

This Road Leads to Area “A” Under the Palestinian Authority, Beware of Entering: Palestinian Ghetto Policies in the West Bank

*Razi Nabulsi**

“This road leads to Area “A” under the Palestinian Authority. The Entrance for Israeli Citizens is Forbidden, Dangerous to Your Lives, And Is Against The Israeli Law.”

Anyone entering Ramallah through any of the Israeli military checkpoints that surround it, and surround its environs too, may note the abovementioned sentence written in white on a blatantly red sign, clearly written in three languages: Arabic, Hebrew, and English. The sign practically expires at Attara checkpoint, right after Bir Zeit city; you notice it as you leave but it only speaks to those entering the West Bank through the checkpoint. On the way from “Qalandia” checkpoint and until “Attara” checkpoint, the traveller goes through Qalandia Camp first; Kafr ‘Aqab second; Al-Amari Camp third; Ramallah and Al-Bireh fourth; Sarda fifth; and Birzeit sixth, all the way ending with “Attara” checkpoint, where the red sign is located.

Practically, these are not Area “A” borders, but also not even the borders of the Ramallah and Al-Bireh Governorate, neither are they the West Bank borders. This area designated by the abovementioned sign does not fall under any of the agreed-upon definitions, neither legally nor politically, in Palestine. This area is an outsider to legal definitions; it is an outsider that contains everything. It contains areas, such as Kafr ‘Aqab and Qalandia Camp that belong to the Jerusalem municipality, which complies to civil Israeli law; likewise, it contains Area “A”, such as the cities of Ramallah and Al-Bireh, all of which complies to Palestinian security and administrative control; and also, Area “B”, such as the city of Bir Zeit, which complies to Israeli security control and Palestinian administrative control.¹

This paper attempts to read the colonial policies that have led to the creation and formation of these area-ghettos in which Palestinians are crowded and gathered

* Research fellow, Masarat - The Palestinian Center for Policy Research & Strategic Studies, Ramallah.

1 For more see the Geographic Data Regulation Unit, Arij (2009).

through different Israeli configurations of control, socio-political-legal conditions that push Palestinians to move to them, in addition to the social formation itself. And regardless of the legal difference, which is not mentioned arbitrarily since the legal status constitutes an overlapping and unclear sphere, whereby it forms, in some places like Kafr 'Aqab and Samiramis, for example, the main makeup of the social sphere. Furthermore, after presenting and analysing the tangible reality, this paper will try to understand the socio-political state created through policies that produced financial ghettos. First and foremost, however, one must note that the Zionist regime's epistemological premises and governing ideology force themselves even upon those who attempt to research this configuration and its subsequent policies.

Israel: A Multimodal Model

Israel is an ideological state. The Israeli state is governed by an ideology which nourishes the state, which in turn nourishes the ideology, politically embodying its idea through a controversial relationship. This idea is what founded the state and the state derives the legitimacy of its existence and continuation from its core. In other words: the Zionist enterprise, as a socio-political movement and ideology (Bishara, 2006), is the formation of both state and regime. Perhaps the best expression of this approach may have been stated by its former minister of foreign affairs and former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations, Abba Eban. He indicated, at the 27th² Zionist Convention, that the state of Israel is "an ideological state; for it does not exist merely to live, but to live from an idea. It exists to lay the ground for this idea and accomplish it; the establishment of a supreme entity that determines the ideological, spiritual, civil, and intellectual structure."³ The suggestion that the Jewish people are to determine the ideological, spiritual, civil, and intellectual form of the political entity on the land of Palestine could have been a professed, blatant apartheid that announces the theft of Palestine and Palestine's right to self-determination. Apartheid never transpired, however, for one reason: the majority of Palestinians were expelled outside its political entity, while the remaining rest were established as a political minority.

Practically speaking, after the Nakba, Israel succeeded in creating a political regime that came short of a professed and regulated apartheid. Rather, it works as a functional

2 This conference examined the relationship between the different Zionist movement institutes, called national institutes of the Jewish people and the state of Israel, and was held one year after Israel's occupation of what remained of Palestinian lands in 1967.

3 Jerusalem Post. (1968). Quoted in (Aronson, G., 1987, p. 28). Abba Eban worked in many sensitive positions in Israel, and was one of its most experienced diplomats, especially in the field of foreign affairs. He occupied the position of the ambassador to Israel in the United States in 1950, the Minister of Culture and Education in 1966, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1974, in addition to the head of the Ministerial Committee for Security and Foreign Affairs.

apartheid: it assumes apartheid rule in the sense of enabling the supremacy of one racial group and its control over another, all the while refraining from regulating it in such a way that transforms into a professed apartheid. One could also say that the Israeli-established regime is closer to being an ethnocracy, as defined by Yiftachel: it is "a regime that seeks to enable the nation to further extend and deepen its imposition of ethnicity and control over the region and the manner in which the resources are distributed throughout the region." (2006) Yiftachel's definition, however, is still inadequate in providing a comprehensive description of this regime; Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza remain completely outside its political configuration yet simultaneously submit to the domination of the regime and its tools of domination, the very tools that keep them outside the political system (Azoulay & Ophir, 2012). We mentioned all this, of course, without delving into the question of Palestinian refugees, whose very absence and refugeedom allow this regime's existence and formation, and who are ruled by the same configuration of control that ensures their continued existence outside the entire area, which it controls with two sets of law: military and civil law.

Likewise, such regime cannot be considered a military occupation in the traditional sense of an occupation for two main reasons. First, Israel does not perceive itself as an occupation force in the West Bank and Gaza; rather, it portrays its presence there as an act of liberation and return and the Naksa (1967 occupation) as a "divine miracle" (Segev, 2005). Accordingly, it builds its civil institutions, settlements, and road network based on this logic. Second, the international law considers its presence there a temporary act, though everything Israel does in the West Bank is anything but temporary (The International Committee of the Red Cross, 2004). The explanation that Israel controls the West Bank as if it were a "colony" is equally divorced from a reality in which the road network connects colonised roads with the mother state in about half an hour's time, changing its features and presenting the colony as if it were "the land of return." Israel's current policies in Judaising the West bank specifically and within the Green Line formerly is more reminiscent of eternalised British colonial models, like in the case of the United States and South Africa (Baryar, 2004; Al-Akash, 2015) than classical colonialism, like the one that existed in India.

Israel is not a mono-model of systematic oppression: it employs gradual ethnic cleansing and displacement, from one area to another, following the United States model of exterminating the "Red Indians", whereby the act of extermination is not manifest to completion; second, in those ethnically cleansed areas, it establishes political civil rule that is closer to an incomplete apartheid; third, it enforces military rule in those areas, benefiting from the disparities between its military and civil rules in the occupied territories. As such, it all becomes a mixture of "apartheid" and "occupation"; accordingly, it rebuilds the social, military, and ideological infrastructures in order to guarantee a Palestinian minority in the Occupied Territories in the future. This way it

enables the constructions of the same system that leads in the future to an apartheid results without being a professed apartheid. It is only through this logic that one can comprehend the Israeli demographic question around the continuation or end of the occupation of the West Bank, or its annexation now or later. Similarly, we may understand the internal Israeli conflict regarding the “solution” in the West Bank⁴. Such conflict does not concern the annexation of the West Bank or lack thereof as much as it does the guarantee over the future shape of political rule following the annexation of the West Bank. Following the same logic, one may understand the “Labour party” plan of disengagement. More precisely, Zionism is a mixture of tools, control and cleansing models lacking contiguity as one whole model.

Thus, the state monopolises legitimised violence within a defined land (Faber, 1919). Israel practically monopolises violence over the entirety of historic Palestine and controls its borders, refusing any other security presence at these borders. Monopolising of such violence is legitimised through the core of the Zionist enterprise (as movement and ideology) in establishing a national homeland for the Jews first; and, second, through biblical theology, especially after the occupation of what remained of the Palestinian lands in 1967 (Mustafa, 2013; Segev, 2005) – even the most liberal of Israeli thinkers, read it through the theological narrative (Bishara, 2006). Accordingly, Israel’s legitimacy is a colonial-Jewish one.

Inside the Jewish state borders, Palestinians live despite the periodic differences⁵ of the colonial enterprise: Palestinians inside the 1948 occupied lands live in the shadow of an ethnocracy, closer in nature to the state of African Americans in the United States; Palestinians in Jerusalem live in a state of existential uncertainty regarding their relationship to the city through their Israeli-issued legal status of a “resident”; Palestinians in the West Bank live in what looks like “ghettos” with centralised governance; while Palestinians in Gaza are closer in nature to the “Guantanamo” model. Practically speaking, politically and physically, regardless of their legal differences in their status, they all live under the Jewish state system of control. Furthermore, all such differences have been determined in order to serve two essential purposes that lie at the core of Zionism: first, guaranteeing a political system that maintains Jewish control and facilitates their domination; second, controlling the land.

4 Usually, opponents of the Israeli right wing and the Likud and its policies attack it with the claim that the former are leading Israel into “one state” of an Apartheid. In an interview conducted by specialist researcher in settlement affairs, Dror Etkis in Hamakor program, broadcast on the 2nd Chanel, he exposes Israel’s policies to force it either to disengage from the West Bank or annex it to become a pronounced state of Apartheid, and so change the framework of the conflict. The interview may be viewed here: <http://news.nana10.co.il/Article/?ArticleID=1224068> (Hebrew).

5 “Periodic” here means the periods which will be discussed later within the frameworks of the different models, which the paper describes as the “Everything model.”

Kafr 'Aqab, the Aftermath of Targeting Jerusalem

The combination of policies that ensure and enable Jewish control – that is, the legal policies of demographics and people and colonial policies of land control – that is, cornering the largest possible number of Palestinians in the smallest possible area, form undefined grey areas in the Palestinian condition. The area of “Kafr 'Aqab” and “Samiramis” best exemplifies those within the general Palestinian landscape. Here, the “general Palestinian landscape” is neither an arbitrary term nor a generalisation of the situation; rather, it refers to the particularity of the aforementioned area as regards its legal existence within the Jerusalem area, and its physical existence in the West Bank area, delineated by the separation barrier. Kafr 'Aqab is economically and socially connected to the West Bank, officially connected to the municipality or Jerusalem, while its residents pay for services that the municipality of Jerusalem should provide but does not at all considering the town's physical location beyond the wall.

The town of Kafr 'Aqab is located between the city of Jerusalem and the city of Ramallah, 11km north of Jerusalem, and around 4km away from Ramallah. Despite the lack of up to date and accurate population statistics, Kafr 'Aqab town council estimates its population at about 70,000, while the Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics counts a population no larger than 18 thousand people (Assaqa & Hilal, 2015, p. 59). This huge difference between the Israeli population census and the town's council statistics mainly stems from the political-legal condition that has shaped the place. Over the course of 50 years, Kafr 'Aqab transformed from a flourishing Jerusalemite neighbourhood whose population census did not exceed 6,000 people before the Naksa (in 1967) into a town whose population reached 70,000 people. This is all amid a clear absence of any official data or periodic statistics on population growth in Kafr 'Aqab. Accordingly, the Palestinian Annual Book of Statistics lacks any relevant statistics, while Israel accounts only for those registered with it, whose number does not exceed 18,000 people. The lack of any periodic statistics in the case of Kafr 'Aqab is not a mere coincidence of institutional governmental statistical neglect; this area, located both within and outside the jurisdiction of the municipality of Jerusalem lives a state of legal and institutional uncertainty: on paper and maps, it is located in Jerusalem, while de facto, it exists beyond the wall that surrounds the city of Jerusalem. Thus, should those who move there fail to submit the residency papers to the colonial authorities in Jerusalem, they would not be counted in the population census in the legal sense; on the other hand, the Palestinian Authority cannot hold population statistics and census in Kafr 'Aqab since its residents do not exist within the area of the Palestinian Authority legal control, despite living in an area whose geographic contiguity, due to the surrounding barrier, would be the West Bank and the Ramallah and al-Bireh Governorate, rather than Jerusalem.

The added value Kafr 'Aqab grants its residents is the preservation of their Jerusalemite identity within a daily reality of living daily economic and social conditions more similar to the West Bank than Jerusalem. This is clearly evident in the interviews Abaher Assaqa has conducted with the residents of Kafr 'Aqab with regards to the incentives to move from Jerusalem to Kafr 'Aqab or to the West Bank in general. As such, Kafr 'Aqab in its current architectural, cultural, and social landscape is the outcome of harassment policies practised against Jerusalemites: it is the scene of Jerusalemite displacement.

And although there are no periodic statistics on population growth - that is, the displacement of Jerusalemites beyond the wall - Israel's pursuit of its policies of control of the city of Jerusalem and its isolation from its natural expansion, which is the main reason for the population's relocation to it, places us in two colonial stages of the city's isolation which through them one could understand the spurt of growth in Kafr 'Aqab: The first was at the beginning of 1993, when Israel started to control the entry of Palestinians into the city of Jerusalem (Khamaisi, 2013); and the second started with the construction of the Apartheid Wall, which Israel began to build in early 2003.

Each of the aforementioned stages - control as a checkpoint, closure as a barrier - constitutes a stage towards geographically isolating Jerusalem and its residents along from their Palestinian contiguity in the West Bank. This may be inferred from the types of people found in Kafr 'Aqab and from their incentives to move there. One may trace three such incentives, and a fourth that derives from them, all of which are based on preserving the Jerusalemite identity:

- First, Palestinians from the city of Jerusalem who financially cannot afford to live or buy a house in Jerusalem. Statistics reveal that 1,500 housing units must be built in Palestinian populated areas annually in order to respond to the natural population growth, while the Israeli government approves no more than 400 housing units a year, which creates a gap of approximately 1,100 housing units, split between natural population growth and reality, which is what has raised real estate prices, in addition to the fact that the remaining area dedicated to Palestinian construction in Jerusalem does not exceed 13%, and at very high prices (Assaqa & Hilal, 2015, p. 57).
- Palestinians who have applied for family unification - that demands providing a proof of residing in Jerusalem as a precondition for application - but cannot live in the city. These Palestinians resort to Kafr 'Aqab as a place that meets the legal requirements as it falls under the Jerusalem jurisdiction and, as such, guarantees maintaining their place of residence in official Israeli documents as Jerusalem.

- The original residents of Kafr'Aqab who live in the old city away from the main road and the crowded neighbourhoods. They still live in the old houses and they are few.
- Criminal outlaws, generally Jerusalemites and West Bank residents, who resort to Kafr'Aqab as no law enforcement exists there. The authorised law enforcement entity there is the Israeli police, who does not enter neighbourhoods behind the (separation) wall unless security-related arrests are in question. On the other hand, Palestinian security services cannot enter Kafr'Aqab due to the illegality of that action as well as the occupation authorities' respective prohibition. The latter is based on the security understandings stated in the security cooperation agreements in the supplements of the "Oslo Accords," which have divided the West Bank into areas A, B, and C, whereby A and B are administered by the Palestinian Authority whereas Area C and Jerusalem, including Kafr'Aqab, subject to Israeli civil law and are completely administrated by Israel.
- The main motive for population transition to, or more accurately its besiege in Kafr'Aqab is the Jerusalemite's preservation of the blue ID card (Israeli residence), which guarantees its population free access to the city and historic Palestine in general, working in it and travelling through it, in addition to maintaining Palestinian presence in Jerusalem, or the potential of presence. These Palestinians cannot live in Jerusalem, and if they do leave the borders of Jerusalem they lose their right to return to it. Israel has imposed such reality on the Jerusalemites while defining its relationship with them based on integration through exclusion (Ghanim, 2012). Israel dictated their status as a "permanent residents" – that is, legally speaking, they are neither Israeli nor Palestinian citizens – they differ from the Palestinians in the West Bank and differ from the Palestinians in the occupied lands of 1948. As permanent residents, Jerusalemites, according to the Entry into Israel Law (1952) which regulates the relations of the colonial state with Palestinians in Jerusalem, must prove that Jerusalem is the centre of their life, and that they exist and reside in it. This legal status, in addition to stripping Palestinian Jerusalemites from their character as the original inhabitants of the city, it recreates them as foreigners in the city rather than a firm cornerstone. Thus, it renders their presence in the city firstly as a tool for regulation and control;⁶ and secondly it establishes a society that lives under a constant existential threat over its presence in the city, and tries to control it.

6 Israel, for example, during the Palestinian uprising in 2015, which was also known for individual operations, punished the families of those who carried out their operations by dislocating them from Jerusalem and stripping their Jerusalemite ID as a tool for collective punishment and deterrent. Even though it did not always carry out this threat, Israel uses it as a tool to control and terrify the Jerusalemite community.

The Land: Expelled and Cornered

This kind of displacement – that is, isolating Palestinians and gathering them in an area similar to Bantustans – does not take place in open areas, or into the authority of another state that adopts different policies, like what happened during the Nakba (1948) and, later, the Naksa (1967). This kind of modern displacement is an expulsion from an area that lives under a colonial system, into another area inside Palestine that suffers from the same colonial condition. The Palestinian is being expelled from Jerusalemite neighbourhoods surrounded by illegal Israeli settlements, into other neighbourhoods outside the Wall, also besieged by the Wall, the illegal settlements, and army barracks. Therefore, Palestinians become expelled from one geographic isolation into another to which the flow of population increases in light of the impossibility to expand and accommodate this kind of growth. Accordingly, the landscape is rendered into a vertically urbanised one, incapable of horizontal expansion and growth. In Kafr 'Aqab, all policies needed to create a ghetto are joined together: the wall; the army barracks; the industrial zone; and the illegal settlement.

Since the Naksa in 1967, and like other similar cases of Palestinian towns in Jerusalem, the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip, Kafr 'Aqab constituted a land of colonial construction and expansion, either in it or upon it. Initially, since 1984, the occupation established the settlement of "Kukhav Yaakov" on the village lands where approximately 2,037 dunams were confiscated in order to establish the settlement that started expanding and restricting the village from the east. On the whole, the settlement expanded until the size of confiscated Kafr 'Aqab lands reached 2,800 dunams in 2001. This equals 30% of lands confiscated from a total of 6,000 square dunams of Kafr 'Aqab lands (Arij, 2012) for the sake of settlement expansion. As for the southern border, the Israeli occupation restricted Kafr 'Aqab firstly by establishing an industrial area right after the occupation of the West Bank in 1967, to the west, and then built the airport next to it (formerly Qalandiya airport), which it later used for military purposes, along with the development of the Ramallah-Jerusalem road at the expense of the Kafr 'Aqab lands. And in 2001, when the occupation embarked on the construction of the Apartheid Wall, Kafr 'Aqab was blocked completely and geographically open into two directions: Jerusalem to the south and Ramallah to the north. And in conclusion, and following the construction of the Wall, the town became geographically open only towards Ramallah and Al-Bireh governorate, which were similarly surrounded by illegal settlements and the Apartheid Wall.⁷

Practically, Kafr 'Aqab became like any other neighbourhood in Jerusalem, a neighbourhood torn by Jewish settlements that render its capacity to become an

⁷ For more see (Nabulsi, 2017).

entity capable of connecting culturally or materially, and preventing it from creating a contiguous Palestinian sphere (Jabareen, 2013), with one exception not to be underestimated: the Wall. The presence of the Wall, when combined with policies of establishing neighbourhoods with a torn minority due to Jewish settlement, has completely removed Kafr 'Aqab from the city and annexed it to the ghetto of Ramallah and Al-Bireh Governorate, unlike the rest of Jerusalem neighbourhoods that are being isolated from their surroundings and kept within the city's sphere. In terms of security, in 1985 the occupation forces established a military base adjacent to the settlement and within its security perimeter that borders the mountain upon which it was built. Likewise, Qalandiya military checkpoint has closed off the Jerusalem-Ramallah road and became the sole passage that directly links Kafr 'Aqab with Jerusalem through an opening in the Apartheid Wall of segregation. In this encircled and limited area, closer to a prison than a town, the displaced began their encampment.

More residents and less land, this is the opposite of the Zionist formula: more lands and less people, manifests its ugliest forms in Kafr 'Aqab. Policies of pushing residents from Jerusalem to it continue; and a besieged and confiscated land being reproduced as a ghetto. Within this condition, and with one exception of lack of law enforcement, control mechanisms, or accountability Kafr 'Aqab started to arise in its current image as a random closed spatial space in the inside, and limited in its expansion towards the Jewish state: unlicensed buildings; constructions that fails to abide by safety regulations; close proximity to the main street; environmental pollution in addition to insufficient distance between the buildings, which creates a state of congestion and urban integration closer to chaos than anything else. More precisely, and as stated by one of the contractors while working on this article, the only limitation that restricts the number of floors in a building is the height to which crane mast that lifts the brick and cement can reach.

A Society in a State of Waiting

What distinguishes the people or social sphere in Kafr 'Aqab is the fact that it is a society living in a state of waiting. All strata, excepting the few original residents, whose number does not exceed ten thousand people, live in Kafr 'Aqab temporarily. The first stratum awaits for improvement in its economic situation in order to buy a house in Jerusalem; the second awaits finalisation of unification procedures for the family to move and start living in the occupied lands of 1948; the third awaits a turnover in their personal legal situation in order to resort to another area in which they can legally live, or move into another "outlaw" town – an area outside Kafr 'Aqab that similarly exists outside the enforcement of criminal law. Temporariness, as a general state of the people in Kafr 'Aqab is not a marginal element when studying the formation of the society in this

are in particular, but rather forms the backbone that enables researchers or observers to understand how violence, crime, and drugs that prevail in Kafr 'Aqab are recycled. And it is hard to understand the social formation without taking temporariness into account. One can understand the effect of temporariness on the formation of society through the visible aftermath; despite the rapid population growth in Kafr 'Aqab, two important scenes have not yet been accomplished despite the sufficient incentives for them to exist in a society that lives without a law or a state: first, social organisations and norms that push for achieving an alternative system to the configuration of state and law; second, lack of creative and local cultural initiatives that fills the vacuum of education and fights violence, crime, and drugs.

The colonial condition is the reason for the formation of a new social formation in Kafr 'Aqab that lacks social infrastructures that regulate Palestinian life elsewhere: family, clan, town, and community. Temporariness is the main reason for maintaining and preserving society as a modern society: an unstable society that lacks permanent regulating structures. The mix between these two, along with adding the trigger factor – resident outlaws and the absence of law enforcement – creates a spot gnarled by violence, crime, and drugs, incapable of handling itself, and in a reality where Kafr 'Aqab became the only place where drug dealing is done neither in a legal or illegal way since the law does not even exist in the first place. And the multi-storey buildings that lack the minimum standard of privacy, due to congestion and adjacent windows, are being rented out and occupied without the minimum of safety measures required when living in multi-story buildings, and despite the area being a polluted health hazard (Arab48, 2017). There is nothing that can possibly explain this orientation except for the two components found in the formation of this space: necessity and the hope that this is only temporary.

Temporariness in Kafr 'Aqab are twofold: the first is the personal, which is reflected in the residents themselves perceiving the place as temporary, while the second takes the form of a threat. It is the colonial threat of losing this waiting station called Kafr 'Aqab. Because since the beginning of the current year, and with the introduction of the "Deal of the Century," which the American administration seeks to conclude between the Palestinian Liberation Organisation and the Israeli occupation, rumours have spread that the Israeli occupation intends to give up Jerusalemite neighbourhoods outside the apartheid wall – that is, the neighbourhoods that have legally remained under the control and authority of the colonial municipality in Jerusalem and which were physically isolated. This includes Shu'fat refugee camp as well as Kafr 'Aqab which constitutes one of the biggest and most visible of these neighbourhoods (Al-Ayyam, 2017). This plan corresponds with another plan submitted by MK Anat Barko to the Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, which proposes giving up the Arab

neighbourhoods in east Jerusalem and beyond the Wall. Netanyahu has put this plan on hold, and a number of analyses have pointed out that he intends to substitute the neighbourhoods separate from Jerusalem for the annexation of settlements (Caspit, 2017). And in addition to recent plans, the statements of the mayor of the Jerusalem occupation municipality, Nir Barkat, to legally give up Jerusalemite neighbourhoods beyond the Wall reaffirm the occupation's intention to legally give up Kafr 'Aqab in return for the legalisation of Israeli illegal settlements (Meniv, 2016). If the occupation legally gives up Kafr 'Aqab it would necessarily mean that all the incentives for residents to move there will vanish: the place would no longer provide its residence the ability to live in it while maintaining a Jerusalemite residence. Therefore, the likely scenario to unfold would be either to abandon Kafr 'Aqab and move to Jerusalem or revoking the permanent residency from those who would remain in it– i.e. turning the squatter into a deserted place.

On Naming It

Travellers from Jerusalem to Ramallah see Kafr 'Aqab through building windows, as if they were many condensed heads imprisoned behind the wall, overlooking the holy city, deprived of it and taken away from it. In between these buildings and Jerusalem lies another refugee camp, "Qalandiya" camp which passers-by do not see it from behind the Wall because of its two- or three-storey building style. Kafr 'Aqab appears in full force and urban chaos from beyond the wall, hiding the past and imposing a new form of refugee camps. Some of the buildings in Kafr 'Aqab comprise of 20 floors, while nothing limits the number of its floors except for the investor's conscience, the conscience of capital, that is. The camp's only condition is the temporary home. The main idea behind the camp is waiting: temporary residence and a delayed return, until the causes for waiting are erased.

One must see the social composition and quality of residents in Kafr 'Aqab through their state of waiting. They wait for respite, that is, a radical change in the political condition. They are escaping systemised poverty, lack of housing opportunities, and family unification. All these are colonial laws and the results of colonial practices in Palestine. Once the first radical and essential transformation is in its political state, Kafr 'Aqab will disintegrate, just as the "Yarmouk", "Nahr el Bared", "Balata", and "Askar" refugee camps would disintegrate. Why then would Kafr 'Aqab be upgraded from a village council to a municipality? Not from a village council to a camp? Why not call things by their name? Naming signifies the core of what it names. As such, the camp is a state that has developed as has the Palestinian case, as an aftermath of the settler colonial enterprise. Why then does Kafr 'Aqab still float between an "area", "a village council", and a "municipality"?

A tent signifies temporariness and displacement from a safe home. It signifies a hope to return and the act of displacement by replacement. The existence of camps in the Palestinian condition has implied a statement of rejecting final naturalisation and clutching at their return. Accordingly, the Palestinian revolution was established first and foremost in the camps, whether outside or inside historic Palestine during different periods. Following this principle as well, Palestinian political culture was established as a culture that glorifies the camp and the return. One may see that tent in the works of cartoonist Naji al-Ali, where Hanadala himself embodies a signature of a child expelled from his homeland before exceeding the age of ten, and where the time in the camp stops and freezes until the return. It is also from the camp that the novels of novelist and teacher Ghassan Kanafani were launched. Likewise, poet Mahmoud Darwish called Beirut "our last tent", while Ahmad Kaabour sang "They Called me a Refugee". The Palestinian revolution was a revolution of refuge until Abu Jihad said with the onset of the first intifada: "we have abandoned the inside."

The refuge is the symbol of the main Palestinian case; a symbol for the Nakba and the Naksa, and the final tangible material product of the Zionist displacement policies that aimed at the disposal of Palestinians as a political, legal entity with human rights. It is also from this principle that the displacement of the Palestinians in 1948 was the condition of establishing the Zionist political entity itself as a non-dictatorial entity capable of promoting, sustaining and perpetuating Jewish control and enabling them to control the politics of historic Palestine. The Palestinian became a refugee so that the Jewish state can establish a state of law that excludes Palestinians as an entity capable of undermining the political system that proclaimed "equal rights for all citizens without discrimination of religion, sex, or ethnicity."⁸ Creating a Palestinian minority resulted from the displacement and expulsion of the majority – that is, the establishment of the Zionist political configuration as a whole was conditional upon the idea of a "camp".

The other added value, no less important than the political value, lies in the ability of politics and political consciousness in the formation of belonging to the community despite the temporary circumstance. Rather, the temporary itself becomes a tool for social organisation and unity, while facing social chaos. As such, society transforms from one that lives in a state of waiting for individual changes into one that lives in a state of collective waiting, which seeks changing a national political condition that

8 This appeared in the Israeli Declaration of Independence, which also states that Israel is the state of the Jewish people, which essentially contradicts the statement of "equal rights to all citizens." Quoting it there serves the context that enabled the expulsions from Israel to be both democratic and ethnic at the same time, which is what the expulsion process facilitated – the production of Palestinians as a minority group within political regime's civil rule.

each individual in society is responsible for changing. Perhaps this is what explains the difference in the living conditions between two camps, one old and another new, between Qalandiya the camp and Kafr 'Aqab the town which has all the characteristics of a camp except its name. In the former, you can find initiatives that warn from the plague of drugs through campaigns like "Our camp is nicer without drugs"; or a graffiti all along the camp's wall that draws drugs and the colonialist ensemble. In addition, there is the presence of political bodies that form the bases for political organisations that play the role of local community governance, solving problems between refugees, and prevents the deterioration of events into fights and social violence. As such, the Fatah organisation in the camp, for example, bears the responsibility of social reform and political organisation. More precisely: society as a society attempts to preserve itself as a healthy society until it reaches its final political resolution, through awareness. In the new camp, however, which only did not receive that title of camp, we witness the absence of all creative, political, and cultural initiatives that protect it from the danger of seeking personal individual salvation for each individual. In other words, the camp, as a name and a description, officially and popularly, automatically forms a configuration of "models" and contents that formulate the society that belongs to a cause.

The camp is the visible material body of the ugliness of displacement and expulsion, and its existence as an entity in the public sphere constitutes socio-political awareness. Thus, the camp itself becomes a political statement and program. The appearance of what we have called here "the new camp" derives from the methods of the "modern displacement" which Israel has practised in order to purge Palestinian presence and maintain the largest areas of land possible with the least number of indigenous people. Similarly, marginalised neighbourhoods and ghettos turn into an incomplete embodiment that lacks the appropriate definition that fits the colonial situation and condition. Constructing a 20-floor building requires a longer period of time, and it is the same time that would take a Palestinian in Jerusalem to be buried under the housing crisis and accumulation of taxes that threaten his existence and the future of his children. It is a slow displacement at the same pace of construction in modern camps. Hence, we may only see the product rather than the process of production. The camp becomes a de facto reality imposed on the landscape with the observer failing to see the violent collective displacement. Having established its political entity, Zionism now alternates its method of displacement and changes its frequency, as it does not need these days to draw attention with events like the Nakba or the Naksa in their magnitude and size. Yet, the outcome after 17 years of building the Apartheid Wall is the same: a refugee camp beyond the wall separating a community from the state of Jews and colonists.

On the whole, Kafr 'Aqab constitutes a ghetto that forms and develops on a daily basis from a mixture of Israeli control systems of Palestinians: the military, embodied in the wall; the legal, embodied in unification procedures and exclusion of Jerusalemites; the colonial, embodied in controlling the land and cramming people; and the temporary, embodied in the vagueness of the destiny of those targeted. Such scene includes apartheid but cannot be limited to apartheid; it is an intricately complex model that includes apartheid but surpasses it to something further complex and more hideous.

References

- Al-Ayyam. (2017, May 25). Israeli Plan to Separate Shuafat Camp and Kafr 'Aqab from the Municipality of the Occupation. Al-Ayyam. Retrieved from http://www.al-ayyam.ps/ar_page.php?id=12127233y303198771Y12127233. (Arabic).
- Arabs 48. (2017, May 29). The Occupation Excludes Shuafat and Kafr 'Aqab from Main Services. Arabs 48. Retrieved from <https://www.arab48.com/%D8%A5%D8%B3%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A6%D9%8A%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%A7%D8%AA/%D8%A3%D8%AE%D8%A8%D8%A7%D8%B1/2017/05/29/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D8%AD%D8%AA%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%84-%D9%8A%D8%B3%D8%AA%D8%AB%D9%86%D9%8A-%D8%B4%D8%B9%D9%81%D8%A7%D8%B7-%D9%88%D9%83%D9%81%D8%B1-%D8%B9%D9%82%D8%A8-%D9%85%D9%86-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AE%D8%AF%D9%85%D8%A7%D8%AA-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B3%D8%A7%D8%B3%D9%8A%D8%A9>. (Arabic).
- Aronson, G. (1987). *Creating Facts: Israel, Palestinians, and the West Bank*. Washington: The Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Assaqa, A. & Jamil, H. (2015). *A Reading in the Socio-Urban Changes in Ramallah and Kafr 'Aqab*. Bir Zeit: The Center for Development Studies, Bir Zeit University. (Arabic).
- Caspit, B. (2017, May 25). The Plan to Separate from East Jerusalem Neighbourhoods as Presented to Netanyahu. Retrieved from <http://www.maariv.co.il/news/israel/Article-585712>. (Hebrew).
- Arij – The Applied Research Institute. (2012). *Kafr 'Aqab Village Profile*. Retrieved from http://proxy.arij.org/vprofile/jerusalem/pdfs/vprofile/Kafr%20'Aqab_EN.pdf.
- Ghanim, H. (2012). The Vital Policies of Settler Colonialism: Producing Jerusalemites as Passers-by. *Qadaya Israeliyya*, 47. Ramallah: Madar. (Arabic).
- Jabareen, Y. (2016). Israeli Planning in Jerusalem: Strategies of Control and Domination. Ramallah: Madar. (Arabic).
- Khamaisy, R. (2007). Israel's Goals and Policies for Urban Planning in the Jerusalem Area. *Journal for Palestine Studies*, 18(72), (44-64). Ramallah: Institute for Palestine Studies. (Arabic).
- Khamaisy, R. (2013). Reshaping the Jerusalemite Urban Sphere Within the Heart of the Palestinian State. *Jerusalem Quarterly*. (Arabic).
- Meniv, O. (2016, May 26). Barkat's Plan for Jerusalem's Borders. Israeli Chanel 10. Retrieved from <https://www.10.tv/news/103436>. (Hebrew).

- Nabulsi, R. (2017). Palestinians in Ghettos – Ramallah and Al-Bireh Governorate. In *Zionism and Settlement*. Ramallah: Masarat Centre for Policy Research and Strategic Studies. (Arabic).
- The International Committee of the Red Cross. (2004). *Occupation and International Human Law: Questions and Answers*. Retrieved from <https://www.icrc.org/ara/resources/documents/misc/62tc8a.htm>. (Arabic).
- The Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics. (2010). *Statistical Yearbook of Palestine*. Ramallah: PCBS.
- Weber, M. (2011). *Politics as a Vocation*. (G. Kattoura, Trans.). Beirut: The Arab Organisation for Translation. (Arabic).