Gaza on Their Minds: The Effect of “Operation Cast Lead” in Mobilizing Palestinian Action¹
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On December 27, 2008, Israeli armed forces launched air raids on the Gaza Strip. In what Israeli military officials coined, “Operation Cast Lead,” Israeli forces attacked the Gaza Strip with twenty-three days of aerial assaults and ground incursions in an effort to weaken Hamas’ power in Gaza and to bring an end to Hamas rockets fired into Israel. “Operation Cast Lead” was not the first Israeli attack in the Gaza Strip since Hamas seized power in 2007, but it was the largest Israeli military campaign since the Second Intifada and was reported to have caused the highest rates of casualties and injuries in a single day since 1948.² The Arab press decried Israel’s assault and described it as one of the worst attacks against Palestinians since the creation of Israel in 1948, what Palestinians call the “nakba,” or catastrophe. Populations in Arab countries took to the streets to protest Israel’s actions and their own governments’ complicity in them, with contentious demonstrations occurring in Jordan and Egypt, the only two Arab countries having formal peace agreements with Israel. But for Palestinians citizens of Israel (who are also called Arab Israelis or Arab citizens of Israel), or in the Israeli-occupied West Bank, “Operation Cast Lead” was a reminder of the splintered nature of the Palestinian national community in the face of continued occupation, evident in the increasing political separation of the Gaza Strip from the West Bank.³

This paper seeks to address the following questions: to what extent does the political, economic and social isolation of the Gaza Strip affect its place in a larger Palestinian national consciousness, especially among Palestinians in Israel and the West Bank who are the physically closest Palestinians to their Gazan kin? Do Palestinians in Israel and in the West Bank continue to identify with those Palestinians living in Gaza as part of their own people, and, particularly for West Bankers, as part of the national project of a future Palestinian state?

Exploring Palestinian responses in Israel and in the West Bank to “Operation Cast Lead” reveals how solidarity with the people of Gaza remains a central feature of collective Palestinian identity and national resistance, despite Gaza’s
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physical and political isolation from the West Bank and from the Palestinian diaspora. More specifically, political statements and protest activity regarding Gaza among Palestinian citizens of Israel reveal greater unity between mass public opinion and political leadership in the Palestinian community in Israel when compared to political statements and protest activity of Palestinians in the West Bank and the leadership of the Palestinian Authority (PA). Overall, internal political divisions hampered a strong response to “Operation Cast Lead” in the West Bank, a reflection of greater challenges to incorporating solidarity with Gaza into the political platforms of the Palestinian community in the West Bank.

INCREASING ISOLATION OF THE GAZA STRIP

The Gaza Strip was of tangential interest to the international community for a long time with regard to the occupied Palestinian territories, and is often referred to as the “stepchild of the West Bank” or “the forgotten man of the Middle East.”

The center of the Palestinian national movement has traditionally focused elsewhere, whether in Beirut or Ramallah, although the movement’s battles were often fought on the streets of Gaza. But the deteriorating humanitarian conditions and the process of “de-development” in the Strip, as noted by scholar Sarah Roy, provides the international community with a testing ground for economic development and humanitarian aid despite its constantly evolving political circumstances and leadership.

In the Palestinian national psyche, however, Gaza remains a key symbol of national resistance. This is partially due to Israeli treatment of the Strip and an Israeli policy of physical separation of Palestinians in the West Bank from those in Gaza. As Sara Roy points out, “it is important to examine the Gaza Strip as a separate entity because the Strip, more than any of the territories occupied by Israel, provides a stark clarification of the intentions as well as the consequences of Israeli policy.”

Gaza saw the building of Israeli settlements after 1967; Gazan residents also experienced some of the most repressive policies of control under the Israeli occupation and in response to Palestinian resistance during the Second Intifada, including thirteen percent more deaths compared to the West Bank. Hamas’ ascent to power in the 2006 Palestinian parliamentary elections and its subsequent seizure of control in the Gaza Strip facilitated fragmentation of the Palestinian community in the political arena. It also resulted in increased Israeli closures of the Gaza Strip and tighter restrictions in the West Bank, including “increased security operations,” restrictions of movement between Israel and the West Bank for foreign passport holders, and reestablished roadblocks and checkpoints that had been previously dismantled.

Today, the Gaza Strip is isolated in three distinct ways: through policies of the Israeli occupation, which govern border crossings and an economic blockade on the Strip; through Palestinian politics, with the rise of Hamas to power in Gaza, political tension and competition with Fatah (and the Palestinian Authority) in Ramallah, and its increasing perception as an Islamist entity; and through the deteriorating humanitarian situation in the Strip and the politics of humanitarian aid policies. Israel’s disengagement from its settlements in Gaza also played a role in separating Palestinians in the West Bank and in Gaza, as the population of Gaza became “effectively sealed in, and the national dismemberment of the Palestinians, long a cornerstone of Israeli policy, has been achieved, at least with regard to the West Bank and Gaza” in the aftermath of the disengagement.

Israel has control over most official movement of goods and people in and out of the Gaza Strip through its established border crossings and transport sites, despite its withdrawal from settlements in 2005. Palestinians
in Gaza are not able to leave the Strip through Israeli-administered borders without permission from the Israeli army. There is another crossing for Palestinians at the Rafah border, which allows for some movement of persons across the border of Gaza with Egypt. Egyptian and Palestinian authorities claim that the crossing is open every day for people to cross; however, in practice Egyptian authorities under the Mubarak regime have kept the border closed with only periodic openings since Hamas came to power in Gaza. Local Gazan businessmen and Hamas officials operate the now infamous underground tunnels between Egypt and Gaza at Rafah to illegally transport goods into the Gaza Strip, including weapons. Gazans rely on these imports from Israel and Egypt to fill Gaza’s stores and markets; the lack of trade and of free movement of goods has crippled Gaza’s economy.

The fragmentation of the PA government between the Gaza Strip, led by Hamas, and the West Bank, led by Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, has isolated Palestinians in Gaza from Palestinians in the West Bank and from the international community. After Hamas came to power in Gaza, the political orientation of both territories seemed to head in opposite directions, as if in direct competition with one another. According to Moin Rabbani, Abbas’ West Bank model sought to accept the reality of the current situation and work with international sponsorship to achieve a set of priorities acceptable to the international community, while Hamas’ Gaza Strip model sought a path of resistance, refused to comply with international demands, and insisted on recognition of statehood. Abbas’ leadership, among other external and internal factors, has weakened Fatah; the party itself is divided between those in the elite close to Abbas and those interested in continuing to resist the Israeli occupation rather than work with Israeli leaders to achieve a final peace agreement.

The Gaza Strip is also increasingly seen as a humanitarian crisis to solve rather than part of the larger project of Palestinian political and economic development. Several major donor states, such as the United States, officially label Hamas a terrorist organization and prevent aid activities from benefiting the Hamas government in any way. American aid agencies, for example, must comply with U.S. legislation on anti-terrorist financing and the Patriot Act, which makes it illegal for any aid organization to provide “material support” to known terrorist organizations. Due to the fact that Hamas is the governing authority in Gaza with whom aid agencies must coordinate for long-term development projects, the space for aid activities is reduced to primarily humanitarian relief. In addition, Israeli policies increasingly restrict the movement of foreign aid workers into the Gaza Strip from Israel, limiting the ability of the international community to conduct operations there. As a result, major donor states increasingly channel bilateral aid through the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank, who is also seen as the trustworthy partner for the broad project of Palestinian development and for future status negotiations.

Indeed, even those working within the humanitarian aid community recognize the danger of these strategies. Karen Abu-Zayyed, former Commissioner General of UNRWA, has noted that the international community is complicit in maintaining the conditions for destitution in the Gaza Strip due to its inability to assist Palestinians in changing their economic reality; Gaza, she says, will become one of the first territories to remain in such a state of impoverishment with the knowledge of the international community. The administration of only a sufficient amount of aid contributes to what Ilana Feldman has called the “humanitarianism problem” in the Gaza Strip, in which aid influences “a political field of identity and action in ways that are not within the control of either relief workers or aid recipients.” The international community, in addition to Israeli
policies and internal Palestinian political divisions, has played an important role in treating the population in the Gaza Strip as separate from the West Bank.

The Imagined Palestinian Community

Palestinian nationalism and collective identity have been shaped by a shared experience of dispossession, displacement and fragmentation. This shared experience provides Palestinians throughout the world with a common narrative that is strengthened with each new denial of statehood, attack on a refugee camp, or military action in the occupied Palestinian territories or surrounding states. Rashid Khalidi notes that the nakba and events of 1948 “reinforced preexisting elements of identity, sustaining and strengthening a Palestinian self-definition that was already present. The shared events of 1948 thus brought the Palestinians closer together in terms of their collective consciousness, even as they were physically dispersed all over the Middle East and beyond.”

This connectedness among Palestinians, despite the lack of a physical state, evokes expressions of solidarity when one segment of the dispersed Palestinian community comes under attack or is threatened in some way. Therefore, Palestinians as a national community can be best understood using Benedict Anderson’s idea of an “imagined community,” in which the nation exists in the minds of each Palestinian as an “image of their communion.” Because Palestinians have no physical place to claim as a nation state, the idea of a Palestinian nation is also subjectively based on competing collective memories that conjure notions of what it means to be Palestinian.

Because Palestinians have no physical place to claim as a nation state, the idea of a Palestinian nation is also subjectively based on competing collective memories that conjure notions of what it means to be Palestinian.

The extent to which Palestinians identify with a Palestinian national narrative and with a collective Palestinian notion of self depends on each individual’s personal experience of what it means to be Palestinian after 1948. Brubaker and Cooper’s work on identity explains how competing external identifications, a selective self-understanding, and a feeling of commonality or connectedness with a group shape the ways in which a person understands and acts upon her identity. For example, in addition to competing Palestinian and Israeli national identities, Palestinians citizens of Israel may understand their strongest sense of self through their religious affiliation (be it Christian, Muslim or Druze); through their generational status; or through a broader Arab identity as reflected in Arab nationalism. If a Palestinian citizen in Israel strongly identifies with a collective national Palestinian identity, it can become the basis for political action.

The idea of “commonality, connectedness and groupness” is particularly useful for understanding Palestinian identity and nationalism in relation to the Gaza Strip. The majority of Palestinians in Gaza today, roughly 1.1 million people, fled from areas in Israel as refugees after the State of Israel was created in 1948. Many Palestinians in the West Bank and throughout Israel understand that the Gaza Strip has experienced some of the worst violence of the Arab-Israeli conflict, with the Egyptian occupation (from 1948-1956 and again from 1957-1967) and the Israeli occupation of the Strip resulting in overpopulation and destitution. In a sense, Gaza also represents what Palestinians see as the worst of Israeli repression in its policies of occupation and provides a rallying cry for the Palestinian national movement against the Israeli occupation.

Solidarity with the people of the Gaza Strip thus becomes a prerequisite for any type of antioccupation efforts or rhetoric, although it does not necessarily result in concrete action to alter the
reality of Palestinians in the Gaza Strip. A major military assault on Gaza, where Palestinians are already unable to leave due to restrictions on movement, automatically produces a Palestinian national response. The underlying motivations and effectiveness of Palestinian protests, however, reveal the challenges to locate the Gaza Strip as part of a common narrative of Palestinian identity.

**Palestinians in the West Bank Respond to “Operation Cast Lead”**

General strikes, sporadic protests, and clashes with Israeli and Palestinian Authority security forces made up the majority response of Palestinians in the West Bank and East Jerusalem to the events of “Operation Cast Lead.” Palestinians took to the streets of Ramallah almost immediately after “Operation Cast Lead” began, shouting expressions of solidarity, such as “the West Bank is with you,” and calling for national unity. But political divisions were on the minds of Palestinians in the West Bank throughout the protests. The pro-Palestinian Authority newspaper, *al-Quds*, published an editorial on January 4, 2009, saying, “On the Palestinian national level, the division must end once and for all. We must all stand in one row against the aggression and the Israeli acts of killing and destruction because the war targets all of us. It also targets all our aspirations for an independent state and a national identity.” The tension between a desire to show solidarity with Palestinians in Gaza and the political constraints tempering full support on the streets characterized the Palestinian response in the West Bank.

The reports of Palestinian news agencies based in the West Bank carried almost daily coverage of death tolls in Gaza and focused on the extent of the destruction, responses of Palestinian political parties, and official statements of the Palestinian Authority. In total, Palestinian news agencies carried hundreds of stories on “Operation Cast Lead” throughout the duration of the conflict, with the Ma’an News Agency, based in Bethlehem, running thirty-four stories alone on the first day of hostilities. In addition, the articles included exhortations to Arab governments to take action on behalf of the Palestinian people, op-ed pieces directed at Israeli and Palestinian leadership, and information describing the responses of the United Nations and other international aid agencies to the situation. The language of the articles themselves focused on actions taken by political party leadership to protest, decry or condemn the attacks in Gaza, almost all with language placing blame squarely on Israel. Individual political parties, such as the PFLP and Fatah leadership in certain Palestinians cities, used Palestinian news agencies to release statements on the atrocities and call its membership to action. Activities varied by district or major city, with Hebron’s Fatah party declaring three days of mourning, decrying an Israeli “Holocaust” in Gaza, and organizing a blood drive for Gazan hospitals. Nablus and Ramallah saw the largest protests, with several thousand attending the first major protest on the Friday after the attacks began, and an increase in demonstrations in the city center as “Operation Cast Lead” continued.

But tight control by the PA hampered demonstrations by political parties as PA security forces regulated the type of response allowed. From the beginning of “Operation Cast Lead,” PA governors sought to “maintain public order” by forbidding major demonstrations (such as were held during the Intifadas) out of fear of clashes with Israeli border police and PA security forces in the West Bank. These fears were not without justification; a protest in Ramallah during the first week of “Operation Cast Lead” resulted in the death of two Palestinian protestors after Israeli forces responded to stone throwing at a demonstration. For the most part, Palestinian security forces worked with Israeli security forces
to ensure that demonstrations did not spread throughout the West Bank or rise to the level of confrontations seen in the Second Intifada.

The role of Palestinian security forces in policing the demonstrations is illustrative of the Palestinian Authority’s position during “Operation Cast Lead.” President Mahmoud Abbas and officials closest to him officially appeared outraged at the atrocities occurring against the Palestinian people, while simultaneously attempting to temper Palestinian support for Hamas as the unsung hero of the war. Only one pro-Hamas demonstration of note was allowed by Palestinian security forces and covered in the Palestinian print media: a group of thirty women walked silently through Ramallah’s Manara Circle, calling for national unity as a PA security jeep drove alongside them and a small number of Palestinian police walked in front of the women. No television crews were present at the demonstration. This sanctioned protest drastically differs from various first-hand reports of the PA security forces using force against unarmed protestors in support of Hamas, arresting demonstrators, using pepper spray, and in one instance, causing the death of a protester.

Despite the actions of its security forces, the PA’s official statements in the West Bank gave the appearance of a government dedicated to working with all factions, supportive of Palestinians in Israel, and outraged at Israeli aggression. The PA-sponsored Wafa (Palestine News Agency) in the West Bank published seventy-seven stories during “Operation Cast Lead,” seven of which included direct calls for action, unification of Palestinian political parties, or condemnation of Israeli actions by Palestinian leadership. Only one of the articles included an explicit threat to cease PLO participation in negotiations with the Israeli government, which was generally seen by Palestinians in the West Bank as a necessary PA response to Israeli actions in Gaza. However, a sense of abandonment and separation between the West Bank and the Gaza Strip remained. One protester held up a cell phone connected to Gaza to broadcast the chanting at a West Bank demonstration, to which the Gaza end of the phone replied, “Really? Is the

West Bank really with us? Did you finally wake up?”

Even Palestinian politicians in Israel were critical of the PA’s stance during “Operation Cast Lead.” Former Minister of the Israeli Knesset, Azmi Bishara, said, “Abbas has a real problem. He’s trying now to be a hero, but he doesn’t even know how to pretend. Even when he tried to talk warmly about Gaza, he couldn’t do it, because he actually blames the victims.”

Despite these claims, Abbas continued to emphasize unity, describing “the current situation in Gaza as a massacre and an act of criminal aggression targeting not only the basic rights of Gazans but of all Palestinians. Israelis have used Palestinian blood in Gaza for their election propaganda.” He also noted that the events in Gaza affect all Palestinians, explaining that he holds the Israeli government accountable for atrocities in Gaza. These statements did not convince a Palestinian public, however, of genuine PA concern, but rather reinforced the perceived disconnect between official PA statements and PA actions.

For many in the West Bank, Hamas’ steadfastness during “Operation Cast Lead” recalled notions of Palestinian resistance central to the collective understanding of Palestinian identity and nationalism. A major result of “Operation Cast Lead” for Palestinian politics was the increased demand among the Palestinian public for reconciliation with Hamas, as many in the West Bank saw the war as a consequence of the division between the West Bank and Gaza. In addition, Abbas’ presidential term ended during the hostilities, causing vigorous discussion in both Palestinian and Arab media sources throughout the Middle East about a potential power vacuum and what was to be done within the Palestinian Authority. In the midst of the war, Hamas
declared that it no longer recognized Abbas as President, but did not dispute his continued place in office in light of “Operation Cast Lead.”

**Palestinians in Israel Respond to “Operation Cast Lead”**

A few hours after the first Israeli bombs fell on the Gaza Strip, Palestinian citizens of Israel mobilized into action. Palestinians organized protests in the major Arab cities of Nazareth and Umm el-Fahm, and Arab political parties in Israel immediately issued statements and organized demonstrations directed at the Israeli government for their actions in “Operation Cast Lead.” Although demonstrations were held in major Arab centers, the most notable protest occurred on January 3, 2009, when approximately 120,000 Palestinian citizens of Israel demonstrated in the Palestinian town of Sakhnin in what was reported to be the largest Palestinian demonstration ever held in Israel. The demonstration in Sakhnin was one of three national protests held in Israel on January 3, 2009, but was perhaps the most important demonstration due to the significance of Sakhnin, where Palestinian citizens of Israel hold annual Land Day protests.

Palestinians also joined in demonstrations with left-wing Jewish Israelis on a national day of protests on January 3, 2009, organizing a protest in Tel Aviv that attracted 15,000 participants, the majority of whom were Palestinian citizens of Israel. The regularity and force with which demonstrations took place across Israel was matched by the strong stance taken by Palestinian politicians and heads of Arab organizations in speaking out on behalf of Palestinians in Gaza.

The regularity and force with which demonstrations took place across Israel was matched by the strong stance taken by Palestinian politicians and heads of Arab organizations in speaking out on behalf of Palestinians in Gaza.

`The regularity and force with which demonstrations took place across Israel was matched by the strong stance taken by Palestinian politicians and heads of Arab organizations in speaking out on behalf of Palestinians in Gaza.`

Palestinian citizens of Israel have taken to the streets in solidarity with Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip before. Palestinian demonstrations and political action surrounding the Second Intifada were held in cities with a majority of Palestinian citizens, such as Nazareth and Jaffa, in solidarity with events taking place in the West Bank. These actions represent a sense of commonality that Palestinians in Israel feel with their kin in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Some demonstrations turned into riots, resulting in violent clashes between police and protestors.

The events of October 2000, in which twelve Palestinian citizens of Israel were killed during one such demonstration, have come to symbolize a public display of Palestinian discontent with Israeli actions against Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. These events have also increased fears among Jewish Israelis that Palestinian citizens in Israel represent a “fifth column” in Israeli society.

In addition, the events of October 2000 marked a “defining moment” for Palestinians in Israel between the ages of seventeen and twenty-five, who appear to identify more with a Palestinian national identity as compared to older generations of Palestinians in Israel. For example, the majority of the twelve Palestinian citizens of Israel killed in solidarity demonstrations during October 2000 were under the age of thirty. This display of solidarity across the physical Green Line represents a bond among those who identify with the idea of a Palestinian nation. Palestinian youth in Israel were some of the most active protestors of Israeli actions in Gaza during “Operation Cast Lead,” with reported incidents of youth throwing stones at cars along highways and at town entrances, wearing ski masks and blocking major roads.

Websites serving the Palestinian community carried daily announcements of when and where demonstrations would occur. The popular website, www.Arabs48.com, provided the most comprehensive directory of demonstrations, with the full geographic range of cities in Israel represented. Over the course of “Operation Cast Lead,” Arabs48.com carried 189 articles about the events in Gaza from a distinctively Arab or Palestinian point of view. The articles on Palestinian websites discussed the actions of Arab...
human rights organizations in response to the attacks; these websites also ran op-eds by Palestinian political leaders in Israel. A majority of articles covering “Operation Cast Lead” on the Arabs48.com website referred to Israel’s actions in Gaza, the level of destruction caused by the daily attacks, and condemnation of Israel’s actions by international leaders. The Arabs48.com website, in addition to the equally popular www.fasl-almaqal.com website, provided an important voice for Palestinians in Israel and a venue to bring together the views and actions of the Palestinian community in Israel.

Palestinian political leaders also brought strong views of the Palestinian community into the public forums where they engage with Israeli political leaders and officials. One notable incident included an argument between a Palestinian Member of the Knesset, Muhammad Baraka, and a member of the Likud party, Gilad Arden, on the floor of the Knesset. Baraka spoke on the floor to demand accountability from the Israeli government for its military campaign and to demand an end to the attacks. At one point, Arden told Baraka to “Go to Gaza,” a common insult in Hebrew with a comparable meaning in English of “Get Lost” or “Go to Hell.”

Tensions between Baraka and Arden, as well as other right-wing Israeli Ministers of the Knesset, escalated to a point where Baraka was forcibly removed from the Knesset.

As a result of these factors, Palestinian citizens of Israel were more unified in their acts of solidarity than Palestinians in the West Bank. One major reason for this unity was the existence of a central body, the Higher Follow-Up Committee for Arab Citizens of Israel, which called for and organized pro-Gaza demonstrations. The Higher Follow-Up Committee consists of Arab leaders from political parties and major organizations, and acts as an umbrella body for representing the concerns of the Palestinian community in Israel. Not only did the Higher Follow-Up Committee plan demonstrations throughout Israel in areas with predominantly Arab populations, it also issued a “Political Communiqué of the Arab Population of Israel.” This Communiqué was a strong statement of Palestinian nationalism and identity, declaring that “the Israeli hostilities against fellow Palestinians in Gaza are an assault against all our people everywhere ... it is our duty to oppose and resist such actions and to break the siege.” It also declares Israel “a criminal state in all its constituent parts, including its political leaders and those entrusted with its security,” and accuses Israel of committing gross human rights violations of the highest legal character, including war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide in Gaza.

The language of the Committee’s Communiqué contradicts some of what Azmi Bishara outlines as the role of Palestinian citizens of Israel to act in solidarity but not necessarily join the activities of resistance of Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. In one section, the Communiqué affirms “the call for a unified Palestinian national struggle based on support for Palestinian resistance confronting Israel’s genocidal hostilities.” This unification of Palestinian political parties in their stance against Israel during “Operation Cast Lead” was also exemplified by the lack of infighting and competition between Arab political parties during an election year in Israel. Palestinian political parties in Israel did not have to worry about the political threat of Hamas to their own survival, as compared to Palestinian politics in the West Bank, which may have played a role in fostering this unity.

Due to their status as Israeli citizens, Palestinian citizens of Israel do not see themselves as part of the same struggle as Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, but as possessing a unique responsibility of solidarity with their Palestinian kin. Even in the midst of numerous demonstrations, there was a clear sense that Palestinians in Israel had a unique role in directly challenging the Israeli government. It is easier for Palestinian citizens of Israel to hold demonstrations to voice their discontent with Israeli policies as a means through which to air grievances, not as a mobilizing tool of resistance in service of a greater national movement. Although it arrested approximately three hundred Palestinian citizens of Israel in the first few days of “Operation Cast Lead,” the Israeli government continued to allow demonstrations to take place. In fact, the Israeli police and the Public
Security Minister met with leaders in the Arab community to discuss how to control riots among Palestinian youth after the first few days of “Operation Cast Lead.” Unlike Palestinians in the West Bank, who must contend with the constraints of Palestinian security forces, Israeli border police, and political complications of internal Palestinian politics, Palestinians in Israel are able to organize politically under Israeli law, which provides for the freedom of expression and demonstration. Palestinians mobilized to send a direct message to the Israeli government that as citizens of Israel, they were outraged by Israel’s actions in Gaza and understood “Operation Cast Lead” as a direct attack against their own community.

Conclusion: Political Ramifications for Palestinians after “Operation Cast Lead”

As evident in the protest activity of Palestinians in the West Bank and Israel, “Operation Cast Lead” provided an opportunity for both the unification and the division of the Palestinian community. The contentious role of Hamas in Palestinian politics may have hindered the Palestinian Authority from making strong statements of Palestinian national unity, but it did not prevent the Palestinian public from taking to the streets in solidarity with Gaza. The Palestinian community in Israel was able to produce a stronger united front in response to “Operation Cast Lead.” The amount of effort put forth by Palestinian leaders and organizations in Israel to call for accountability for Israel’s actions in “Operation Cast Lead” provides evidence of a Palestinian collective identity within the Palestinian community in Israel that may trump its Israeli identity. The division of the Palestinian community in the West Bank reveals the extent to which the notion of “resistance” in the collective understanding of Palestinian identity is splintered between officials in the Palestinian Authority and the general population.

Ironically, though it is the cause for much of the division in the Palestinian community today, the Gaza Strip may become the most important catalyst in unifying Palestinians around a common cause once again.

Although they could demonstrate with minimal political obstruction, Palestinians in Israel face greater long-term political consequences for siding with their Palestinian kin in the Gaza Strip than Palestinians face in the West Bank. Political activity in support of Palestinian solidarity fuels arguments of those on the political right in Israel, such as Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman, for the physical transfer of Palestinians in Israel to the West Bank in the case of the creation of a future Palestinian state. The Palestinian community and many Jewish communities in Israel view such transfer policies, in which Israel would evacuate settlements in the West Bank in order to allow for the transfer of its Palestinian population to the West Bank, with disdain. Thus, the Palestinian response in Israel to “Operation Cast Lead” reveals that Israel must work to better incorporate Palestinian citizens of Israel into Israeli society and respond to Palestinian grievances, or face a growing Palestinian population frustrated with the aims and objectives of the Israeli government.

As long as successful reconciliation between Fatah and Hamas remains unlikely, the future of a Palestinian national project is in danger of remaining one of division rather than unity for Palestinians in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. The threat of Palestine as a nation existing solely in the minds of its people—a true “imagined community” in every sense of the word—rather than in a physical, independent state remains strong. The control of Palestinian protest activities by the Palestinian Authority during “Operation Cast Lead” also signifies a growing divide between the demands of the populace and the political actions of those who claim to represent it.

The political polarization evident in the West Bank signals an “absence of a national liberation movement among Palestinians that could create institutions to support a strategy of national resistance and reconstruction.” In this sense, the Gaza Strip, as a symbol of national resistance in
the face of substantial violence and destruction, becomes a significant bastion of Palestinian resistance at the heart of Palestinian identity. Though isolated and ignored by much of the international community, the experience of Gazans under occupation acts as a symbol of resistance and justification for condemning Israel’s actions and occupation of Palestinian territory. Ironically, though it is the cause for much of the division in the Palestinian community today, the Gaza Strip may become the most important catalyst in unifying Palestinians around a common cause once again.
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