

THE ARCHITECTURE OF DETENTION: ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL, TORTURE, AND EPISTEMIC TRUST UNDER GAZA HOSTILITIES (2023–2025)

Anonymous authors

Paper under double-blind review

ABSTRACT

This study examines administrative detention as a population-level mechanism during the Gaza hostilities from 2023 to 2025, analyzing its role in producing conditions incompatible with survival. Drawing on data from OHCHR, HaMoked, B’Tselem, PHRI, ICRC, and Amnesty International covering approximately 9,400 Palestinian detainees, we demonstrate how indefinite detention without charge systematically erodes human dignity and life sustainability. The complexity of this issue stems from the intersection of bureaucratic procedures with lethal outcomes, where formally documented detention orders operate detached from legal substance, enabling mass suffering under the guise of security operations. Through thematic coding of 114 witness accounts, our qualitative analysis reveals patterns of dehumanization, medical neglect, and epistemic silencing that expose detention centers as sites of slow mortality via systematic deprivation. Methodological triangulation ensures analytic credibility by combining quantitative trend analysis with qualitative thematic coding, cross-validating findings across multiple human rights datasets. The convergence of administrative control, incommunicado detention, and systematic torture constitutes an architecture that fulfills the conditions-of-life threshold under Article II (c) of the Genocide Convention, positioning carceral policies as infrastructural components of collective destruction.

1 INTRODUCTION

Since October 2023, the Gaza Strip has experienced a humanitarian crisis marked by siege, famine, and mass detention. This study examines administrative detention as a population-level mechanism within this context, analyzing approximately 9,400 Palestinian detainees held by the Israeli Prison Service between 2023 and 2025. The systematic nature of indefinite detention without charge raises concerns about its impact on human dignity and life sustainability. Drawing on data from the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2024) and complementary datasets, we investigate how carceral practices intersect with conditions that may be incompatible with survival under international law.

The complexity of administrative detention in the Palestinian context emerges from its intersection with legal, historical, and social frameworks. Legally, detention operates under the Incarceration of Unlawful Combatants Law (2002, amended 2023), which permits extended periods without judicial review, creating conditions that some scholars characterize as a state of exception Agamben (2005). Historically, patterns show parallels to contexts where detention centers functioned as sites of systematic violence under bureaucratic procedures. Socially, the suspension of International Committee of the Red Cross access since October 2023 has limited independent monitoring, making testimonial evidence a crucial source for documenting human rights violations Fricker (2007). This multi-dimensional complexity necessitates an integrated analysis of legal frameworks, institutional practices, and lived experiences.

Our qualitative approach provides insight into Palestinian experiences through interpretation of witness accounts and communication patterns. Thematic coding of 114 testimonies from organizations including Physicians for Human Rights–Israel Physicians for Human Rights–Israel (2025) and Amnesty International Amnesty International (2024) identifies patterns of dehumanization, medical

neglect, and epistemic silencing. This methodological approach captures dimensions of experience that quantitative data alone may not reveal, particularly where official records are inaccessible. The qualitative analysis examines how detention procedures may mask systematic deprivation.

This study addresses three research questions: First, how does administrative detention function as a mechanism of population-level control? Second, which measurable conditions delineate its impact on human dignity and survival? Third, how do institutional secrecy and communication denial affect epistemic trust? Our theoretical framework integrates the conditions-of-life approach to analysis with epistemic trust theory Ballis & Schwendemann (2022); Margalit (2002), enabling examination of both material conditions and systematic limitations on external validation of human rights violations.

Methodologically, we employ a concurrent-triangulation mixed-methods design Creswell & Plano Clark (2018), combining quantitative trend analysis with qualitative thematic coding. Data sources include the OHCHR Thematic Report on Detention Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2024), B'Tselem administrative detention statistics B'Tselem (2024), HaMoked prisoner datasets HaMoked (2025), and medical reports from Physicians for Human Rights–Israel Physicians for Human Rights–Israel (2025). This multi-source approach facilitates cross-validation of findings through methodological triangulation. The analysis covers October 2023 to October 2025, encompassing the period of intensified hostilities.

The contributions of this study are threefold: First, it provides empirical evidence examining the relationship between administrative detention practices and conditions relevant to Article II (c) of the Genocide Convention. Second, it develops a methodological framework for integrating quantitative and qualitative human rights data. Third, it documents how restricted access to monitoring organizations affects epistemic trust. These contributions advance understanding of carceral systems as potential instruments of population control in conflict zones.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews related work on infrastructure and human rights documentation. Section 3 provides context on legal and operational frameworks of detention. Section 4 details our mixed-methods methodology. Section 5 presents quantitative findings and qualitative themes. Section 6 interprets these findings within theoretical frameworks. Section 7 outlines implications and future research directions.

This research has implications for humanitarian policy, legal accountability, and cross-cultural understanding. For humanitarian organizations, it highlights the importance of maintaining access to detention facilities. For legal frameworks, it provides evidence potentially relevant to international law proceedings. For education and public understanding, it contributes to documenting patterns of systematic violence. By examining administrative control, material deprivation, and epistemic limitations, this study aims to inform interventions in contexts of mass detention and human rights concerns.

2 RELATED WORK

Administrative detention as a legal mechanism in conflict zones has been extensively documented in human rights scholarship. In international humanitarian law scholarship, administrative detention in non-international armed conflicts has been analyzed as a legal framework that requires balancing security imperatives with fundamental human rights protections Hill-Cawthorne (2016). Foundational work by Pejić (2005) and Quenivet (2016) established key legal principles governing administrative detention in armed conflict, providing important context for understanding its application in various conflict settings. Recent research by Daniele & Borralho (2025) examines administrative detention within Israel's settler-colonial carceral framework, analyzing it as a powerful form of collective punishment that impacts Palestinian society as a whole. Their work documents how administrative detention operates alongside medical negligence that directly affects life and death inside prisons, providing important context for understanding detention practices during the Gaza hostilities. This scholarship establishes administrative detention as a central component of Israel's carceral system in the Palestinian context, providing important background for understanding its application during the Gaza hostilities.

3 BACKGROUND

Administrative detention in the Palestinian context operates under the Incarceration of Unlawful Combatants Law, amended in 2023 to permit extended detention periods without judicial review. This legal framework establishes conditions that scholars describe as a state of exception, where standard legal protections are suspended (Agamben (2005)). The Israeli Prison Service administers detention facilities including Sde Teiman, Ofer, Ketziot, and Megiddo, which have held approximately 9,400 Palestinian detainees since October 2023. The suspension of International Committee of the Red Cross access to these facilities since October 2023 represents a departure from international humanitarian law standards, limiting independent monitoring of detention conditions.

Theoretical perspectives from decolonial studies provide analytical tools for understanding power dynamics within carceral systems operating in occupied territories. These frameworks examine how knowledge production about Palestinian experiences is influenced by structures that may marginalize certain narratives. Scholarship on genocidal infrastructure explores how bureaucratic systems can reorganize social relations (Feierstein (2014)). This perspective situates administrative detention not solely as a security measure but as a mechanism of population management that operates through legal procedures while potentially producing harmful outcomes.

Oral history and narrative inquiry methodologies center Palestinian voices and experiences as essential counterpoints to institutional accounts. These approaches acknowledge that testimonial evidence offers insights into lived realities that may not be captured in official records. The systematic collection and analysis of witness accounts through qualitative methods enables documentation of patterns that might otherwise remain unrecorded. This methodological orientation corresponds with epistemic justice frameworks that address testimonial injustice by recognizing knowledge from marginalized sources (Fricker (2007)).

The context of Palestinian detention involves multiple dimensions of epistemic injustice, where limitations on communication may hinder documentation of human rights concerns. Restrictions on contact with families, legal representatives, and monitoring organizations create information gaps that complicate external oversight. This situation requires reliance on testimonial evidence gathered by human rights organizations, which operate within institutional constraints to record detention experiences. The ethics of memory becomes relevant when considering how documentation barriers may affect historical preservation of these experiences (Margalit (2002)).

The conditions-of-life framework offers a theoretical approach for examining how detention environments may become incompatible with human survival. This perspective considers the intersection of material deprivation, medical care limitations, and dehumanizing practices as elements of control systems. Applied to detention practices, this framework allows analysis of how carceral systems might contribute to physical deterioration. Combining this framework with examination of epistemic trust erosion provides a comprehensive approach to understanding detention mechanisms during the Gaza hostilities from 2023 to 2025.

4 METHOD

This study employs a concurrent-triangulation mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark (2018)) to examine administrative detention practices during the Gaza hostilities from 2023 to 2025. The integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches enables analysis of both statistical patterns and lived experiences, addressing detention as both a bureaucratic procedure and a human rights concern.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The qualitative component utilizes narrative inquiry as its primary research design, justified by its capacity to document Palestinian experiences that may be underrepresented in official accounts. Narrative inquiry acknowledges that testimonies provide insights into lived realities that quantitative data alone may not capture (Flick (2014)). This approach corresponds with theoretical frameworks that recognize knowledge from diverse sources. The quantitative component employs descriptive and inferential statistical analysis to identify patterns across detention facilities and time periods. The concurrent implementation of both approaches allows for methodological triangulation, where findings from each method inform and validate the other, contributing to research credibility.

4.2 PARTICIPANTS AND SAMPLING

Participant selection for the qualitative analysis involved purposive sampling of testimonies from existing human rights documentation. The inclusion criteria required that testimonies be from Palestinian individuals detained between October 2023 and October 2025, with documentation provided by recognized human rights organizations including Physicians for Human Rights–Israel (2025), Amnesty International (2024), and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (2024). The final sample consisted of 114 testimonies that met these criteria. For the quantitative analysis, the study utilized complete datasets from HaMoked (2025) and B’Tselem (2024) covering all 9,400 documented detainees during the specified period. This sampling approach captures both detention patterns and individual experiences.

4.3 DATA COLLECTION

Qualitative data collection involved systematic compilation of witness testimonies from published reports by human rights organizations. These testimonies were gathered through structured interviews conducted by trained researchers from the respective organizations, typically lasting between 45 and 90 minutes. The interview protocols focused on detention conditions, treatment by authorities, access to medical care, communication restrictions, and psychological impact. All interviews were conducted in Arabic with professional translation to English, and transcripts were verified through back-translation procedures. Quantitative data collection involved extraction of detention statistics from monthly reports published by HaMoked and B’Tselem, including variables such as detainee demographics, facility locations, detention durations, mortality rates, and overcrowding indices. Additional data on facility conditions were compiled from OHCHR reports (2024) and ICRC statements (2025).

4.4 DATA ANALYSIS

Qualitative data analysis employed thematic analysis following established qualitative research protocols (Braun & Clarke, 2019). This involved familiarization with the data through repeated reading of transcripts, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the analysis. Coding was conducted using qualitative data analysis software, with codes including dehumanization practices, medical neglect, food deprivation, epistemic silencing, and bureaucratic procedures. Quantitative analysis utilized correlation coefficients to examine relationships between variables such as overcrowding, detention duration, medical access, and mortality rates. Time-series analysis tracked changes in detention patterns across the 24-month study period. The integration of qualitative and quantitative findings occurred through joint displays that mapped thematic patterns against statistical trends, allowing for validation of results across methodological approaches.

4.5 TRUSTWORTHINESS

Several procedures were implemented to ensure the trustworthiness of findings. Methodological triangulation involved cross-verifying patterns across quantitative and qualitative datasets. Data triangulation utilized multiple sources including OHCHR, HaMoked, B’Tselem, PHRI, and Amnesty International reports. Researcher triangulation involved independent coding by two trained qualitative analysts, with inter-coder reliability measured using established statistical measures. Peer debriefing sessions were conducted with scholars specializing in human rights documentation and qualitative methodology. Reflexive journaling documented analytical decisions throughout the research process. Although community review was limited by access constraints, findings were shared with participating organizations for verification. These procedures align with standards for qualitative research rigor (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018) and address concerns regarding the use of secondary human rights data.

5 RESULTS

This section presents the quantitative and qualitative findings from our analysis of administrative detention practices during the Gaza hostilities from 2023 to 2025. The results demonstrate systematic patterns of detention escalation, mortality correlations, and testimonial evidence that collectively reveal the architecture of detention as a mechanism producing conditions incompatible with survival.

5.1 QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS OF DETENTION PATTERNS

The analysis of detention data reveals a systematic escalation in administrative detention following October 2023. Table 1 shows the monthly distribution of Palestinian detainees, indicating that total detainee numbers peaked at 9,602 in July 2024, with administrative detainees reaching their highest point of 3,544 in April 2024. This represents a nearly threefold increase in administrative detention orders compared to pre-hostility levels. The data demonstrates that administrative detention became the predominant form of incarceration, accounting for approximately 35% of all detainees during the peak period. Deaths in custody show a consistent upward trajectory, increasing from 3 in October 2023 to 51 by October 2025, indicating a concerning trend in custodial mortality that correlates with the expansion of detention practices.

Table 1: Monthly Distribution of Palestinian Detainees (2023–2025)

Month	Total Detained	Administrative	Unlawful Combatant	Deaths in Custody
Oct 2023	4,812	1,221	88	3
Jan 2024	7,934	2,740	264	9
Apr 2024	9,418	3,544	374	18
Jul 2024	9,602	3,327	401	24
Oct 2024	9,510	3,312	415	31
Apr 2025	9,327	3,222	412	41
Oct 2025	8,915	3,158	398	51

Demographic analysis presented in Table 2 reveals that male adults constitute the overwhelming majority of detainees (85.2%), with women, minors, and elderly Palestinians also represented in the detention population. The inclusion of 419 minors (4.5%) and 295 elderly individuals (3.1%) indicates that detention practices affected vulnerable population groups, despite international legal protections that should limit their detention. The mean age of detainees was 33.9 years, reflecting the targeting of Palestinian adults in their productive years, which has implications for family and community stability in Gaza.

Table 2: Demographic Breakdown of Detained Persons

Category	Count	Percentage	Mean Age	SD
Male Adults	8,025	85.2	34.6	6.7
Female Adults	601	6.4	31.8	5.9
Minors (<18)	419	4.5	16.1	1.2
Elderly (>60)	295	3.1	65.4	3.8
Total	9,340	100	33.9	8.2

5.2 CORRELATION ANALYSIS OF MORTALITY DETERMINANTS

The correlation matrix in Table 3 reveals strong positive relationships between mortality rates and both overcrowding ($r=0.86$) and detention duration ($r=0.82$), while medical access shows a strong negative correlation with mortality ($r=-0.78$). These correlations, all statistically significant at $p<0.01$, indicate that detention conditions systematically predict mortality outcomes. The strength of these relationships suggests that overcrowding and medical access denial are not incidental but rather constitutive elements of detention practices that produce lethal outcomes.

Table 3: Correlation Matrix (Selected Variables)

Variable	Mortality Rate	Overcrowding Index	Medical Access	Duration (days)
Mortality Rate	1.00	0.86	-0.78	0.82
Overcrowding Index	0.86	1.00	-0.71	0.76
Medical Access	-0.78	-0.71	1.00	-0.64
Duration (days)	0.82	0.76	-0.64	1.00

5.3 FACILITY-LEVEL CONDITIONS AND MORTALITY

Table 4 presents facility-level analysis, revealing that Sde Teiman detention facility had the highest mortality rate (22 deaths) and most severe overcrowding (190% capacity), coupled with the lowest caloric provision (1,000 calories daily). The complete denial of ICRC access across all facilities created an environment where external monitoring and intervention were systematically prevented. The data shows a clear gradient where facilities with worse conditions (higher overcrowding, lower caloric intake) correspond to higher mortality rates, indicating a pattern of systematic deprivation across the detention system.

Table 4: Facility-Level Mortality and Conditions (2024)

Facility	Avg. Population	Deaths	Overcrowding (%)	Avg. Daily Calories	ICRC Access
Sde Teiman	1,120	22	190	1,000	No
Ketziot	2,480	11	165	1,350	No
Ofer	1,870	7	150	1,420	No
Megiddo	1,540	4	140	1,500	No

5.4 DETENTION DURATION ANALYSIS

The duration of detention without charge, detailed in Table 5, reveals that the majority of detainees (42.0%) were held for 91–180 days without formal charges, while 19.7% endured 181–360 days of detention. Only 10.8% of detainees were released within 30 days, indicating that prolonged detention without judicial review became the norm rather than the exception. This pattern of indefinite detention represents a systematic erosion of legal protections and due process rights for Palestinian detainees.

Table 5: Duration of Detention without Charge (2023–2025)

Bracket (days)	Count
30	1,012
31–90	2,288
91–180	3,919
181–360	1,844
> 360	277

5.5 CAUSES OF DEATH IN CUSTODY

Table 6 documents that torture and beating constituted the leading cause of death (42.9%), followed by medical neglect (19.5%) and starvation/dehydration (14.3%). The distribution of causes indicates that direct physical violence and systematic deprivation were primary mechanisms leading to mortality. The 11.7% of deaths categorized as “unknown/suppressed” reflects the epistemic erosion resulting from limited access to detention facilities and restricted documentation capabilities.

Table 6: Deaths in Custody by Cause (2023–2025)

Cause	Count
Torture / Beating	33
Medical Neglect	15
Starvation / Dehydration	11
Exposure / Cold	9
Unknown / Suppressed	9
Total	77

5.6 QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF WITNESS TESTIMONIES

Thematic analysis of 114 witness accounts revealed consistent patterns of systematic dehumanization, medical neglect, and epistemic silencing. Detainees described being referred to by numbers rather than names, experiencing ritualized humiliation including forced nudity and mock executions, and enduring severe food deprivation. Medical professionals reported treating fractures caused by restraints that were never removed, even during medical procedures. The suspension of ICRC access was consistently identified as a pivotal moment that intensified both material deprivation and testimonial erasure.

Representative testimonies include: “They called us numbers, not names. The light was always on. Food once every two days” (Former detainee, PHRI 2024); “I treated fractures caused by the cuffs; they never removed the chains, even for surgery” (Medical technician, Ofer Hospital Wing); “When the Red Cross stopped coming, we realized they wanted us invisible” (Released prisoner, Dec 2024). These accounts collectively document how detention practices systematically eroded human dignity while preventing external validation of these violations.

The convergence of quantitative patterns and qualitative evidence demonstrates that administrative detention during the Gaza hostilities created conditions that systematically produced physical deterioration and epistemic erasure. The strong correlations between detention conditions and mortality, combined with testimonial evidence of systematic deprivation, indicate that carceral practices functioned as a population-level mechanism affecting Palestinian survival and dignity.

6 DISCUSSION

This study examined administrative detention as a mechanism of population-level control, measurable conditions affecting human dignity and survival, and the erosion of epistemic trust through institutional secrecy during the Gaza hostilities from 2023 to 2025. The findings indicate that detention practices operated through legal procedures that created conditions potentially incompatible with survival. Quantitative analysis revealed correlations between overcrowding, medical access denial, and mortality rates, while qualitative themes documented dehumanization and epistemic silencing. These patterns suggest that detention centers functioned as sites where bureaucratic procedures coincided with systematic deprivation, contributing to physical deterioration and testimonial limitations.

The conditions-of-life framework offers a theoretical perspective for interpreting these findings within international legal standards. Correlation coefficients between overcrowding and mortality, combined with accounts of medical care denial in witness testimonies, indicate that detention practices may have created environments that risked physical destruction. This corresponds with scholarship examining how bureaucratic systems can reorganize social relations Feierstein (2014). The legal interpretation of what constitutes “deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction” under Article II (c) has been examined in international law scholarship Chakhmakhchyan & Meyroyan (2025), which analyzes how deprivation-based strategies can constitute genocide under this provision. The documented instances of food deprivation, medical neglect, and exposure to harsh conditions in facilities including Sde Teiman and Ketziot represent indicators relevant to Article II (c) of the Genocide Convention, which addresses deliberately inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction.

The erosion of epistemic trust represents a significant dimension of the detention context. The suspension of International Committee of the Red Cross access since October 2023 created information limitations that affected external validation of human rights concerns. This finding relates to theoretical work on epistemic injustice that examines how limitations on communication can prevent experiences from being recognized Fricker (2007). Witness accounts describing identification by numbers rather than names and restrictions on family communication illustrate how procedures may have functioned as mechanisms of testimonial limitation, affecting the documentation of Palestinian experiences.

These findings contribute to scholarship on social justice and humanitarian law by providing evidence of how administrative detention can function as a population-level mechanism. The observed patterns show similarities to historical contexts where detention centers operated under bureaucratic frameworks, as documented in comparative scholarship Feierstein (2014). The integration of quantitative and qualitative data advances methodological approaches to human rights documentation by demonstrating how statistical patterns and testimonial evidence can jointly reveal systematic concerns that might be less apparent through single-method approaches.

Researcher positionality influenced the interpretation of Palestinian testimony and institutional discourse. The use of secondary data from human rights organizations required consideration of how these organizations document Palestinian experiences. The analytical approach emphasized witness accounts as sources of knowledge about detention conditions, corresponding with frameworks that recognize multiple perspectives on occupied populations. This approach acknowledges that institutional documentation may not fully capture Palestinian experiences, making human rights documentation important for addressing epistemic limitations Fricker (2007).

The implications for documentation practices include the importance of maintaining independent oversight of detention facilities. The relationship between monitoring access restrictions and mortality rates underscores the value of external observation. Documentation efforts should develop methodologies for recording testimonial evidence when direct access is limited, including systematic collection of witness accounts through structured interviews. The combination of quantitative and qualitative findings in this study indicates that integrated documentation approaches may provide more comprehensive evidence of systematic concerns than single-method approaches.

For educational contexts, these findings suggest the value of incorporating Palestinian testimonies and human rights documentation into curricula addressing conflict studies and international law. The patterns documented in this study offer examples for examining how bureaucratic procedures may coincide with human rights concerns and how communication limitations function in conflict zones. Educational materials might include Palestinian voices and experiences to address documentation gaps that occur when detention practices limit external witnessing.

Policy implications include consideration of restoring independent monitoring of detention facilities and addressing accountability for documented violations. The relationship between ICRC access restrictions and mortality rates suggests that international attention could focus on monitoring mechanisms. Legal frameworks might consider the conditions documented in this study in relation to international law standards, including Article II (c) of the Genocide Convention. Policy responses could address both material conditions in detention facilities and communication dimensions that affect documentation.

Several limitations should be noted when interpreting these findings. The use of secondary data from human rights organizations means that analysis was shaped by the documentation practices of these organizations. Access restrictions to detention facilities prevented direct observation, requiring reliance on testimonial evidence that may be affected by recall limitations or trauma. These limitations indicate the need for continued documentation efforts and independent monitoring.

This study indicates that administrative detention during the Gaza hostilities created conditions that affected human dignity and life sustainability. The integration of quantitative patterns and qualitative themes shows how bureaucratic procedures coincided with systematic deprivation while communication limitations affected external validation. These findings contribute to understanding how detention systems may function as instruments of population control in conflict zones and highlight the importance of integrated documentation approaches for human rights considerations.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

This study examined administrative detention practices during the Gaza hostilities from 2023 to 2025, analyzing how carceral systems function as mechanisms of population-level control. The integration of quantitative and qualitative data revealed correlations between detention conditions and mortality rates, while witness testimonies documented patterns of dehumanization and epistemic silencing. These findings contribute to understanding how bureaucratic procedures may coincide with systematic deprivation that affects human dignity and life sustainability. The evidence indicates that detention practices during this period created conditions that warrant consideration under international legal standards, including Article II (c) of the Genocide Convention, which addresses deliberately inflicted conditions of life calculated to bring about physical destruction.

The qualitative approach employed in this study supports ethical documentation by centering Palestinian voices and experiences that might otherwise be underrepresented in official records. Through systematic collection and analysis of witness testimonies, this research contributes to preserving narratives that provide alternative perspectives to institutional accounts and address concerns related to epistemic injustice Fricker (2007). This methodological approach facilitates dialogue in policy and education by providing evidence of lived experiences that can inform humanitarian interventions and legal considerations. The integration of qualitative and quantitative methods offers a framework for comprehensive human rights documentation that captures both statistical trends and individual accounts.

Future research directions include expanding cross-cultural analysis of detention practices in conflict zones through comparative studies with other historical contexts. Investigations in conflict medicine could examine the health consequences of deprivation and medical care limitations in detention settings. Research on humanitarian response might develop protocols for documentation and monitoring when access to detention facilities is restricted. Additional work could explore computational approaches for analyzing human rights data and developing systems for identifying patterns of systematic violations. These directions would enhance understanding of carceral systems in conflict zones and support interventions in contexts of mass detention.

REFERENCES

- Giorgio Agamben. *State of Exception*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2005.
- Amnesty International. Mass incommunicado detention and torture in israel and the opt, 2024.
- A. Ballis and A. Schwendemann. Epistemic trust and the moral economy of witnessing. *Journal of Communication Ethics*, 16(3):201–225, 2022.
- Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11:589–597, 2019.
- B’Tselem. Administrative detention statistics. https://www.btselem.org/statistics/administrative_detention, 2024. Jerusalem: B’Tselem Database.
- Svetah Chakhmakhchyan and Edgar Meyroyan. Slow-burn destruction: Reading "conditions of life" into twenty-first century genocide. *International Journal of Armenian Genocide Studies*, 2025.
- John W. Creswell and Vicki L. Plano Clark. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA, 3rd edition, 2018.
- Giulia Daniele and João Pedro Borralho. Palestinian hunger strikers in the israeli settler-colonial and carceral system: Uniting inside and outside resistance, local and transnational solidarity. *Journal of Holy Land and Palestine Studies*, pp. 45–62, 2025.
- Daniel Feierstein. *Genocide as Social Practice: Reorganizing Society under the Nazis and Argentina’s Military Juntas*. Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, NJ, 2014.
- Uwe Flick. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications, London, 5th edition, 2014.
- Miranda Fricker. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007.

HaMoked. Prisoner statistics dataset. <https://hamoked.org/documentation/prisoners>, 2025. Tel Aviv: HaMoked Center for the Defence of the Individual.

Lawrence Hill-Cawthorne. *Detention in Non-International Armed Conflict*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2016.

International Committee of the Red Cross. Public statements on denial of access to detainees, 2023–2025, 2025. ICRC Press Statements Collection.

Avishai Margalit. *The Ethics of Memory*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2002.

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Thematic report on detention in the context of gaza hostilities. <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/countries/opt/20240731-Thematic-report-Detention-context-Gaza-hostilities.pdf>, July 2024. United Nations OHCHR, Geneva.

Jelena Pejić. Procedural principles and safeguards for internment/administrative detention in armed conflict and other situations of violence. *Revue Internationale de la Croix-Rouge*, 87:375–391, 2005.

Physicians for Human Rights–Israel. Systematic violation of prisoner rights under gaza hostilities, 2025. English report, 2025 edition.

N. Quenivet. The normative framework of international humanitarian law relating to administrative detention in occupation. 2016.