

The Six Controversies of the Palestinian Cause

Against Halting the War of Extermination

April 23, 2025

Dr. Wael Shadid

Head of the Center for Leadership and Diplomacy

The Palestinian cause and the conflict with the colonial Zionist occupation evoke a set of controversies related to the Palestinian cause. We select six of these controversies to review in this article as a prelude to a proposed roadmap for halting the criminal war of extermination carried out by the Zionists, supported by the United States. These controversies are confirmed and reinforced by the current situation resulting from the criminal war of extermination of the Palestinian people.

The First Controversy: Arab and Islamic strategic depth has been and continues to be the basis and geopolitical and strategic driver for liberating Palestine from invaders throughout history. This includes the first moment of the conquest of Palestine by the Arabs during the era of the Islamic state under Omar ibn al-Khattab, and the annexation of Palestine to the Arab-Islamic nation. Then, in the course of history, came the liberation of Palestine from the Crusader invaders. The Zengi dynasty, of Turkish descent, paved the way for Saladin, a Kurdish dynasty who deployed the Arab armies of Syria, Egypt, and Iraq to liberate Palestine from the Crusader occupation. The Crusader past is similar to the Zionist present, where in the past, Western Crusader powers united to occupy Palestine. Today, the West unites with Zionist Jews for the same goal to support this occupation. Thus, history shows that the liberation of Palestine can only be achieved through its Arab and Islamic strategic depth.

Consequently, this dialectic assumes that the greater responsibility for liberation falls on the shoulders of Arab and Islamic strategic depth and that the Palestinian people remain the spearhead and igniter of the spirit of resistance. They are the torch of resistance within Palestine until the appropriate geopolitical conditions for liberation are in place.

Throughout history, invaders have been aware of this fact and have worked, and continue to work, to weaken Palestine's geopolitical depth and drown it in political problems and troubles, thus remaining weak and unable to create a state of liberation. The strategic depth of Palestine is not far from us these days, as the difficult and complex geopolitical, economic, and social conditions in Iraq, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt hinder this depth from moving toward forming a nucleus for the liberation of Palestine.

Consequently, the occupation of Palestine remains the root of the geopolitical problems of this geostrategic depth, and, at the same time, it is the basis for its empowerment and stability.

The second dialectic: The Palestinian people are a fighting people who generate resistance, stubborn and. This means that Palestinian people generate one resistance after another if it does not achieve its goals. They generate one resistance after another, and so on until the strategic depth is ready for liberation. Since 1920, the Palestinian people have been resisting, led by Musa Kazim al-Husseini, the sheik of the Palestinian national movement, who was martyred in 1933. Then, Syrian-born Izz ad-Din al-Qassam emerged and was martyred in 1935. He was followed by Abdul Qadir al-Husseini, Musa Kazim al-Husseini's son, who was martyred after the Arabs abandoned him in the Battle of Qastal in 1948. Palestinian organizations emerged in the 1960s and 1970s to lead the resistance scene, such as Fatah, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and others. When the flame of resistance faded, the First Intifada erupted in 1987, followed by the Second Intifada in 2000. The Islamic Resistance emerged in 1987 to take up its share of the resistance, spearheaded by Hamas and Islamic Jihad.

This dialectic assumes that resistance is, in general, the hallmark of the entire Palestinian people, not a label or brand to a particular resistance faction. This means that no resistance faction should burden itself with the load of resistance alone, bear its historical responsibility, or burden itself with the consequences of resistance and its inherently high costs. Nor should it believe that the ideology of resistance would ultimately disappear due to its weakness. Rather, it is the march of a persistent and determined people, in which resistance is passed down from generation to generation- for resistance is an idea that never dies.

The third dialectic: The responsibility for national action within Palestine is a collective responsibility for all Palestinians, not the responsibility of a single entity or faction that decides the fate of the Palestinian people and their cause. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) previously constituted a collective body recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, and the Palestinian National Council (PNC) became the de facto reference for the Palestinian people, conferring national legitimacy on it. Consequently, the PNC and the 1968 National Charter were the national reference for all Palestinians. This reality remained in place until the Oslo Accords and the emergence of a new political entity called the Palestinian Authority (PA), which subsequently usurped the PLO and its PNC, depriving the Palestinian people of their unified national legitimacy.

It is true that the Legislative Council (LC), linked to the PA and Oslo, emerged along the way, but it remained insufficient to represent all Palestinians, both abroad and at home.

It subsequently failed to continue, and the LC was unable to keep pace with the unifying national role of the PNC.

This dialectic assumes that the Palestinian people, now, due to the closure of the PLO and the closure of the PNC and the freezing of its role, no longer have the unifying national reference they once had. This argument also assumes that no Palestinian faction can fulfill this role alone (i.e., the role of representing all Palestinians), or decide the fate of the Palestinian people and the Palestinian cause alone, whether as a collective national issue or as a separate issue in the West Bank, Gaza, or abroad. It is not in any Palestinian faction's interest to bear this enormous burden alone, and it is nationally unacceptable. The political, economic, geopolitical, and strategic pressures are far greater than any single faction's capabilities. Experience has proven the inability of any faction to manage Palestinian affairs, even within a specific geographic area. Indeed, the Palestinian division (which is unacceptable within the public) is a fatal factor in preventing unity against the occupation.

The geographic division of the Palestinian people, as a result of the occupation, into four parts: the West Bank, Gaza, the 1948 territories, and abroad, has made representing all Palestinians a complex matter requiring a massive and creative national effort to resolve this dilemma.

This dialectic also demonstrates that, since the Oslo Accords, the Palestinian people have been unable to form a unified national liberation movement since the freezing of the PLO and its National Council. The Palestinian factions, particularly the two main factions, have continued to control Gaza and the West Bank separately.

The fourth dialectic relates to the massive scale of global and popular communication resulting from social media, which often broadcasts events before news agencies and television stations. This rapid and massive popular communication generates intense emotions among the public, which may directly or indirectly influence the strategic and political orientations of the resistance, relevant institutions, or even ruling regimes, whether negatively or positively.

This dialectic assumes that emotions drive bias toward, support for, and applaud a particular orientation, while simultaneously opposing any other orientation that contradicts this sentiment. This, in turn, leads to a shift away from reality, and viewing things from a single angle, rather than from a holistic perspective, as leaders should.

This dialectic also assumes that leaders determine their strategic and political framework and approach based on the factors influencing their internal and external environment, and based on the interactions of opportunities, threats, capabilities, and challenges. They then support this with emotion, which plays a role in driving the rationally determined strategic direction. Accordingly, this dialectic also assumes that neither popular sentiments should influence decision-making, directly or indirectly, nor leaders take

emotions into account when adapting decisions they deem sound, realistic, and in the national interest.

The fifth dialectic: Resistance and liberation movements around the world are undertaking a major national mission: resisting occupation to achieve liberation. Therefore, at the core of their mission is protecting and defending their people to achieve national independence. However, this dialectic was put to a harsh test in Palestine after the Al-Aqsa flood, as the occupation deliberately launched a devastating war of genocide in Gaza, rendering it uninhabitable. It is also carrying out the same experiment in the West Bank, displacing the residents of the camps and working to annex the West Bank to the occupying state. This war of extermination, the Western complicity, the shameful official Arab failure, and the brutal blockade have placed the resistance, for the first time, at a critical turning point.

Either the resistance, which has astounded the world with its steadfastness and the legendary steadfastness of the people in Gaza, continues, or an entire people, including their children, women, and infrastructure, will be annihilated in the most heinous forms of crime the world has witnessed live for hundreds of years.

This dialectic assumes that, after such collusion, betrayal, and annihilation, the resistance has the right to take whatever measures it deems appropriate to halt this forced, criminal genocide to the extent it accepts. It also assumes that the Palestinian people, their national elites, and the Arab and Islamic public appreciate the resistance's performance, regardless of the minimum they accept during negotiation, and will provide a safety net.

The Sixth dialectic: Peoples under occupation have the right to resist, and the occupation bears full responsibility for all crimes it commits against the people it occupies. Accordingly, the Israeli occupation bears full responsibility for its crimes against the Palestinian people according to the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (dated August 12, 1948, particularly Articles 47-78). Consequently, the occupation bears responsibility for the killing and destruction, as well as for reconstruction and the resulting costs.

These six arguments can form the basis for a strategic and political conceptual framework for launching and establishing a Palestinian-led resistance maneuver to halt the criminal war of extermination and formulate a new negotiation strategy followed by consistent political measures. Knowing that there are appropriate circumstances in terms of current global dynamics between the United States and other countries of the world, and upon the strategic blindness of the Zionist enemy, resulting from arrogance and arrogance. This blindness and arrogance have long led it to practices that backfire against it and its Zionist project.