



The Destruction of Archaeological Resources in the Palestinian Territories, Area C Kafr Shiyān as a Case Study

Salah Hussein A. Al-Houdalieh and Saleh Ali Tawafsha

Aerial photograph of Khirbet Kafr Shiyān in 2016, looking south. Photo by Maher Barghouthi.

Many archaeological sites and features scattered throughout the Palestinian Territories are facing a number of serious challenges that stem in part from rapidly expanding urbanization, the unchecked looting of antiquities, and political considerations relating to the control and management of the area. These factors, among others, have led to the partial or total destruction of thousands of archaeological sites and features, and to the illegal extraction of hundreds of thousands of archaeological objects, which ultimately find their way into the antiquities market (Al-Houdalieh 2006, 2010).

Under the Oslo II Accord of 1995, the West Bank was divided into three administrative areas, A, B, and C. The agreement also called for the transfer of internal security responsibility to the Palestinian authorities no later than eighteen months from the inauguration of the Palestinian Council. Currently, the Palestinian authorities have full control of Area A and civil control of Area B. However, Area C, which comprises about 60 percent of the West Bank—and also includes nearly 60 percent of its archaeological sites and features, including some prominent ones—is still administered under full Israeli civil and security control. Rjoob's research (2010) shows that the Israelis, while forbidding

Palestinian institutions from safeguarding these sites, have not protected the West Bank heritage resources located in Area C, even with the Area C sites located very close to the boundary zones of Areas A and B, which are fully and partly under Palestinian control. Consequently, Area C has become prime territory for antiquities looting, the misuse of resources, and both intentional and unintentional destruction of archaeological sites. In addition to Rjoob, several other researchers have exposed the situation concerning archaeological sites in Area C, including: Taha (2002, 2004), Yahya (2005, 2008), Al-Ju'beh (2008), Cinthio (2004), Kogelschatz (2016), Kersel (2015), Greenberg and Keinan (2007), and Al-Houdalieh (2010, 2012). These scholars have classified the Area C heritage resources as endangered sites deserving of special attention—both from the parties to the conflict and from international institutions dealing with cultural heritage—to prevent further destruction.

We visited several archaeological sites located in Area C of the Ramallah province with the aim of finding out the extent of the destruction that these sites have suffered in recent years. The severity of this destruction became apparent when we visited Khirbet Attarah located approximately 6 km southeast of Khirbet Kafr Shiyān and a few hundred meters south of Tel En-Nasbeh. According to Bagatti (2002: 119–20), Khirbet Attarah is dated to the Roman, Byzantine, and Crusader periods, and its



Figure 1. Khirbet Kafr Shiyān in 1986, looking west. From Finkelstein and Lederman 1997: 343.

architectural remains included several stone walls, a reservoir, an oil press and a wine press, several rock-cut subterranean tombs, and a stone quarry. During our visit to this site, we became aware that the site has been totally destroyed over the past few years, and now several huge residential and commercial constructions stand on the site. The complete destruction of Khirbet Attarah left us little to document and so we chose nearby Khirbet Kafr Shiyān, which still has some archaeological features, as a case study for this research project.

The main aims of the study are threefold: (1) to present the reality of a minor archaeological site located in Area C, one with a relatively long settlement history and which indeed resembles hundreds, if not thousands, of other archaeological sites throughout the Palestinian Territories; (2) to document and describe the surviving, visible architectural remains of Khirbet Kafr Shiyān; and (3) to examine the impact of the destruction this khirbet (Arabic “ruins”)—and others like it—is experiencing.

The methodology implemented in studying the khirbet includes the following components: (1) aerial photography of the site using a kite; (2) a thorough site survey including direct observations,



Figure 2. Roman-era looted tomb, 2011. Photo by S. Al-Houdalieh.

Figure 3. Aerial photograph of Khirbet Kafr Shiyān in 2016, looking west. Photo by Maher Barghouthi.



inventory data sheets, and the photographing of all visible features, both ancient and modern. This survey was carried out over ten working days in the first half of November 2016 by a fieldwork team of six persons: the two authors, two employees of the Ramallah Archaeology Department, and two volunteers from among the land owners; (3) interviews with a number of the site's land-parcel owners, other residents of the study area, the projects engineer of Beitunia Municipality, and the director of the Ramallah archaeology department; (4) a typology of all surveyed features; (5) a survey of the existing literature related to Khirbet Kafr Shiyān in particular, and to the destruction of the archaeological resources in the Palestinian Territories in general.

Name, Location, Size, Property Ownership, and Land Use of the Site

Throughout the existing literature, we found that the name of the site has been rendered in different ways: Kefr Shiyān (Conder and Kitchner 1883: 103), Kfer



Figure 4. Corbelled, round stone watchtower, looking west, 2016. Photo by S. Al-Houdalieh.

Shiyān (Peters 1904: 337), and Kafr Sheiyan (Finkelstein and Lederman 1997: 341). However, the land owners of the site know it variously as “Kafr Shiyān” (Arabic كَفْر شَيْيَان), Al-khabta, and Batin Hamza. The khirbet is located 4 km west of the historic core of the city of Ramallah and approximately 16 km northwest of Jerusalem. It lies within Area C, just few hundred meters west of the boundary with Area A and within the municipal limits of Beitunia. Khirbet Kafr Shiyān (fig. 1) occupies the summit of a large hill rising to 745 m and commanding a relatively wide vista to the north, south, and east; to the west, the view is obstructed by a hill of greater elevation. The ancient settlement of the khirbet covered a total area of about 80,000 m², with the best-preserved part measuring nearly 45,000 m² located in the center of the site. The land parcels of the khirbet are entirely private Palestinian properties belonging to several different individuals who are residents of Beitunia; most of the parcels were once surrounded by stone walls. During the last few years, many long-time land owners of the site have sold all or part of their properties, and the new owners have started to develop the land for residential or commercial facilities.

In order to explore the pattern of land use at Khirbet Kafr Shiyān over the last two centuries, we conducted interviews with five individuals from among the present landowners. These subjects consisted of three males and two females, their ages ranging between 55 and 75 years, all of whom had actively participated in agriculture fieldwork on the site over a long period of time. The interviews indicate that the land of the khirbet was once planted with a large number of fig trees and grapevines, and also with some almond, olive, and pomegranate trees. In addition, the land was actively cultivated with seasonal crops until the beginning of the 1980s. One of our interviewees (75 years old) stated that when he was a child he, like other landowners’ children, used to accompany his parents in living in their family’s agricultural watchtower (Arabic *muntar*) built on the khirbet. Each summer, from late August until the beginning of October, they regularly moved to their fields, to guard them and to harvest the figs and grapes. However, they and the other families gradually started to abandon their agricultural watchtowers at the beginning of 1950s, but still continued the cultivation and maintenance of their fields.



Figure 5. Remains of ancient walls, looking southeast (a) and northeast (b), 2016. Photos by S. Al-Houdalieh.



Figure 6. Traces of in situ plaster layers, looking east, 2016. Photo by S. Al-Houdalieh.



Figure 7. The large construction at the summit of the khirbet, 2016. Photo by Maher Barghouthi.

Previous Surveys

C. R. Conder and H. H. Kitchner (1883: 103) surveyed the khirbet in 1873 and recognized a large cistern, which exists under a building; several vaults built of different sized stones, including some well-cut and dressed stones; and some rock-cut tombs on the eastern edge of the site.

J. P. Peters visited Kafr Shiyān in 1902 and stated that it is

the ruin of a village, apparently of the Roman period, wonderfully well preserved. It was unfortified, and lay on the spur of a hill, defended by nature on three sides [north, south and east], but on the fourth [west] where the main hill rose above it, quite unfortified by either nature or art. A street, rather narrow and not straight, leads up to and through the village on the north side. The foundation and side walls of various houses and enclosures are standing on either side. Conspicuous on the right hand are the remains of a tower [an agricultural watchtower from the Ottoman period] with slopping walls. [...] ruins of a large building [...] under this on the north is a cistern, the mouth of which is now blocked up, which is said to be large and to have columns. Here are also masonry vaults. [...] Here are fragments of tessellated pavement. [However] no columns, capitals, or ornamented stones were found. (Peters 1904: 377–78)

Following a much later survey, conducted in the 1980s by a team of several members from the Department of Land of Israel

Studies and Archaeology at Bar-Ilan University, the Archaeological Staff Officer for Judea and Samaria, and the Archaeological Survey of Israel, the resulting report included an entry for Kafr Shiyān which reads:

A large ruin with remains of a large number of buildings, some of them preserved to 3 m [in height], others almost completely dismantled and their stones incorporated into fences. The walls are built of dressed stones. Cisterns and caves [were documented]. A Herodian measuring cup and a stamped [jar] handle with part of the word “bismillah” were also found.

The pottery sherds collected during this same survey (82 in total) produced the following results: “Hellenistic 18.3 percent; Hellenistic-Roman 7.3 percent; Roman 18.3 percent; Byzantine 37.8 percent; Byzantine-Umayyad 11 percent; Umayyad-Abbasid 3.7 percent; and finally, Early Ottoman 3.7 percent” (Finkelstein and Lederman 1997: 341).

In 2011, Al-Houdalieh visited the site in the course of his research study entitled “Tomb Raiding in Western Ramallah Province” and documented more than thirty-five looted, subterranean, rock-cut Roman-period tombs of the loculi type on the western side of the site. They were located approximately 10 to 12 m apart from each other and had been heavily vandalized. Each tomb chamber featured three to five loculi, and some included square depressions in their floor surface (fig. 2).

New Data Collection and Fieldwork Results

We conducted a survey of the khirbet in October and November 2016, which documented within the study area the following: six watchtowers, a large number of agricultural terrace walls, remains of a large number of ancient rooms, five cisterns, two man-made caves, thirty-five looted tombs, thirty-one holes caused by antiquities looters, four modern roads, eighty caravan trailers, and twelve new residential, industrial, or commercial buildings (fig. 3).

Watchtowers

In the Palestinian Territories, the surviving agricultural watchtowers can be classified, according to their design and materials, into two types: (1) seasonal arbors consisting of a wooden frame covered by reeds, tree branches, and/or fabric; and (2) stone watchtowers of different shapes. The stone structures, the subject of this section, are broadly distributed throughout the mountainous areas of the West Bank and date from the Late Ottoman era through the middle of the twentieth century (Al-Houdalieh and Ghadban 2013: 511).

The fieldwork at Khirbet Kafr Shiyān documented six of these stone watchtowers, which can be further classified into three types: round (3), quadrilateral (1), and irregular, solid stone mounds (2). The round (fig. 4) and quadrilateral watchtowers are all built with an internal domed space and two levels connected via an internal staircase. The ground floor was for livestock and storage and the upper level took the form of an open roof terrace used as living space and for daily tasks. By contrast, the watchtowers built as solid stone mounds look like an irregular heap of stones with an external staircase on one side.

Cisterns

In light of the absence of any permanent water source within the khirbet or in its immediate environs, the inhabitants throughout the settlement's history relied on collecting rainwater in cisterns to fulfill their water needs throughout the year. The five documented cisterns at the site are all abandoned and filled to various depths with debris. All the cisterns are hewn into the bedrock and are bell-shaped in cross section; they have capacities ranging from 20 to 30 m³ and each has a round shaft opening 0.9 m in diameter and 1.9 m deep, on



Figure 8. Vandalized Roman-era ritual bath, looking south, 2016. Photo by S. Al-Houdalieh.



Figure 9. Column drum incorporated in a terrace wall, looking south, 2016. Photo by S. Al-Houdalieh.

average. Traces of multiple layers of hydraulic plaster were documented in all the cisterns, in which pottery sherds, thin stone pieces, gravel, grog, and ash were embedded. Two large rock surfaces were documented around two of the cisterns: they are relatively flat, slightly sloping downward toward the opening of the cisterns; one of them has a channel 30 cm wide and more than 5 m long for channeling water.



thick plaster layer consisting of lime mixed with soil, grog, gravel, and ash, traces of which can be seen in situ in several places, mainly on the external faces (fig. 6), as well as on several of the fallen stones. Most of the documented wall segments are joined to each other at right angles to form the corners of rooms or buildings of various sizes.

One remarkable building is located on the summit of the settlement, measuring 24 m × 20 m and flanked by several rooms to the south and east (fig. 7). Historically, this building was approached from the west through a door opening, the southern side of which is still in situ. Based on the building method of the documented walls, the size and cutting technique of the stones, and the numerous Byzantine pottery sherds embedded in the surface plaster layer, most of these walls can be dated to the Byzantine period.

Two cave-like installations were documented: one in the western section of the khirbet and the other in the eastern. Both are hewn into the bedrock, semi-circular in shape with similar internal dimensions, and their walls and ceilings are coated with hydraulic plaster layers. Their doorways are 1.5 m wide, on average, and at least 1.6 m in height. A large freshly opened hole was identified inside each of the two installations, which may indicate that both have been vandalized during the last few years. The eastern installation (fig. 8) is at least 2.5 m wide × 2.2 m deep × 1.6 m height (the floors were covered by an unknown thickness of erosion deposits). It is accessible via at least six hewn steps 1.7 m in width leading down from the surface. A large water cistern is located just to the north of the staircase, outside the hewn, plastered cave. Thus, it is believed that this installation, and perhaps the other as well, served as ritual baths during the Roman period.

Figure 10. Looting pit at the summit of the khirbet, looking south, 2016. Photos by S. Al-Houdalieh.

Ancient Walls and Cave-Like Installations

We documented the remains of a large number of ancient walls located all over the khirbet (figs. 1, 3, and 5). They are built of large, well-cut stones laid in regular courses, two stones thick and 1 m in total thickness on average. The walls survive in height from a few centimeters up to 4 m above the present ground level (fig. 5). The interstices between the stones were filled with small stones and earthen mud. The walls were coated with at least one

Agricultural Terrace Walls, Plowing, and Landscape Modifications

The practice of constructing agricultural terraces in the mountainous region of the Palestinian Territories, including at Khirbet Kafr Shiyān, may have begun during the Chalcolithic period (Sayej 1999: 203–7) and then continued without interruption until the present day (Al-Houdalieh 2006: 109). A large

number of terrace walls of various dimensions were documented at the khirbet, some more than 60 m long \times 2 m high \times 1.8 m thick, on average, while the majority are of lesser dimensions (fig. 3). These terrace retaining walls were built from different sized stones, both worked and unworked, laid in irregular courses and mostly on top of much older wall remains. Some of these terrace walls incorporate column drums of various diameters and lengths (fig. 9). It is believed that the local farmers obtained the material required for these walls by collecting stones found scattered in their own fields. Most of these terraces are now either damaged or almost completely destroyed due to several factors: the abandonment of necessary maintenance over the last few decades, the grazing of animals on the site, erosion suffered during the winter rainy seasons, and the various activities of urban development.

Based on information provided by three of the interviewees, in recent decades, the local farmers plowed their lands with tractors that penetrated the ground surface down to a depth of 0.25 m–0.4 m. Plowing this deep has undoubtedly caused immense damage to the architectural remains of ancient constructions. Now, in 2016, a land parcel of approximately 4,000 m² (1 acre) located on the western side of the khirbet has been completely disturbed and reconfigured using heavy earth-moving machinery. The landowner has leveled the ground, stripping away and removing all soil and ancient material down to a depth of 1 m, collected the large stones from any demolished structures and piled them at several different spots around the khirbet, and finally brought in loads of terra-rossa soil in order to recover this plot of land.

Evidence of Vandalism

Antiquities looting is a widespread phenomenon throughout the Palestinian Territories. The antiquities looters are working in small and large gangs, using traditional manual digging equipment, metal detectors, and sometimes bulldozers to search for archaeological objects. The looters are both amateurs and professionals. The amateurs lack proper archaeological fieldwork experience and the knowledge necessary for dating and pricing the extracted archaeological objects. The professionals, on the other hand, are characterized by a high level of experience in field archaeology, and in the dating of almost all the archaeological objects and determining their monetary value (Al-Houdalieh 2006, 2010).

As mentioned, Al-Houdalieh has documented in a previous research project, thirty-five looted Roman-era tombs at this site. Moreover, during this present research project we identified thirty-one new looting pits scattered all over the khirbet, the majority of which were documented on the summit of the settlement. These pits, some of which were freshly excavated, varied in size, shape, and depth: the largest pit measures 8 m \times 3 m \times 1.7 m deep, while the smallest one is 1.5 m \times 1.2 m \times 1 m deep (fig. 10). The antiquities looters have piled the excavated earthen deposits and rubble on one or more sides of their digging spots, and over time some of the removed material has eroded back into the pits. Such vandalism of the site has, without question, resulted in the destruction of well-stratified cultural layers and

ancient architectural remains, and perhaps the extraction of unknown numbers of cultural objects.

Modern Urban Development and Site Assessment

Urbanization, particularly in terms of private housing, commercial, industrial, and road construction, constitutes a real and increasing threat to archaeological resources in the Palestinian Territories. Over the past few decades, a large number of historical and archaeological features and sites have been either partially or completely destroyed as a result of modern urban development (Al-Houdalieh and Sauders 2009). Khirbet Kafr Shiyān is one typical example.

We initiated an impact assessment regarding Khirbet Kafr Shiyān and its immediate environs. This assessment surveyed a wide variety of constructions and structures: three residential buildings, one still under construction; a large chicken farm consisting of four barracks; a large steel fabrication workshop (factory); a workshop for metal recycling; six huts built of metal plates; eighty caravans (trailers); and four unpaved roads. Furthermore, the above-mentioned large parcel of approximately 4,000 m², after being stripped and refilled, is partially used to store caravans (fig. 2). From the perspective of site preservation, the most threatening constructions at the khirbet are the residential, commercial, and industrial compounds located on its eastern and northern sides, as well as the roads constructed throughout the site, all of which have resulted in approximately 34,000 m² (42 percent of the khirbet) being completely damaged. In all of these construction projects, bulldozers were used to remove all the ancient walls, and the cultural deposits associated with them, down to bedrock—all without any kind of documentation. Indeed, it is impossible to reconstruct the exact extent of the damage done to the site by this modern urban development; however, we assume that a large number of ancient features (including houses, cisterns, caves, and the settlement's ancient road) have been destroyed. In addition, a large number of archaeological objects have probably been extracted and found their way to the illicit antiquities market or into private collections.

In order to understand the reality of the modern urban development at Khirbet Kafr Shiyān, and to explore the governmental administrative policies relating to this site, we interviewed the projects engineer of Beitunia Municipality, Mrs. I. Al-Deek, and the Director of Ramallah Archaeology Department, Mr. J. Mustafa. We made the two interviewees aware of how their responses would be used for purposes of this study. We asked them one question: What is your department's involvement or stance regarding the urban development projects being carried out at Khirbet Kafr Shiyān?

The response of the projects engineer of Beitunia Municipality is summarized as follows: The question of this khirbet is very complicated, like other archaeological sites located in Area C of Beitunia Town. We are not allowed by the Israeli authorities to protect, manage, or develop any of them. Some of them, such as Khirbet Meta, Maghayer al-Lauz, and Abu Zatoon, were de facto annexed to Israel by the construction of the Separation Wall, and

the others are suffering from various destructive impacts. The Palestinian landowners are carrying out their projects without consulting us. They are aware that we cannot issue building permits in Area C and, at the same time, we cannot prevent any new construction within it.

The response of the director of the Ramallah archaeology department is summarized as follows: Taking into account that the Israelis prevent us from protecting any site located in Area C, including this site, we are still trying our best to ensure the protection of these sites. Once we learned that some transgressions were happening to this site two years ago, we sent official letters to the mayor of Beitunia Municipality informing him and requesting his help in protecting the site. Moreover, one of our employees used to visit the site—occasionally and secretly—for purposes of monitoring.

Possible Solutions

At the conclusion of the 1967 war, all Palestinian Territories were placed under complete Israeli military control, a situation that prevailed until the mid-1990s. Since then, a distinction has been made between “civil” and “security” control, and an “A-B-C” protocol holds sway: limited Palestinian autonomy is allowed within Areas A and B, while Area C remains under full Israeli control. Thus, at the present time, the Israeli Staff Officer

impact that the modern era has had on the archaeology of the site. We can only echo the observation of Shanks, who writes that “it is more than a little sickening to think of the loss of so much of the past due to contemporary development and neglect” (1998: 17). The urban development projects carried out at Khirbet Kafr Shiyān and in its immediate surroundings, together with the obvious illicit digging activities, have resulted in the permanent and irretrievable loss of well-stratified cultural layers and a large number of known ancient architectural remains, not to mention the extraction of unknown numbers of archaeological objects. The end result, sadly, is that our understanding of and connections with the peoples of antiquity—the ways in which they lived and the things they created—have been forever damaged.

In order to remedy these problems, we suggest the following: (1) Since the Israelis are not taking the necessary measures to protect and safeguard the archaeological resources located in Area C, at least from the Palestinian perspective, and the Palestinians are not currently allowed to control and manage these resources on their own, we believe that handing over responsibility of Area C to the Palestinians—in accordance with the intent of the Oslo Agreement—will mitigate many of the challenges being faced there. (2) Taking into account that, realistically, archaeological resources can never be protected by force, the Palestinians must redouble their efforts to raise awareness among the Pales-

“The urban development projects carried out at Khirbet Kafr Shiyān and in its immediate surroundings, together with the obvious illicit digging activities, have resulted in the permanent and irretrievable loss of well-stratified cultural layers and a large number of known ancient architectural remains, not to mention the extraction of unknown numbers of archaeological objects.”

for Archaeology (SOFA) continues to control all archaeological resources located in Area C, which encompasses 60 percent of the heritage resources of the West Bank. Our case study of Khirbet Kafr Shiyān in Area C shows that the site has been severely impacted by modern urban development and antiquities looting. In comparing our own very recent survey and aerial photographs to the descriptive survey conducted by Peters in 1902 and the aerial photograph taken by Finkelstein and Lederman in 1986, we witness the profound physical changes that have occurred on the site in a period of just over one century. A large number of the architectural remains visible in the 1986 photograph do not exist anymore, and this in itself reflects the accelerated pace of the site’s destruction and development during very recent times.

Based on our field study of the surface pottery sherds and on the range of documented architectural remains, we can conclude that Khirbet Kafr Shiyān was inhabited during the Roman, Byzantine, and Early Islamic periods and thereafter was used for agriculture, right through the Ottoman period and down to modern times. The present site assessment reveals the devastating

tinian general public, stressing the value of such archaeological resources for both their cultural identity and their economic interests. (3) All Palestinian institutions related to cultural heritage, together with the local communities, must actively cooperate to create a comprehensive national policy to defend the land’s heritage resources. (4) In order to stop all future urban development projects that might be carried out on private land located within known archaeological sites, the Palestinian Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities should take possession of these sites, allowing that the Palestinian National Authority would fairly compensate the landowners for their properties.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Al-Quds University and the Palestinian Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities for their moral support during all phases of this research project. We are also indebted to all interviewees for their cooperation in accomplishing this research. Finally, we would like to thank Tom Powers for his constructive comments and editing on the draft of this work.

References

- Bagatti, Bellarmino. 2002. *Ancient Christian Villages of Samaria*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.
- Cinthio, Björn. 2004. Intellectual Property and Human Rights in Palestine. Online: <http://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/record/1554874>. Accessed 8 February 2017.
- Conder, C. R., and R. E. Kitchner. 1883. *The Survey of Western Palestine. Memoirs of the Topography, Orography, Hydrography and Archaeology*, vol. 3. London: Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Zvi Lederman, eds. 1997. *Archaeological Survey of the Hill Country of Benjamin*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
- Greenberg, Raphael, and Adi Keinan. 2007. *The Present Past of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Israeli Archaeology in the West Bank and East Jerusalem Since 1967*. Tel Aviv: S. Daniel Abraham Center for International and Regional Studies.
- Houdalieh, Salah H. al-. 2006. The Destruction of Palestinian Archaeological Heritage: Saffa Village as a Model. *Near Eastern Archaeology* 69: 102–12.
- . 2010. Archaeological Heritage and Related Institutions in the Palestinian National Territories 16 Years after Signing the Oslo Accords. *Present Pasts* 2: 31–53. doi: <http://doi.org/10.5334/pp.20>
- . 2012. Archaeological Heritage and Spiritual Protection: Looting and the Jinn in Palestine. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 25: 99–120.
- Houdalieh, Salah H. al-, and Shadi Sami Ghadban. 2013. Agricultural Watchtowers in Al-Tireh Quarter and 'Ain Qinia Village, Ramallah, Palestine. *International Journal of Architectural Heritage* 7: 509–35.
- Houdalieh, Salah H. al-, and Robert R. Sauders. 2009. Building Destruction: The Consequences of Rising Urbanization on Cultural Heritage in the Ramallah Province. *International Journal of Cultural Property* 16: 1–23.
- Ju'beh, Nazmi al-. 2008. "Cultural Heritage in Palestine Contested and Neglected Heritage: A Palestinian Position." Online: http://www.cccb.org/rcs_gene/nazmi_al-jubeh.pdf. Accessed 3 November 2016.
- Kersel, Morag M. 2015. Fractured Oversights: The ABCs of Cultural Heritage in Palestine after the Oslo Accords. *Journal of Social Archaeology* 15: 24–44. doi: 10.1177/1469605314557586
- Kogelschatz, Megan. 2016. Protecting the Past for a Better Future: Protecting Palestinian Cultural Heritage. M.A. thesis, University of Oregon. URI: <http://hdl.handle.net/1794/20523>
- Peters, J. P. 1904. Visit to kferShiyan, Janieh, and Neighborhood. *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* 36: 377–85.
- Rjoob, Ahmed A. 2010. Contested Management of Archaeological Sites in the Hebron District. *Present Pasts* 2.1: 75–88. doi: <http://doi.org/10.5334/pp.24>
- Sayej, Ghattas I. 1999. The Origin of Terraces in the Central Hills of Palestine: Theories and Explanations. Pp. 201–9 *The Landscape of Palestine: Equivocal Poetry*, ed. Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, Roger Heacock, and Khaled Nashef. Birzeit: Birzeit University Publications.
- Shanks, Michael. 1998. The Life of an Artifact in an Interpretative Archaeology. *Fennoscandia Archaeologica* 15: 15–30.
- Taha, Hamdan. 2002. Protection of Cultural Heritage in Palestine. Pp. 265–70 in *La tutela del Patrimonio Culturale in Caso di Conflitto*, ed. Fabio Maniscalco. Naples: Massa.
- . 2004. Managing Cultural Heritage in Palestine. *Focus* 1: 31–32.
- Yahya, Adel H. 2005. Archaeology and Nationalism in the Holy Land. Pp. 66–77 in *Archaeologies of the Middle East: Critical Perception*, ed. Susan Pollock and Reinhard Bernbeck. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2008. Looting and Salvaging. How the Wall, Illegal Digging and the Antiquities Trade are Ravaging Palestinian Cultural Heritage. *Jerusalem Quarterly* 33: 39–55.



Salah Hussein Al-Houdalieh is a professor of archaeology and cultural heritage at Al-Quds University. His current research and teaching interests include archaeology and ethnography in the Levant, cultural identity, antiquities looting, mosaics, and heritage ethics. Several of his fieldwork projects have examined how both urban development and the looting of antiquities are impacting Palestine's cultural heritage and endangering its archaeological resources.

Salah Ali Tawafsha is the general director of antiquities protection at the Palestinian Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities. He earned an MA degree in archaeology from the Institute of Archaeology of al-Quds University. His current interests include safeguarding and protecting the archaeological resources located in the Palestinian National Territories, traditional buildings, and combating antiquities looting.