive transformation of political, economic, and social conditions, as Karl Marx famously observed, revolutions are "the locomotives of history," human history is, in large measure, a history of revolutions. Besides, the Arab uprisings constituted a significant revolutionary event in the twenty-first century. Notwithstanding, it is important not to confuse revolution with political violence or armed violence, which is often governed by political and even international considerations, as in the cases of the Taliban or ISIS. Thence, the defining characteristic of revolution, distinguishing it from other forms of violence, is that it is a comprehensive mass movement rather than the action of a particular elite, as is the case with a coup d'état. Its objective is the radical transformation of existing conditions, and it may be carried out through the use of violence or the threat of violence. From this perspective, Thomas Greene describes revolution as "a change in the administrative apparatus of government, its structure, and its functions by means not authorized under the existing constitution, involving violence or the threat of its use." (Thomas, 1986, p. 19) Further, revolutionary forces achieve victory only when they wrest state power from the ruling class and suppress its resistance. This raises a fundamental question: must revolutions derive their legitimacy from constitutional or legal authority, or is the revolution itself the source of legitimacy? This question becomes even more pressing when one considers the argument that the people's right to revolution is a legitimate right to resist tyranny, even when the rules governing such resistance are unwritten, deriving their legitimacy from historical reality itself. As it has been argued, "The people's right to revolution is legitimate, and the right to resist tyranny is legitimate. Thus, the legitimate rules are unwritten; yet they remain superior to the written laws recognized as legally valid." (Dr. Sadiq, 1990, p. 274) Every revolution is a logical consequence of rebellion; yet it may also constitute an imperfect application of its very essence. Besides, such an application can ultimately lead to outcomes that are contrary, and even antithetical, to the spirit of rebellion itself, whereby freedoms are restricted rather than expanded. Conceivably the various interpretations and implications associated with the Arab revolutions, or what came to be known as the Arab Spring, seem to confirm this issue. Secondly, revolutionary consciousness is usually linked to favorable material and political conditions, which together create the circumstances necessary for revolution, were these factors truly what ignited the Arab Spring uprisings? In reality, it is difficult to assert with certainty that these uprisings were entirely spontaneous or sudden, or that what occurred fell completely outside the realm of prior planning. In this regard, Tayyib Tizini had previously warned of "the danger of the global Zionist influx toward the Arab world with the aim of dismantling it and removing it from history by integrating it into what is currently called the New Middle East, or the New and Revised Middle East." (Tayeb, 2005, p. 84) According to this perspective, these revolutions were only attempts to dismantle the state and create conditions of chaos after the failure of direct warfare in the Afghan and Iraqi models, while state terrorism emerged as one of their most prominent consequences.

Today, the concept of terrorism has assumed an elastic and elusive character that makes it difficult to define precisely. This ambiguity is often regarded as intentional, allowing the term to be adapted to the interests of major imperial powers that grant legitimacy to what serves their objectives while denying it to those who oppose them. For, terrorism is therefore a profoundly political concept, its application is not governed primarily by universal legal or ethical standards; rather, its meaning is determined by the contexts in which it is employed, the discourses that produce it, and the interests that shape its usage. From this perspective, terrorism takes multiple forms and manifestations, among the most controversial is state terrorism, understood as the organized use of violence by state authorities which is frequently invoked in discussions concerning Israeli actions in the Gaza Strip, which some describe as having become an open-air prison since 2006. Hence, we find ourselves confronting a historical moment in which the problem of violence is posed with exceptional intensity, as though a new era were being inaugurated one in which the boundaries governing the permissibility of killing are expanding on a global scale which reflect a profound decline in the presence and effectiveness of universal human values and their reproduction under increasingly distorted conditions. Does the abandonment of these human values not amount to the inauguration of a new form of barbarism, characterized by the rule of force and the law of the jungle? If this is terrorism, then how are we to distinguish between the resistance fighter and the terrorist? And if occupation itself is brutal, should we expect resistance to be beautiful?

The war on Gaza has exposed a profound crisis at the level of ethical discourse and international law. For, the West not only

supports the Israeli colonial project but also condemns any position supportive of the Palestinians under the label of anti-Semitism. Western media insist on telling us that the resistance seeks to destroy Israel, while the same media conceal from us the images of Israel's destruction of Palestinian land and of the Palestinian people, as though Israel's right to exist were equivalent to its right to exterminate the Palestinian people.

"The horizon of a shared world has never ceased to recede as the world itself has become much smaller. In the absence of the living word, the idea through which reason, law, and morality open the path to human liberation has increasingly lost its credibility." (Achille, 2001, p. 72) Is not holding an entire people hostage under the constant threat of violence, killing, and intimidation itself a form of terrorism? Israeli policy in its war on Gaza is based on three fundamental elements that indicate we are confronted with state terrorism: the targeting of civilians, particularly women and children; the destruction of residential buildings and essential infrastructure; and the deprivation of every means necessary for sustaining life, including food, water, medicine, and electricity. The purpose of this policy is to eliminate the resistance while rendering Palestinian lives expendable in the face of international complicity and Arab silence. Contrastingly, Western powers have condemned the resistance movement and labeled it a terrorist organization, while deliberately disregarding the historical realities of Palestine and the relevant principles of international law. As has been observed: "In their modern history, the Arabs have endured repeated humiliations, such as the prolonged blockade of Iraq, which lasted for more than ten years... the continuation of daily air raids and bombardments... and the acceptance of the blockade without any Arab regime daring to break it, until the Arab homeland itself risked becoming one vast Iraq, with its skies, seas, surroundings, and coastlines under siege. The objective was the military destruction of Iraq, the fragmentation of the Arabs, and the weakening of the northern front after the encirclement of Iran, in preparation for the liquidation of the Palestinian cause." (Collectivework, 2007, p. 28) Within this context, what occurred in Iraq does not appear as an isolated event but rather as part of a broader process of reshaping the Arab region, a process whose contours are clearly manifested in the Palestinian case, where both the people and the land are subjected to destruction, and Palestinian existence itself has become perceived as a burden upon the occupation. Consequently, the occupying entity no longer finds it necessary even to restrain its violence; instead, it has institutionalized a network of repressive practices that includes the widespread deployment of occupation forces, surveillance, arrests, and restrictions on movement, it is a war against people who have suddenly, and without prior warning, been transformed into suspects and accused persons without ever being brought to trial.

This Hitlerian and fascist policy directed against the Palestinian body through its marginalization, confinement, breaking, and mutilation, and ultimately by forcing it into an existence under siege, enclosed by barbed wire reflects a broader system of domination, as has been observed: "Humanity in a cage is Palestine in general and Gaza in particular, both of which have become the defining symbol par excellence. They constitute one of the greatest laboratories for a system of brutality in the process of technological completion, a system that aspires to become global... This regime of brutality is founded upon the deliberate fragmentation of spaces rendered uninhabitable, and upon the relentless shattering of bodies threatened with dismemberment, compelled to live in pits, and at times beneath the rubble, within the fissures and cracks of environments exposed to every form of devastation." (Achille, 2001, p. 209) History also bears witness to extreme situations in which the adoption of terror has been regarded as an unavoidable evil, as has been noted: "Jewish groups resorted to violence when the British occupied Palestine. In 1946, the Zionist Irgun organization carried out the bombing of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem... In 1947, the same organization detonated a car bomb near Damascus Gate in the Old City of Jerusalem, killing twenty civilians. Such attacks continued until the British withdrew. In 1948, the Stern Gang assassinated the United Nations mediator Count Bernadotte, these acts of terrorism contributed to the establishment of the State of Israel. Today, it is the Palestinians' turn to adopt the very methods once used by the Jews in order to liberate the occupied territories." (Tahar, 2017, p. 31) Ignoring the reality of resistance may drive the weak, the oppressed, and the despairing toward terrorism as a means of liberating their homeland from occupation. For while resistance embodies honor and nobility, terrorism embodies cowardice and baseness. Yet the more fundamental question remains: How long will the Palestinian continue to face a future in which the only alternatives are to become a corpse or a martyr? Under today's conditions of brutality, killing ceases to be an exception, and war is presented as the supreme manifestation of human existence "an inquiry into life, but from the standpoint of its destructive power." (Benjamin, 1991, pp. 57–81) This signifies the triumph of the logic that destruction may be pursued without limit (Achille, 2001, p. 17). In the Penal Colony, Franz Kafka portrays the invention of a unique torture machine whose function is to generate pain by inscribing words onto the human body with needles, only for the machine ultimately to turn upon its own creator. This image closely resembles the condition of the Israeli army insofar as, in its attempt to subjugate and humiliate the Palestinians, it has also inflicted harm upon itself. Its self-inflicted moral injury has exceeded the suffering it sought to impose upon the Palestinians, who achieved a heroic victory simply by enduring, and by surviving despite policies of persecution designed to break their collective will and extinguish their desire to live.

4. RESISTANCE AND MEMORY

Based on the foregoing, it is important to move to another dimension of resistance, namely memory, as the domain in which the traces of resistant action are preserved. For, memory "is not merely a general capacity or inclination to retain; preservation, forgetting, and remembering are all phenomena that belong to the historical formation of human beings and are part of their history and culture." Resistance, for that reason, does not end with the act itself; rather, it extends through time by means of memory, which preserves what has occurred and continually reconstructs its meaning. This is affirmed by Paul Ricoeur, who argues that "memory is not merely the retrieval of the past but its reconstruction." (Idris, 2020, p. 419) Due to the fact that memory is "the most formidable adversary of history," it becomes a field of struggle. Since October 7, the Israeli war machine has waged a war not only against demography and geography but also against memory itself. In his book *Culture and Resistance*, Edward Said emphasizes the significance and power of memory as a collective instrument for preserving identity, he refers to what he calls "unorganized memory," since the Palestinian people possess neither a state nor a centralized institutional authority. Yet, as he observes, if one enters the home of any Palestinian, one is likely to find objects such as the key to a family house, letters, official documents, title deeds, photographs, or newspaper clippings, items carefully preserved to keep alive the memory of a period when "our existence was collective and cohesive." (Edward, 2006, p. 161)

Therefore, the past remains connected to the traces that preserve it and prevent it from disappearing or fading away, it is these traces that make it possible to remain in contact with the past and to come to know it. In this way, memory becomes a fortress against historical erasure. Since the spirit of resistance lies in refusing to forget that which does not lapse with the passage of time namely rights, it establishes a living memory that resists both forgetting and obliteration. Furthermore, language, or even a particular mode of speech, is itself a great repository of memory that must be preserved and actively used, for it carries the past forward into the present and then into the future, safeguarding it from disappearance or from slipping into the abyss of oblivion

(Edward, 2006, p. 161). Hence, as Milan Kundera observed, the struggle of human beings against power is ultimately a struggle of memory against forgetting, an important question deserves our attention: Has the collective Arab memory failed to recall and interpret the lessons of history? Can we still depend on this collective memory to alter the balance of power today or in the future? Can the factors of a shared destiny, religion, language, and Arab identity still be regarded as significant forces in supporting the Palestinian cause and our causes more generally? More importantly, do we still aspire to a common Arab future? What appears evident is that Arab identity no longer signifies much beyond the use of a common language, and that language may be all that remains shared among Arab peoples. This suggests that, for future generations, Arab identity will no longer be experienced as a nationalist struggle or a religious calling. Consequently, Arabs must determine for themselves the form that their future Arab identity will take, since the ultimate criterion of their continued existence lies solely in their capacity to endure and survive in a globalized world, especially if their revolutions amount to little more than events of shame and promises of achievements that neither have been nor will be fulfilled.

5. CONCLUSION

In the Palestinian experience, resistance derives its meaning not merely from being a reaction to occupation, but from being an existential and historical structure that is continually renewed within the context of the struggle. In the Palestinian case, refusal is not a passing attitude but a foundational act that reshapes the relationship of the Palestinian people to their imposed reality and transforms suffering into the energy of historical resistance. Within this process, the structural violence of occupation intersects with multiple forms of resistance that range between civil steadfastness, political action, and direct confrontation. On that account, the question of violence in this context cannot be separated from the reality of ongoing colonialism and its unequal conditions. Thence, memory emerges as a central element in the continuity of resistance, preserving the cohesion of Palestinian identity in the face of attempts at erasure and dispossession, and transforming both personal and collective history into a symbolic force that sustains acts of defiance and steadfastness. Hence, memory is not invoked merely as the past; rather, it is lived as a daily reality under siege, making it a living testimony to the ability of peoples to transform pain into meaning and suffering into a form of historical survival.

REFERENCES

- Abd al-Rahman, A.-K. (2006). *The nature of despotism and the downfall of enslavement* (1st ed.). Al-Jamal Publications.
- Abd al-Rahman, A.-K. (2006). *The nature of despotism and the downfall of enslavement*. Al-Jamal Publications.
- Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the postcolony*. University of California Press.
- Camus, A. (n.d.). *The rebel* (3rd ed.; N. Reda, Trans.). Oueidat Publications.
- Benjamin, W. (1991). *Theories of German fascism*. Verso.
- Collective Work. (2007). *The culture of resistance: Proceedings of the Sixteenth Philosophical Symposium organized by the Egyptian Philosophical Society at Cairo University* (1st ed.). Center for Arab Unity Studies.
- Al-Azzawi, S. A. (1990). *Political sociology: Its foundations and dimensions*. Directorate of the House of Books.
- Said, E. W. (2006). *Culture and resistance* (A. El-D. Zeina, Trans.). Dar Al-Adab.
- Nassib, I. (2020). *Naqouri's predictions and her sisters* (1st ed.). Jubail, Saudi Arabia.
- Ben Jelloun, T. (2017). *Terrorism as you didn't explain it to your son* (H. J. Trans.). Dar Al Saqi.
- Tizini, T. (2005, August). Questions of Arab democratic reform. *Al-Mustaqbal Al-Arabi*, (318).
- Greene, T. H. (1986). *Comparative revolutionary movements: A study in the theory of justice* (T. Al-Hamad, Trans.). Dar Al-Tali'ah.