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Abstract

Six recent non-fiction graphic novels about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict are analyzed in order to understand how narratives are constructed and presented about each community. What emerges when considered together is that while complex narratives that challenge hegemonic stereotypes are depicted about the community that the authors favour, their depiction of ‘the other’ often relies on either stereotypes or omissions and these depictions present single stories of entire communities. I argue how the inclusion of alternative narratives within graphic novels can enhance the text, provide opportunities for readers to gain deeper knowledge about the conflict, and begin to appreciate and recognize the rights of the other can emerge.
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Getting Graphic: Depictions of Single Stories in Non-Fiction Graphic Novels about Israelis and Palestinians

Matt Reingold

In her now famous TED Talk from 2009, Chimimanda Ngozie Adichie cautioned her listeners about the dangers of the single story. Adichie shared with her audience how growing up in Nigeria, she developed a single story about what literature could be, based on her exposure to British authors who wrote about snow, the weather, and apples. Her single story of literature did not include authors who wrote about experiences like her own: being a black, female, Nigerian who ate mangoes. Similarly, her college roommate in America had a single story about Nigerians that revolved around poverty, disadvantage, civil war, and misery. This single story was markedly different from the one that Adichie had of her own upbringing in which there was laughter, joy, love, family, and community.

Adichie (2009) extrapolated from her personal experiences to wider collective experiences. To do so, she explored the greater significance of what single stories do to our collective understandings of people and groups. The danger of the single story, cautions Adichie, is that it:

…creates stereotypes, and the problem with stereotypes is not that they are untrue, but that they are incomplete. They make one story become the only story … [They] rob people of dignity … [They] emphasize how we are different rather than how we are similar. (Adichie, 2009)

In the following essay, I will explore the danger of the single story with regards to non-fictional graphic novels about the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The conflict between Israelis and Palestinians is one of the most contentious in the world. Predating the birth of Israel itself in 1948, Palestinians and Jews began fighting over possession of land since the early 1900s. Since declaring itself independent in 1948, Israel has engaged in many major international conflicts alongside innumerable minor conflicts with Palestinians. At the core of the conflict are competing national narratives over who has the right to the land, and in more recent years, what responsibility Israel should have for resettling Palestinians who were displaced during the early years of the state.

Beginning with Joe Sacco’s Palestine which was published in 1993, there have been five additional graphic novels published in English that directly address the often-hostile relationship
that exists in the intractable conflict between the two groups. The non-fictional texts reflect a variety of different genres including journalism, autobiography, and travelogue. Each of the six graphic novels is disruptive and radical, in that each presents alternate narratives from the ones that are typically depicted in mainstream media, and the group introduces new understandings of either Israelis or Palestinians. The novels feature multiple stories, as each challenges the prevailing biases that permeate the media. At the same time, each also perpetuates the danger of the single story by reinforcing biases that describe only one side of the conflict; the absence of contrasting narratives leads to further entrenchment, partisanship, and conflict because a diversity of ethno-national voices is absent on the page. Furthermore, considered all together, the genre of non-fictional representations of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict reinforces the danger of the single story because each presents a portrait of the two communities as engaged in endless conflict and none of them paint the history of the regional peace initiatives, or even individual narratives of positive collaboration between Israelis and Palestinians.

Within the field of graphic novel studies, the topic of war and conflict includes a wide variety of different texts. These include more famous ones like Art Spiegelman’s (1996) seminal biography of his father’s Holocaust experiences in *Maus* and Marjane Satrapi’s (2004) autobiography of growing up during the Iranian Revolution. Less well-known include Gene Luen Yang’s (2013) exploration of the Chinese Boxer Revolution in *Boxers & Saints*. Graphic novels about war tend to depict more than just the conflict; they provide insight into the nature of trauma and the ways that war impacts the lives of soldiers and citizens. Hillary Chute (2016) has argued that one of the reasons for why depictions of war have been so prevalent in graphic novels is their inclusion of the visual. In her study of trauma in graphic novels, she has written how “trauma does not always have to be disappearance; it can be plenitude, an excess of signification” by exploring “what it means to ‘picture’ suffering and trauma” (p. 5). Seeing becomes witnessing, which draws the reader into the event as a participant and not only a bystander.

To varying degrees, all six of the non-fictional graphic novels that will be analyzed in this paper take up the notions of trauma during and following conflict in Israel and the Palestinian territories. The texts are Jack Baxter, Joshua Faudem, and Koren Shadmi’s (2015) depiction of the April 30, 2003 suicide bombing at the Tel-Aviv bar Mike’s Place and its impact on its Jewish Israeli patrons in their graphic novel *Mike’s Place: A True Story of Love, Blues, and Terror in*
Tel Aviv, and Ari Folman’s (with artist David Polonsky, 2009) exploration of his complicity in harming defenceless Palestinians in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila during the First Lebanon War in September 1982 in Waltz with Bashir. Maltese-American graphic novelist Joe Sacco (2001, 2011) explores the ways that Palestinians have been victimized, harmed, and traumatized throughout their struggle for independence in both Palestine, his first work about the Palestinian people, and Footnotes in Gaza, his second and lengthier treatment about their struggles. The final two graphic novels feature Jewish Americans—Sarah Glidden (2010) and Harvey Pekar (2014)—who try to understand the nature of the conflict and the ways that the prolonged conflict have shaped how they have come to relate to Israel as components of their individual Jewish identities.

Since Adichie’s (2009) TED talk, the concept of the single story has been explored by a number of scholars who have applied her concept to other literary subjects. Erin Jessee (2017) has identified how amongst survivors of the 1994 Rwandan genocide, who try to reclaim their own experiences, there is a tendency to reject the means by which single stories are used to craft a homogenous and singular national narrative. Similarly, Catarina Martins (2011) has argued that the ways that single stories are used to demarcate the experiences of child soldiers prevents the children from being able to share and own their narratives. This paper explores how Adichie’s theory of the dangers of the single narrative can help develop an understanding for how graphic novels about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict simultaneously provide a multiplicity of voices and perspectives from one community alongside the presentation of singular narratives from another community. I argue that analyzing the texts through the lens of the single story reveals that while the authors and illustrators are able to foster new and critical thinking about one community, by ignoring stories of the other party in the conflict, they negate their narrative and make reconciliation even more fraught and difficult.

I have divided the essay into sections correlating to different ways that single narratives are presented in the graphic novels. In the first section I will consider four graphic novels that primarily illustrate complexity in the depictions of Jewish Israelis while paying minimal attention to complexity in the Palestinian community. In the second section, I will analyze Joe Sacco’s graphic novels about the Palestinian people and show how Sacco simultaneously featured the diversity of the Palestinian people while including minimal details that presented Israelis with the same type of complexity. In the concluding section, I will assess the six texts
together and analyze how as a cohesive grouping they reaffirm the single story narrative as a by-product of the stories that the authors and artists have chosen to feature, and consider how the texts model the ways that graphic novelists and readers can better understand communities that differ from their own.

**Texts that Primarily Focus on Jewish-Israeli Narratives**

**How to Understand Israel in Sixty Days or Less**

Sarah Glidden’s (2010) *How to Understand Israel in 60 Days or Less* chronicles Glidden’s experience as a secular American Jew who participates in a trip to Israel for young Jewish adults. Over the course of her almost two-week trip to Israel, Glidden challenges her own assumptions about the country. Beginning with a left-wing orientation that viewed any support of Israel as suspicious and a defense of perpetrators who oppress Palestinians, Glidden’s tour culminates in a recognition that Israel and its people are—like any society—more complex than the media coverage with which she was saturated in America.

During her time in Israel, Glidden (2010) challenged herself to move beyond her own pre-existing biases and to try to interact with Jewish Israelis. This was difficult for her given that her initial stance was that Israel is responsible for the failure to arrive at peace with the Palestinians. Glidden was particularly sensitive to the plight of the Palestinian people, and she believed that Israel was responsible for committing systematic oppression because of ethno-national prejudice and discrimination. As a result of meeting secular Israelis—who simultaneously modeled love and commitment to Israel as a Jewish state, coupled with staunch disagreement with specific Israeli policies and positions towards the Palestinian people—Glidden unexpectedly began to develop feelings of attachment to the country. Meeting tour guides, medics, and fellow trip participants who also wrestled with their Israel relationship led Glidden to come to understand that she can be both “sympathetic to the Israeli experience and be outraged by it” (Reingold, 2019a, p. 533).

One of the aesthetic ways that Glidden (2010) explored the newfound tension in her relationship with Israel was by illustrating herself as a participant in a court trial in which she played the role of judge, jury, prosecution, defense, and witness (Figure 1). By playing these roles simultaneously, Glidden visualized the struggle and inner tension that she faced as she tried to find ways to synthesize her new appreciation for Israel, with her pre-existing judgment of the country, and her continued belief that Israel must do more for the Palestinian people. In these
scenes, Glidden was doing more than just putting Israel on trial; by interrogating herself, she was also judging whether she was guilty of abandoning her own values and morals as a result of being a participant on a pro-Israel trip.

_Figure 1_. Glidden depicting herself as figures in a court trial, interrogating her relationship with Israel.

(Glidden, 2010, p. 27)

A further element to the sophistication that Glidden (2010) brought to her relationship with Israel was with how she eschewed simplification of the conflict into a digestible culminating position. Glidden uncomfortably—yet willingly—transitioned from a position of certainty about Israel to one of uncertainty, and this in itself rejected the simplistic ways that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been typically represented. Her dual positions of supporter and critic require complex navigation in order to balance these different stances, as she came to recognize legitimacy and authenticity in both Jewish and Palestinian narratives. Glidden’s evolution in her understanding of Israel has disrupted the narrative she had previously told herself about Israel, because she came to recognize that the conflict is far more complex than she had previously thought.

Despite her newfound understanding of secular Jewish attitudes towards Israel’s legitimacy and the complexities that are involved in this awareness, there are ways that Glidden (2010) simplified the dynamic that exists between Israelis and Palestinians. Most noticeably is
the absence of Palestinian and Arab presence within the text. She began her work by sharing with the readers her plans to visit the West Bank and to meet with Palestinians who have suffered as a result of mistreatment by Israelis. She wrote: “I think it’s our responsibility to check out the reality on the other side of the Green Line” (p. 17). Yet as her memoir evolved, she became less certain that she wanted to visit the West Bank because she thought it looked dangerous, and she was dissuaded from meeting with Palestinians by Jewish Israelis who defended Israeli policies without any evidence or justification for doing so. Eventually, Glidden met with only one Palestinian, and the meeting took place under the auspices of her Jewish tour group, resulting in an interaction that was carefully curated to present a particular type of Palestinian. In this interaction, the Palestinian spoke alongside Jewish Israelis about mutual forgiveness and reconciliation. The conversation did not address oppression, violence, persecution, or mistrust.

Palestinians are not the only people who are absent from the text. Nina Fischer (2015) has identified how even the majority of the people who are featured in the text are North American Jews. Fischer noted how there are more Orthodox Jews at the airport in America than are depicted in the rest of the graphic novel. Additionally, even though Glidden (2010) spoke at length about Israel, the overwhelming majority of these conversations took place with fellow American Jews and not Israeli Jews. Taken together, Glidden’s text models an engagement with Israel as seen through the lens of American Jews. While interacting with American Jews who have a contrasting political orientation to her own has shifted her understanding of the country, this newfound relationship was built on a foundation of relationships with non-Israelis. The critical absence of voices—Palestinian and Jewish-Israeli—is significant because it resulted in an incomplete understanding of the situation and the critical stakeholders who were directly involved in the conflict. Being able to return to America with greater awareness of the complexity is important and demonstrates the myriad ways non-Israeli Jews think about Israel, but Glidden’s work reaffirms the single story through the absence of unfiltered Palestinian voices and the presentation of American support of Israel.

Beyond the absence of the Palestinian experience, the Glidden (2010) text is also absent any genuine dialogue and confrontation that exists as part of a conversation about Israelis and Palestinians. While it is true that the conflict was discussed, throughout all of the conversations in the text, one of the speakers—most often Glidden—was presented as the learner and her
interlocutor was the expert. These dialogues involve a power imbalance and even though Glidden interjected challenges into the dialogue based on her pre-existing knowledge, she invariably deferred to their expertise. The text failed to model effective dialogue in which two highly knowledgeable people with contrasting stances share those positions with others. This absence reaffirms the singular narrative of Israel in which one position is elevated over another and the other is denigrated or denied a chance for authentic and legitimate representation. The danger of this single story is that the reader is denied the opportunity to consider both positions and make an informed decision, in addition to not seeing two simultaneously passionate speakers present arguments that each wholeheartedly believes in. This absence makes reconciliation impossible for it is only through this type of awareness that understanding of the other can emerge.

**Mike’s Place**

Like Sarah Glidden’s (2010) *How to Understand Israel in 60 Days or Less*, writers Jack Baxter, Ari Faudem, and illustrator Koren Shadmi’s (2015) *Mike’s Place: A True Story of Love, Blues and Terror in Tel-Aviv* also revolved around a North American’s trip to Israel. Despite this similar originating detail, the contents of their experiences differ greatly. Whereas Glidden was an unmarried twenty-something American Jew attending a guided tour, Baxter was a married, thirty-something non-Jew who was in Israel to film a documentary about Mike’s Place, a Tel-Aviv bar that prided itself on being an apolitical place to listen to good music.

Baxter’s (Baxter, Faudem, & Shadmi, 2015) initial premise for his film was to tell the story of Mike’s Place and the cast of characters who frequented the bar regularly in 2003, during the Second Palestinian Intifada. When describing the appeal of Mike’s Place, Gal, one its owners explained how “people are sick and tired of politics … Israeli is more than conflict and politics. Mike’s Place is the real Israel—the best part of the Middle East” (p. 16-17). In order to understand the appeal of Mike’s Place, Baxter interviewed native Israelis as well as recent immigrants. He asked questions about why they would want to stay in Israel despite the tense environment and the escalating conflict. Baxter’s plan to show a kinder and gentler side to Israel was disrupted when a suicide bomber detonated a bomb at Mike’s Place on April 30, 2003, killing three and wounding fifty—including Baxter. Baxter traced the impact of the bombing on his interviewees and reflected on the destructive ways of terrorism within a society. Baxter also documented how the bar’s owners worked tirelessly in order to reopen it within a week of the
bombing; their labors were a testament to their belief in the bar’s importance as a symbol for perseverance. The inclusion of this narrative spoke to the ways that Baxter recognized the different ways that Israelis experience terror in their country.

Throughout the course of the work, Baxter (Baxter, Faudem, & Shadmi, 2015) uncovered layers of complexity within Israeli society and effectively documented the daily minutiae of life during the Second Intifada. While the suicide bombing was sandwiched between his exploration of Israeli society, Baxter showed how acts of terrorism did not come to define Israeli society and how regular and average Israelis lived during the waves of violence. On the surface, Baxter’s conversations and depictions of Israeli society were benign. There were numerous conversations about love, relationships, and entrepreneurship, and yet their continued presence even after the bombing demonstrated complexity by presenting readers with an Israel they did not expect. This was an Israel in which religious and secular Jewish Israelis discussed more than war, the life of a soldier, and the relationship between Israelis and Palestinians. This was an Israel where music, food, and love were the bedrock of a community. Baxter’s depictions of Israeli society reflected Chute’s (2016) observations about other war-based graphic novels in how…

…while [the] work is driven by such traumatic events, these events are not isolated; [it] also bears witness through words and images to the everyday – to the ordinary and to the scenes of enunciation that produce the acts of witness … Motivated by crisis, they bear witness to lived experience that is often shaped by crisis but is not necessarily fully dictated by it. (p. 29)

In his seminal analysis of the comics form, Scott McCloud (2014) postulated that the more abstract a face is, the more easily the reader is able to envision himself in that narrative. Conversely, faces that are rich in specific detail make it more difficult for the reader to see themselves in the specific story. In Mike’s Place, Shadmi illustrated all of the people in rich and specific detail. Shadmi’s artistic choice reflected the uniqueness of the story that was being told. It was not a story about the reader or a story that could be abstracted or generalized. It was a story about a particular group of people in a very specific time. While the reader was likely familiar with what a bar scene looks like, considering that people still go out amidst a wave of terror attacks might be a new perspective on Israelis.

In addition to the realistic faces, Shadmi (Baxter, Faudem, & Shadmi, 2015) also illustrated the suicide bombing itself and its aftermath in rich detail. This included illustrating
individuals writhing on the ground with their limbs removed and detailed depictions of the wreckage of the bar. The attention to detail extended even to a scene where Israeli paramedics were shown scraping blood, body parts, and even minute skin fragments off the walls in order to ensure that the body was buried as completely as possible in accordance with Jewish burial practices (Figure 2). Shadmi’s attention to detail contextualized the impact of a terror attack for the reader who has likely not seen a bombing up close in this way. Like the faces that have been illustrated, the detail of the bombing simultaneously distanced readers from the scene—for they were not there—while also reinforcing the broader statement of Baxter’s experiences in coming to understand Israel as more than just a place where violence occurs, and one where real people live real lives.

**Figure 2.** Orthodox Jews clean body parts from the walls following a terror attack.

![Image of Orthodox Jews cleaning body parts](image-url)

(Baxter, Faudem, & Shadmi, 2015, p. 100).

The depiction of an Israeli society that is not consumed by fear because of terror is unique within the cannon of non-fictional graphic novels about Israel. Yet despite the insightful portrait of Jewish Israelis and the compassionate way that he presented their stories, Baxter’s (Baxter, Faudem, & Shadmi, 2015) text was not a complete portrait of Israeli society. The
glowing comments about the beauty of Israeli society and the ways that music and food can unite the country together included a number of glaring omissions. Like Glidden’s text, Baxter provided no context for the Second Palestinian Intifada and he included only one Palestinian character throughout the entire text. This one character—Hoosi—even acknowledged that he was an outlier within his own family for his willingness to interact with Jewish Israelis and for frequenting Mike’s Place. An additional way that Baxter failed to recognize the full complexity of the situation was by way of a series of quotes from the Quran with which he began each chapter. These passages refracted the depictions of violence perpetrated by the suicide bomber by advocating for peace and compassion, and yet by framing the Second Intifada as a religious conflict and not a national conflict, Baxter suggested that the conflict is similar to violent extremist groups (such as ISIS) and not tied to the specific conflict that is happening in Israel or the ways in which Palestinian nationalism is expressed in both violent and non-violent ways.

Taken together, Mike’s Place provided the reader with a sophisticated understanding of Jewish Israeli society, and yet by not considering the Palestinian people, the reader was left with the impression that terrorism is the fault of Palestinians, and if not for the presence of the Palestinian people, Jewish Israelis would be able to undisturbedly enjoy their food and music. Presenting such rich detail about one community—including even scenes where Jewish-Israelis disagree with each other—while not providing any semblance of balance through content or depiction about the other is the essence of the danger of the single story, because it deprives the reader of the ability to make sense of the wider Palestinian-Israeli conflict and reinforces the entrenchment of singular narratives.

Waltz with Bashir

Whereas both Baxter, Faudem, and Shadmi (2015) and Glidden (2010) presented readers with greater complexity about Israeli society by showing sides of Israel that are either less featured in the media or by explicitly challenging assumptions about Israel, Ari Folman and David Polonsky’s (2009) graphic novel Waltz with Bashir actively critiques Israel. Released initially as an animated movie and shortly thereafter as a graphic novel, Waltz with Bashir depicts Folman’s attempts to understand the role that he played as an Israel Defence Forces (IDF) soldier at the massacre of Palestinians in the refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila during the First Lebanon War in 1982.
Over the course of the text, Folman (with artist David Polonsky, 2009) comes to the realization that he has blocked out all of his memories from his time as a soldier in Lebanon and he determines that this must mean that he was complicit in the murder of innocent Palestinians. In order to discover the truth, Folman interviewed former platoonmates, psychologists, and historians, with the express desire of recovering his memories and determining to what extent he should bear moral responsibility for what transpired. As a result of his enquiries, Folman determined that while he was not an active participant in the crimes, he witnessed them and illuminated the night sky with flares for the Christian Lebanese, so that they could continue killing Palestinians. He came to realize that his own government knew what was happening and did nothing to protect the Palestinian people or help the soldiers navigate their own feelings of culpability.

Folman’s (with artist David Polonsky, 2009) critique of the Israeli military establishment is powerfully expressed in a series of conversations between front-line soldiers and high-ranking military personnel, including Minister of Defence Ariel Sharon (Figure 3). Frenkel, one of Folman’s fellow soldiers, reminded Folman of their daily routine: “we’d get up in the morning. We fixed our breakfast right there on the beach, canned beef and eggs. The order would come down: send out the men. Get your gear… put on your flak jackets… and go hunt for terrorists” (p. 53). Accompanying the description are images of the two groups—Israeli soldiers in Lebanon and military leaders in Israel. Whereas the soldiers were skinny, scrawny, and eating canned meat, the military’s leaders were depicted as overweight and dining on steak and pasta on elegant dishware. The enjambment created by the contrast in depictions could not be clearer: while the soldiers suffer on the frontlines, the powerbrokers in Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv dictate their actions, oblivious to the toil that the war in Lebanon has placed on soldiers.
Figure 3. Depictions of frontline soldiers and military generals.

(Folman and Polonsky, 2009, p. 53)

In my analysis of Waltz with Bashir elsewhere, I (Reingold, 2019b) have argued that Folman’s story is more than an autobiographical exploration of the past; it is also a critique of how Israeli society has not yet found a comfortable balance between the need for a strong military alongside the need to provide emotional and psychological support to its soldiers. I
wrote: “Folman introduces a voice which … expands the boundaries of the nation’s collective memories” (p. 18). Revealing his most intimate—and humiliating—experience for all to see begins the process of “crafting an alternative national narrative that recognizes … that Israeli soldiers have been called upon or expected to behave in ways that deeply disturb themselves and reverberate throughout the soldiers’ lifetimes” (p. 19). In my reading of the text, Folman is not anti-Israel or even anti-IDF; rather, he is an individual who believes that his country has not lived up to a high enough moral standard in how it treats its own soldiers and how it demands actions of them that lead to feelings of residual shame and humiliation. This is a necessary and crucial voice that challenges the single narrative often put forth in the media about the strong and determined Israeli soldier.

As a graphic novel that visualized a critique of the normative depiction of Israeli military life, *Waltz with Bashir* can help to reframe the ways that readers consider the relationship between government, military, and citizenry. Yet as a text that directly addressed a series of brutal acts of violence against the Palestinian people, the voices of these Palestinian people were noticeably absent within the text. As Kamran Rastegar (2013) has noted, “While one may easily term *Waltz with Bashir* a social-trauma narrative, it is one that is framed in terms of the trauma of the perpetrator” (p. 63). Rastegar’s point is based on an observation that many have made, including both Ursula Lindsey (2009) and Rachel Kunert-Graf (2018), that throughout the entire work not a single Palestinian was interviewed or given a voice in order to speak about or reflect on what transpired at Sabra and Shatila.

When Palestinians have been depicted in the text, they have invariably been portrayed as either terrorists—including a child aiming a bazooka at a group of Israeli soldiers—or as groups of elders whose features are nearly indistinct from each other (Figure 4). Elsewhere, as noted by Rastegar (2009), Folman and Polonsky (2009) deliberately did not translate the Arabic words of a Palestinian woman who questioned where Folman was with his camera when the atrocity was happening. Folman’s failure to meaningfully engage with the impact of his—and his country’s—role in the Sabra and Shatila massacre positioned the massacre as something which primarily affected Israeli soldiers. By denying the Palestinians a voice in the graphic novel, Folman denied the viewer an opportunity to consider the impact of the violence on the real victims of the Sabra and Shatila massacre and as a result, it has led to no greater understanding of the Palestinian identity or historical experience other than as a people who were brutally acted upon.
Figure 4. Palestinian women mourning.

(Folman and Polonsky, 2009, p. 115).

**Not the Israel My Parents Promised**

The final graphic novel written from a position that identifies primarily with Israel is Harvey Pekar’s *Not the Israel My Parents Promised*, which is illustrated by J.T. Waldman (Pekar & Waldman, 2014). Over the course of the text, Pekar told two stories simultaneously. The first was the history of the state of Israel. Pekar began his narrative with the biblical relationship between the Jewish people and the land of Israel and concluded his overview with Israel’s 1973 Yom Kippur War, summing up the ensuing four decades as “a publicist’s worst nightmare” because “Jews oppressing others just to survive seems dicey. Unilaterally deciding the fates of foreign people and building walls around them is not good” (pp. 155 & 157).

Concurrent with his historical overview was his explanation of how his own relationship with Israel evolved from when he was a child growing up in Cleveland in the 1940s and 1950s to the present in the 2010s. Pekar (Pekar & Waldman, 2014) revealed that he was raised by his parents to be unashamedly supportive of Israel and to actively reject any narratives that implicated Israel in wrongdoing. As he entered young adulthood and was exposed to Marxist and socialist ideas at college, Pekar began to explore whether Israel was as innocent as he had previously thought. Pekar ultimately determined that not only did Israel bear responsibility for perpetuating the conflict with the Palestinian people, the country was also flawed for the ways it prioritizes Jewish religious law over secular Jewish values.

Part of the complexity of Pekar’s (Pekar & Waldman, 2014) graphic novel comes as a result of his own continued relationship with the state of Israel and his desire to continue talking
about it and learning about it. Despite his concern with the way that the state has operated in both the past and present, Pekar’s continued engagement with the country modeled the ways in which a concerned citizen can remain committed to a vision of what a country can be even if it is not that way in the present. Additionally, the way that Pekar modeled an evolution in his thinking—irrespective of what the thinking was—reflects a worldview that adopts the importance of the multiplicity of narratives and demonstrates the impossibility of remaining in a fixed position if the conflict is going to be resolved.

Of the four texts considered in this section, Pekar and Waldman’s (2014) is the only one that doesn’t include perspectives from living Israelis about the conflict. In his determination to model the legitimacy of critiquing Israel, Pekar negated the voices of Israelis who could respond to his comments. While he did make mention of Israeli leaders from the 1950s and 1960s, Pekar generalized the average Israeli as war-obsessed and unable to practice religion freely due to an Orthodox monopoly over religious rituals. The absence of any Israeli voices within a text about Israel is not the only omission in the text. Equally absent were any Palestinians who could provide support for Pekar’s concerns over their treatment. Pekar assumed responsibility for the Palestinian narrative without quoting or citing a single contemporary Palestinian; this act, while nobly intended, reaffirmed biases of Palestinians as people in need of defending and of being unable to advocate on their own behalf and strips them of dignity and the right to have their own voices heard.

Beyond failing to include the perspectives of either of the relevant stakeholders in the graphic novel, Pekar’s (Pekar & Waldman, 2014) history of the conflict is incomplete. Pekar framed Palestinian violence as solely a response to Israeli military practices without critiquing or interrogating it while simultaneously blaming the conflict on the Israelis with no attempt to judge their behaviour in a balanced way. Pekar’s single-sided narrative did not reflect a nuanced understanding of history in which both Palestinians and Israelis have been recognized by both the United Nations and by historians for being complicit in perpetuating the conflict. In addition to the ways that he made use of narratives, Pekar also omitted seminal events from recent Israeli history. Ending his history lesson in the 1980s—despite the text’s publication in 2014—denied the reader the right to read about positive advances made by Israel including the passing of the 1992 Oslo Accords with the Palestinian people and the 2004 Disengagement from Gaza. Additionally, by ending his history when he did, Pekar failed to address the First and Second
Palestinian Intifadas or the assumption of political power by the Hamas terror organization, all of which have resulted in terror and destruction within Israel.

Visually, like Baxter’s (Baxter, Faudem, & Shadmi, 2015) Mike’s Place, Waldman illustrated richly detailed faces in most scenes. One of the few scenes where a face is obscured was in the one scene where Pekar actually engaged with an Israeli. After being expelled from the United States Army at the age of 17, Pekar hoped to immigrate to Israel. In his visit to the Israeli consulate in Chicago, a faceless Israeli bureaucrat told Pekar that Israel did not want to accept him for immigration because he did not have any useful skills to offer the country. Illustrating this man without distinct facial features in a text that is replete with these details reflects the type of generalization that Pekar formed about Israeli history (Figure 5). Illustrating the consular official without any distinct appearance is a reflection of Pekar’s general attitude towards the ways that all Israelis treated those who were not like them. This type of single-story generalization is reflected later in the text when Pekar suggested that nothing in Israel has changed in forty years nor does he acknowledge any of the peace initiatives including the Oslo Accords or the Disengagement from Gaza. Viewing this one Israeli as a metonym for every Israel—and again, no other Israelis spoke in the text—reaffirms the danger of the single story for it leads to a simplistic understanding of both the conflict and the people who are engaged in it.

Figure 5. Pekar rejected from immigrating to Israel.

(Pekar and Waldman, 2014, p. 93)
Texts that Primarily Focus on Palestinian Narratives

Palestine and Footnotes in Gaza

In this section, I will analyze Joe Sacco’s (2001 & 2010) two graphic novels about the lives of Palestinians living in Gaza and the West Bank. Whereas the texts in the previous section were composed from an orientation that was supportive of Israel even as it was critical of it, both of Sacco’s texts were written from a perspective that prominently features Palestinians, and both texts were highly critical of Israel. Chute (2016) has written how Sacco’s graphic novels are “an ethical attempt to represent intimately those ignored in the world arena … [and] whom history devastates and ignores” (p. 201).

Sacco’s first text was about the Palestinian people is *Palestine*. First published in issue form from February 1993 to October 1995, the individual issues were collected and reprinted together in 2001. The text centered around interviews Sacco conducted over the course of two months in late 1991 and early 1992. Sacco told the stories of ordinary Palestinians whose lives have been negatively harmed first by their expulsion from Israel in 1948 and later by the ongoing conflict with Israel. Throughout, Sacco included detailed descriptions and visualizations of specific instances of Israeli aggression. He provided the reader with extended dialogues with these Palestinians as he became “a conduit for the traumatic experience” (Walker, 2010, p. 82) when he shared their experiences and troubles with the world.

*Footnotes in Gaza* is Sacco’s lengthier work about the Palestinian people. Published in 2009, Sacco interviewed Palestinians in Gaza and learned from them about massacres that occurred in the Palestinian villages of Khan Yunis and Rafah in 1956 as part of the Suez Crisis between Israel, France, Great Britain and Egypt. Sacco presented the 1956 violence as part of a perpetual pattern of aggression in which Israel had systematically tried to oppress and eliminate the Palestinian people by forcefully expelling Palestinians and declaring independence in 1948 through to the 2003 death of American pro-Palestinian activist Rachel Corrie (bulldozed by an Israeli military vehicle). According to Maureen Shay (2014), Sacco’s use of cyclical time in this way allowed the interviewees “the right to access historical trauma and claim it as their own in their contemporary (subjugated) moment” (p. 209). Additionally, it powerfully linked together the entirety of the Palestinian experience as part of a prolonged and sustained series of violent acts that have resulted in shame, humiliation, death, and displacement.
The template that Sacco (2001, 2010) used for developing his stories is comics journalism, and in both works he includes himself directly in the narratives as a reporter who was trying to ascertain the truth about what has happened to the Palestinian people, and how their stories have been buried by mainstream media outlets who prefer to report stories depicting Palestinians as terrorists and not as people who have been hurt by Israelis. For this reason alone, Sacco’s work is significant as his graphic novels are the only two non-fiction graphic novels that are accessible in English, focusing on the Palestinian experience and featuring Palestinians as the main characters. By employing the journalistic technique of interviewer, Sacco restored the dignity of the Palestinian people by identifying each speaker by name, illustrating each face in great detail, and trusting the authenticity of the narratives and stories that they share. So committed is he to this aspect of testimony that Sacco very often illustrated his interviewee’s face in a small panel within the larger panel of what was being described (Figure 6). Including the speaker’s name in a text-bubble is not enough; the speaker had a face and with that an identity that called for depiction. This process, in Charlotta Salmi’s (2016) understanding, “reverses the process by which humans become faceless targets in the murky border areas—not only pushed to the margins by violent expressions of statehood but erased by international representations of conflict” (p. 425). As authentic chroniclers of their people’s history, the Palestinians Sacco interviewed become the experts of the past, even if the official state-sanctioned Israeli reports disagreed with their version of events.
Figure 6. Faces of Palestinian witnesses.

In addition to presenting Palestinians as victims, like Baxter’s (Baxter, Faudem, & Shadmi, 2015) depiction of the minutiae of daily life for Jewish Israelis under the threat of terror, Sacco (2001, 2010) provided the reader with an opportunity to witness how Palestinians spent
their time engaged in life conflict. This included visits to homes and discussions about the future. By introducing readers to Palestinians beyond—a community that has not received much treatment in popular media—Sacco humanized their experiences and rendered them less other or foreign. It made the reader more sympathetic to their plight when the stories of tragedy were introduced, because the people themselves had become more real. It is this opportunity that led Mary N. Layoun (2005) to note how “in its enactment of the acquisition and exercise of a ‘relational literacy’ operating precisely in relation to popular notions of Palestine, Sacco’s comics series is at least implicitly an address, perhaps even an injunction, to transnational circuits of seeing, reading, and (mis)understanding” (p. 319).

In her analysis of Sacco’s work, Chute (2016) wrote: “historical graphic narratives are openly interpretive in terms of style: while they represent real lives, they neither aspire to nor perform the (putative) transparency of photography or film” (p. 214). Chute’s observations cut to the heart of the single-sided narrative that permeates throughout Sacco’s work. While it is true that his work was both historical and interpretive, like all of the other texts that have been considered so far, his use of the historical was problematic by virtue of its selectivity and the ways that Sacco’s own biases were present in his presentation of history. Throughout both texts Sacco employed history in a way that manipulated how his readers feel about Israelis and Palestinians. In one instance, he juxtaposed how American Jews who have no direct ancestral connection to the land are eligible for immediate citizenship under Israel’s Law of Return with Palestinians who have a rich connection to the land yet are unable to get citizenship. While factually true, Sacco’s decision to conjoin these two facts without providing any context elicited pathos that led the reader to a strong emotional reaction with only a superficial understanding of the complex politics surrounding Israel’s Law of Return.

While Chute (2016) praised Sacco for his use of Israeli archives in order to document the violence that was perpetrated against Palestinians, both of his texts were noticeably absent of any Israeli responses to Palestinian claims or even interviews with regular and average Israelis he met on the street similar to the ones he conducted with the Palestinians he met on the street. When Israeli voices were included—and these were rarities—they were from pro-Palestinian Jewish Israelis or Israelis who were highly critical of the military establishment. Over the course of an extended dialogue with two Jewish Israelis, one remarked how she “would never cross the Green Line into Arab land” because she does not view the West Bank as part of Israel. She then
shared how “maybe, if [she] were a Palestinian, [she’d] be a terrorist, too” (Sacco, 2010, p. 254). The inclusion of Jewish Israeli voices of this type provided important support for the Palestinian narratives that Sacco has included but they did not introduce the reader to alternative perspectives on the events in question and led to the creation of a single story about Israelis. A more nuanced approach to presenting the events would have allowed the reader to arrive at independent conclusions and not be denied important voices and perspectives even if Sacco personally rejected them.

Throughout both texts, Sacco (2001, 2010) interjected his own criticism of the Israeli archival materials and questioned the veracity of the testimonies that are included in the reports. This type of critical and thoughtful journalism is a hallmark of reputable reportage. However, Sacco did not bring this same type of critique to the testimonies of Palestinians he interviewed, often accepting their statements at face value, or when discrepancies emerged, he found ways to synthesize the narratives together so as to accept the differences as part of the flawed memories of traumatized people. The absence of equal critique is a further reflection of the single story that Sacco presented throughout the texts as it denied the narratives presented by Israelis by privileging the ones provided by Palestinians.

The ways that Sacco (2001, 2010) privileged the testimonies of Palestinians over Israelis is also evident in the ways that he illustrated members of the two groups. Sacco illustrated individual Palestinians in photorealistic style, capturing the unique and distinct facial features and bodies of everyone with whom he interacted. Similarly, this attention to detail was also found in the ways that he illustrated locations in the West Bank and Gaza (Figure 7). Thomas Juneau and Mira Sucharov (2010) have noted how in Palestine, “whenever Sacco is outdoors, the frames are nearly drowned in mud… Seeing its overwhelming presence throughout the novel’s pages … can powerfully convey to readers the crumbling infrastructure, economic underdevelopment, and general desperation characterizing life in the West Bank and Gaza” (p. 174). The scenery itself became a character, testifying to the brutal conditions under which Palestinians live.
Conversely, with the exception of the few Israelis that Sacco (2001, 2010) personally interviewed, the majority of Israelis are depicted as generic stock characters, lacking defining features and distinct identities. When Israeli soldiers are shown, their faces are often occluded by dark shadows, connoting the negative perception that Sacco and his interviewees associated with them (Figure 8). The contrast between the ways that the two groups of people are shown is an inverse of the one that Folman and Polonsky (2009) included in Waltz with Bashir, where Israelis were fully developed, and Palestinians were not. Like Folman’s inaccurate representation of Palestinians, which resulted in generalizations, stereotypes, and negation of a narrative, so too when Sacco presented only the Palestinian people as fully developed, the experiences and narratives of the Israeli people were denied legitimacy.
Figure 8. Depiction of Israeli soldiers.

(Sacco, 2010, p. 373).

The Danger of the Single Israeli or Palestinian Story

Despite the significant narrative differences between the six non-fiction graphic novels, a number of common threads runs through my analysis of them. The most significant one for the purpose of this paper is how each text presented a thoughtful and nuanced engagement with diverse voices from one community. At the same time, the multiplicity of voices tended to be divided on ethno-national lines. The texts complicated the reader’s understanding of the communities that were addressed by introducing narratives that have received less media attention and by showing the heterogeneity within each of the communities. The danger of the single story is not present due to the multiplicity of voices. Concurrent with this is a limited engagement from outside of the author’s own community and a reliance on either omission or stereotyping, which reaffirms Adichie’s concerns with regards to single stories. In their reportage of personal and communal experiences, the authors made use of history in ways that promoted a complex portrait of one community’s history while denying the reader a clear picture of the other community’s history, and by considering them together, the patterns of representation more clearly emerged.

Yet as Chute (2016) has argued with regards to graphic novels, “taking for granted that ‘pure’ historical representation is never possible, comics calls into question the status of any ‘objective’ or ‘realistic’ account” (p. 198-199). Sacco (2001, 2010), Pekar and Waldman (2014),
Baxter, Faudem, and Shadmi (2015), Folman and Polonsky (2009), and Glidden (2010) each have their own unique understandings of Israel and Palestine. However, each has assembled an incomplete portrait of history and failed to give voices to other sides, even if they personally find them disagreeable. Furthermore, as has been evidenced above, each of the authors demonstrated a willingness to critique their own communities; this fostered creative and thoughtful debate, and led readers to arrive at a greater understanding of the diversity that exists within the community. At the same time, remaining closed off from the nuances of the other community and presenting single narratives has led to further entrenchment within one’s own narratives and to negative depictions of the other, ultimately making peace and reconciliation more difficult to achieve. This is because if the narrative of the other is a single-story, the nuances and experiences are lost, leading to generalizations, stereotypes, and an inability to see oneself in the other.

Additionally, by recognizing this wide-ranging omission of multiple narratives, all five of the authors mirrored a similar observation that Fischer (2015) has made about Glidden’s (2010) graphic novel. Drawing on the work of Emmanuel Lévinas, Fischer argued Glidden has not come to recognize the legitimacy of the counternarrative because she has not yet recognized the legitimacy of the person standing opposite her. Fischer wrote: “If we do not see faces, and thus implicitly, do not see humans, how can there be dialogue? In order to reach such a possible human interaction, seeing the other side’s face—that is, to humanize them—is the precondition for hearing their story” (p. 308). With regards to the multiplicity of narratives that I am considering here, by not interviewing people who differ from themselves or their own ideologies, the authors have made choices to write the other side out of both the text and the narrative. These others remain hidden and their stories are silenced, waiting to be shared with other readers in contrasting texts as opposed to the alternative of finding a way to contain the different voices—even though they disagreed with each other—within a single text. Finding ways to bridge this gap requires “a call to empathy, and it is the encounter with the face of the Other than makes one empathic” (Fischer, 2015, p. 308).

Considering the limitations of the texts is not merely an academic exercise. It is only by exposing the reader to a multiplicity of perspectives that the reader can begin to understand the complexity of the narratives and the ways in which all parties feel that their narratives must be heard. This call for greater inclusion is not a call to eliminate bias or preferential treatment to one side. As Juneau and Sucharov (2010) rightly suggested, part of the merit of the non-fictional
graphic novel is the personalized perspective offered by the author and artist. The texts themselves are models for the types of nuanced and engaged storytelling that can effectively lead to societal change because each set of authors and artists models a willingness to listen to the voices of others, even if those others are localized within one community. That not a single graphic novel about Israelis and Palestinians that integrates a plurality of intra-communal narratives indicates a pattern in the choices made by the writers and artists.

I see in the absence of certain voices and perspectives a reflection of the wider concerns about the effectiveness of peace education in Israel along with how the conflict has been taught outside of Israel. Zvi Bekerman and Gabi Horenczyk (2004) reported that in an Arabic-Hebrew bilingual school, parents simultaneously reported the desire for integration and cross-cultural communication as the keys to peace alongside fears that excessive integration will detract from students’ unique cultural and national identities. In a study I (Reingold, 2017, 2018) conducted with fifty high school seniors at a Jewish secondary school who studied in an elective about Israeli culture and society, the students reported that they benefitted tremendously from being exposed to learning about incidents in Israeli history that presented Israel in a negative or critical way. Yet the students simultaneously reflected on the surprise and shock they felt at discovering these truths for the first time. Their surprise was not limited only to upsetting narratives; many shared that it was not until their time spent in the course that they had ever read a text by an Arab. Like Adichie’s (2009), experiences reading stories about England in Nigeria in which only some narratives are presented, twelve years in formal Jewish education without having learned a Palestinian narrative perpetuates the impossibility of coming to see the humanity of the other side.

As graphic novelists, the writers and artists do not grapple with the same types of pedagogical challenges and realities like those observed by Reingold (2017, 2018) and Bekerman and Horenczyk (2004). As artists, they have the freedom and liberty to create what they want. And yet, it is noteworthy how the findings about cross-cultural dialogue in the above-mentioned studies mirror the same types of presentations of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. This similarity suggests that the graphic novels about Israel and Palestine are not created in a cultural and political vacuum and they resemble the broader ways that the conflict is taught about and discussed. As works of non-fiction that reflect wider patterns of entrenched storytelling, the graphic novels can powerfully shape the ways that participants and bystanders can come to know
and understand the nature of the conflict and lead to a de-entrenchment. In their analysis of bilingual peace education initiatives in Israel, Bekerman and Horenczyk (2004) wrote that they “convinced that issues of cultural identity are central to … types of efforts aimed at improving intergroup relations” (page). Similarly, while still not beholden to any particular agenda, graphic autobiographies that also engage with cross-cultural dialogue and peace education can play a role in transforming the ways that people talk about Israelis, Palestinians, and the conflict between them.

Conclusion

Michael Lissack (2016) has written that we “cannot process all the information that is present in the world around us. We have to pick and choose what to pay attention to” (p. 35). The danger of picking and choosing is that it results in people practicing “compartmentalization or reductionism” which leads to a denial of the “reality of interrelationships or the multiplicity of interpretations that exist whenever that situatedness is acknowledged” (p. 35). Like Adichie’s (2009) solution to the danger of the single story, Lissack argued that one of the ways that we can avoid the pitfalls of simplification is to focus on the narratives of others. He noted that people who genuinely listen to the narratives of others “use the images evoked to create meaning – meaning that goes on to inform actions” (p. 41).

The goal of effective storytelling is to leave the reader or listener enthralled with the narrative and wanting to implement the lessons or messages in their own life, as they best see fit. The reader must be given space in which to navigate the tensions in order to arrive at their own conclusions. All six of the graphic novels considered in this paper push the boundaries of the limits of the communities that they reflected. They challenge readers to recognize that each of the communities contains a multiplicity of voices and perspectives and to reduce a community to a singular position negates the authenticity and complexity of the community. In this way, each offers the reader a more thoughtful and complex portrait of one side of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Yet as has also been shown, there is still much to be done when presenting the narratives of the communities that differ from the ones that the authors and artists represent or to which they are partial. In this sense, the authors relied on stereotypes, singular narratives, and oversimplifications to convey to the reader a specific way to think about the other. This has led to a fortification of biases and prejudices towards the other and makes meaningful dialogue and
positive interaction even more difficult. This does not mean that Harvey Pekar (2014) or Joe Sacco (2001, 2010) should suddenly abandon their belief that Israel is responsible for the conflict if they do not believe it to be true, or that Sarah Glidden (2010) should suddenly feel safe walking around the West Bank by herself if she is genuinely afraid. Instead, it involves crafting narratives in such a way that recognizes and values their own positions while also shedding light on the other side’s narrative and the narratives of those people who are not even included. By doing this, the authors have the power to recognize the traumas of the past while offering a way towards a different, and hopefully brighter, future.
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