When I was asked by the Journal of Palestine Studies to spearhead a special issue on the Palestinian diaspora in North America (Turtle Island), I had to think about it deeply.* While I presumed that the Journal was approaching me because of my own demographic and ethnographic studies of Palestinians in Chicago, and was indeed honored by the request, I also recognized that most of my Palestinian-specific research had been undertaken a few decades earlier. I thought about the body of ethnographic studies of geographically bounded, self-defined Palestinian communities in the United States that had accumulated since that time—a pool of work it was safe to assume had grown in the intervening years—and came up with very little. The fact is that our repository of studies of Palestinian American communities is not much larger now than it was when I first started such research in the 1980s. At that time, I had located three prior studies, all of them unpublished and conducted in Chicago, which made sense: the Chicago metropolitan area has been a primary location for Palestinians since the turn of the twentieth century and remains to this day a place where they are numerically dominant among communities of Arab origin.1 Two of these studies were doctoral dissertations that compared aspects of Chicago’s Palestinian community with its Syrian/Lebanese community, and one was a 1947 University of Chicago master’s thesis on Palestinian Muslims in Chicago.2 Between then and now, Randa Serhan’s ethnographic study of a U.S. Palestinian community is the only published work3 I can think of that is situated between my 1980s–early 2000s work and Loren Lybarger’s recent book.4 This bleak state of affairs is somewhat shocking,
especially considering that Palestinian communities in North America are growing in size, spreading in location, and multigenerational, and that they are neither off the radar of surveillance nor dissolving into whiteness.

What I want to consider here is why, over the course of the past five decades, and since the rise of race and ethnic studies in the academy, scholars have access to no more than a bare handful of studies on Palestinian American communities. I am not arguing that community ethnographies are the most important type of research, because we surely need a robust field of study that encompasses a wide range of topics, methodologies, and perspectives. Furthermore, our scholarship needs to draw conclusions that make claims and demands that are national and transnational in scope. Nevertheless, community studies are important because they arm a community with data that helps it obtain access to resources, fight discrimination, build local solidarity and power and, especially in the case of Palestinians, organize against erasure and document its continuous presence as an involuntary diaspora. Here I lay out explanations for this state of affairs, at points using my own career trajectory to mark the larger issues at stake. I link the Palestinian case to the wider struggles of Arab American studies, which nearly five decades after its inception as a field of study still faces marginalization if not invisibility in the academy, despite a rising number of scholars and publications across a broad range of disciplines.

Palestine is absolutely central to this disconcerting situation. Beginning in the 1960s, groups long silenced by white supremacy fought bitter struggles for the establishment of race and ethnic studies programs in the academy. They demanded an end to their communities’ neglect and misrepresentation in university curricula and advanced claims for a decolonized academy that not only recognized but lifted up their communities. Yet more than fifty years later, we find that scholars of Palestinians, and Arabs more broadly, in the United States have largely been denied a seat at the race and ethnic studies table. Minus a few notable exceptions, it is still difficult to major in or even find courses in Arab American studies, let alone Palestinian diaspora studies, at most universities and colleges in the United States. Access to grant funding for humanities or social science research on these communities is little better than it was fifty years ago. (It is notable, but I think no accident, that today research on American Muslims is gaining in visibility and seems to be facing fewer obstacles to recognition, especially if its contextual framework evidences historical amnesia, is detached from U.S. empire, and evokes liberal multicultural frameworks of religious difference.) This predicament of obscurity results in large part from the decades-long marginalization and silencing of a body of scholarship that gives Palestinians and Arab Americans voice in the United States, scholarship that rightly criticizes the Israeli occupation of Palestine and the substantial human rights violations caused by the machinations of U.S. empire in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA)/SWANA region. Despite recent paradigm shifts that challenge earlier silences within the disciplines as well as in area studies and race and ethnic studies, Arab American studies has been easily disregarded by scholars who see “racial” subordination as defined only by domestic policies, legal bars, and official categories, ignoring the interplay of empire and race—a standpoint that plays into the hands of others actively trying to suppress Arab American voices. Scholars are silenced when they cannot get published, speak at mainstream conferences, locate funding for their research, or teach in their field, and when the growth of their field is hampered by the need to persistently resist these efforts at suppression. This silencing is but one part of what I have called the “war-on-terror racial project,” a systematic set of ideological tools and
policing practices that rely on racialized tropes to discipline and quash dissent while simultaneously denying “race” by replacing it with “threat.”

For scholars of Arab America, documenting this racial project as an important step toward dismantling it required our scholarly lens to be wide-ranging, as its representations and disciplining were not aimed at Palestinians alone, but at Arabs, “Middle Easterners,” and Muslims more broadly. As a result, after more than one hundred years of Palestinian presence in the United States and over fifty years since the birth of Arab American studies, we have only a handful of scholarly studies of Palestinian communities in North America.

While I concede that this void is not the most pressing issue of our time, as we have much in the way of injustice to fight, I will return to why these studies should nonetheless be seen as important. My intervention here, which I lay out chronologically and thematically, explains how Palestine is central to both the scholarship and fates of Arab American studies scholars and why scholarship on Palestinians in North America has taken a more recent shift that foregrounds solidarity. I argue that while we may continue to face barriers from above, we are witnessing successes from below. Here, I offer a brief roadmap of my argument, which has been constructed quite thinly from an Arab American studies perspective and hopefully not too thickly for those outside the field.

In short, supporters of the Israeli conquests of 1967 launched a wide-scale racialization project in the United States (and other places) in order to silence criticism of these conquests and their attendant population removals, land confiscations, and other human rights violations. Although the discursive project that cast Palestinians as inferior human beings had been in place for a very long time, the U.S. domestic climate in the late 1960s had witnessed significant changes, including the rise of the civil rights movement, pan-ethnic organizing, and Third World solidarities, all of which posed the potential for popular censure of Zionist expansionism. This project intentionally built on the logics of white supremacy by deploying hierarchical notions of superior and inferior people in narratives and representations that cast Arabs as inherently violent and as terror threats. Working on more than ideological levels, a “war on (Arab) terror” commenced that policed pro-Palestinian activists and scholarship on Palestine and Palestinians, effectively keeping the ranks of both sparse. Because the racial trope was about Arabs, its negative impacts—including discrimination, surveillance, bullying, hate crimes, and social and political exclusion—spread widely across all Arab American communities. Over time, scholarship on Arab Americans shifted from community studies intended to make communities visible and proclaim their existence to a cohesive and integrated body of work that constituted a pan-Arab American demand for political and scholarly recognition of racialization and racism. But scholars and activists leading this charge were rebuffed from above (and often from below) by counterarguments that they were ineligible to make these claims because they were not a racial minority. To scholars of Arab America, the mass collective impacts of 9/11 on Arabs and Muslims—as all were held accountable for the acts of a few—evidenced the ultimate success of this racial project.

Today, as scholars of Arab America are still waging the struggle for a place in the academy, the central role of Palestine in the oppression and exclusion faced by Arab Americans (and by Muslim Americans, although that story is more complex) is being elided in favor of a new narrative that conveniently starts the “war on terror” on 9/11 and thus implicitly identifies Arab/Muslim terrorists as the cause of racialization. But changes on the ground mean that different stories can now be told from below. As anti-racist and anti-colonial solidarities widen,
they invite explorations of the challenges inherent to struggles for Palestinian freedom taking place within the context of other freedom struggles. These stories represent emerging themes in Arab American and Palestinian American studies and are featured in this issue in the writings of Loubna Qutami and Chandni Desai. Lybarger’s contribution highlights changes within Palestinian American communities to which activists must attend if they are to grow their movements at the local level. Indeed, knowing one’s community at this level is critical to mobilizing it for solidarity work and to building relationships with other groups marginalized under white supremacy. It is also critical to gaining access to resources to build a community’s power and strength, which are essential to furthering the anti-racist, anti-colonial, and anti-imperial struggles discussed in this issue by Qutami, Desai, and Lybarger. Such access has long been a demand of social justice work and is central, for example, to the current re-visioning around calls to defund the police and invest instead in communities, and to the demands of opponents of countering violent extremism (CVE) programs for resources not tied to surveillance.

**Documenting the Racial Project and Its Broad Scope of Representation and Repression**

Dissent is stifled by keeping people voiceless, policing them, denying them resources, and by propagating caricatures that promote fear, devalue human life, and deny human dignity. These tactics have a long and deep history in the United States, one that is familiar to groups subordinated by white supremacy, hetero-patriarchy, and ableism. Bringing about an end to such practices requires their documentation and exposure and a place at the table, as well as some measure of power. For reasons I discuss in detail elsewhere, Arab Americans were spared the worst of white supremacy until the second half of the twentieth century, when systematic efforts to silence and police them unfolded. Recognizing earlier aspirations to whiteness, Arab American studies scholar Alixa Naff once wrote, “If the political events in the post–World War II Arab World had not reactivated Arab immigration and provoked the descendants of the first wave into an Arab identity, they might have assimilated themselves out of existence.” The events Naff references included the rise of the United States as a global superpower, the creation of Israel in Palestine and, most directly for Palestinians in the U.S. diaspora, the 1967 Israeli conquest of the rest of Palestine. Arab American studies points to 1967 as the year in which emerged the systematic mass media framing of Arabs as barbaric, uncivilized, and inherently violent people, largely in the context of U.S. news coverage of the 1967 war. Policing of Arab Americans and pro-Palestinian activists began shortly thereafter, under the wholly invented pretext that they constituted a domestic terrorist threat. While aggressive spying, monitoring of bank accounts, intimidating interviews, and efforts to deport activists were formalized in Richard Nixon’s Operation Boulder, those kinds of policing/disciplining practices began before that time and have continued long after. Representations of Arabs as terrorists, and only terrorists, saturated the American news and film industry after 1967 in an ideological effort to construct a “common sense” understanding for interpreting events on the ground, both in the United States and globally. By design, these constructions were not centered on Palestinians: recall that Golda Meir said Palestinians did not exist, Joan Peters claimed they were all immigrants, and Zionist activists argued that Jordan was the Palestinian state—all arguments comprising the project of erasure that accompanies settler colonialism.
about Arabs as terrorists provided a justification for repressive domestic state actions as they also unleashed a pattern of hate crimes that continues to this day.

Anthropologist Nabeel Abraham noted in 1994 that while the Federal Bureau of Investigation showed little interest in investigating hate crimes against Arab Americans, it was actively surveilling and harassing them as potential terror threats, even though there had not been a single act of Arab terrorism in the United States. Equally important but far less studied were the organized efforts to thwart Arab American mobilizations against such repression and representation with interventions designed specifically to deny them partners in the struggle. Longtime Arab American activist James Zogby refers to these measures as “campaigns of pressure designed to make us ‘radioactive,’” and “to have us excluded” from a wide range of organizations, advocacy coalitions, and political campaigns. He cites reports that were circulated to potential partners in solidarity referring to Arab American activists as “Arab propagandists,” “a made up community,” “anti-Semites,” and a “subversive plot” supporting Palestinian terror. Arab American activists and scholars understood these silencing, demonizing, and policing efforts as mechanisms that aimed to: build and maintain popular support for the Israeli conquest of Palestine; to divert attention away from Israel’s population removals, land confiscations, and other human rights violations; and to produce popular acquiescence to U.S. policies in the region. Orientalism, as well as centuries-old demonization of Islam and the logics of white supremacy wholly inspired the tactics and discourses deployed to justify silencing and policing—hierarchical notions of superior and inferior people, and binaries of civilized and uncivilized “races”—giving them immediate traction in a society built on such logics.

While this racial project had Palestine at its root, its impacts in the United States were pan-Arab. Scholars conducting community studies found that no matter which Arab American community they were looking at, their research was unified by a common overarching context of discrimination, exclusion, and fear that powerfully shaped the daily lives of those they wrote about. Following the 1979 Iranian Revolution, the terrorist trope was expanded to Muslims using the same language and the same images. Arabs and Muslims were conflated, and Muslim American communities—beyond those of Black Muslims who had been surveilled for decades—were also vilified and policed. By the 1990s, scholarship on Arab Americans had gathered a liberatory momentum, with scholars calling for the recognition of Arab Americans as racialized minorities and demanding an end to the political subjugation, social exclusion, scholarly invisibility, and hyperpolicing of Arab American communities. Efforts to deny Arab Americans a place at the civil rights table, as well as the refusal of race and ethnic studies scholars to acknowledge the racialization of Arabs, were buttressed by the post–civil-rights-era classification of Arabs and others from the MENA region as Caucasian by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB Directive no. 15, issued for the purpose of civil rights monitoring). Joanna Kadi observed in 1994 that “in the United States and Canada, it is not only white people who refuse to see us, it is other people of color—Latinos, Africans, Asians, Natives—who do not acknowledge our existence.” Mobilizations to create a separate census category for Arab Americans began in this era in an effort to diminish what scholars and activists referred to as invisibility.

When the 9/11 attacks occurred in 2001, the groundwork had been laid for an all-out siege of Arab American and Muslim American communities, by the state and public alike, and for minimal popular action to protest that state of affairs; low levels of joint solidarity meant that
Arab and Muslim Americans stood practically alone. Attorney General John Ashcroft’s statement that Arab/Muslim terrorists were living “in our communities—plotting, planning and waiting to kill Americans again,” actively launching a “reign of terror” while enjoying “the benefits of our free society even as they commit themselves to our destruction” made seemingly common sense. The racial project that was launched to stifle dissent over Palestine had achieved its greatest victory. It successfully silenced dissent on the treatment of Arabs and Muslims anywhere, not only in Palestine, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Yemen, but also in the United States. The pan-Arab/pan-Muslim scope of the racial project and repression meant that the next wave of scholarship, conducted on the impacts of 9/11 in the United States, had to be broad and inclusive, a pattern that marks all of the post-9/11 studies, whether by Nadine Naber in the San Francisco Bay Area, Sunaina Maira in Boston, Jen’nan Ghazal Read in Texas, members of the Detroit Arab American Study Team (Wayne Baker, Ronald Stockton, Sally Howell, Amaney Jamal, Ann Chih Lin, Andrew Shryock, and Mark Tessler), or myself in Chicago. Studying just one community, whether Palestinian, Lebanese, Yemeni, Syrian, or others, risked missing the vast reach of collective post-9/11 punishment. As we worked with the categories of meaning at the time, Palestinians were elided, just as they were when the Arab terrorist construct was created. As these shared conditions continue to obtain—whether in the form of surveillance, immigration bans, CVE programs, or lack of recognition of Arabs as racialized—studies focusing on one community seem to lack relevance.

Harassment and Censorship of Scholars

If the field of scholars of Arab America had been sufficiently large, especially among social scientists, we would have been able to focus on making the claim of collective racialization and repression while also accommodating distinct community studies. Before and after 9/11, we would have had the space to conduct research on different Arab American communities—to compare and contrast their experiences with racialization, policing, and bullying; to examine their transnational patterns, including movement and remittances, and analyze them in relationship to state policies and domestic economic possibilities; and to compare different urban settings and theorize about how local context shapes patterns of inclusion, exclusion, activism, and power. But we did not have this luxury because we had neither the breadth of scholars nor the research funding, and we were spending lots of energy fighting our exclusion (as we continue to do). It is nothing short of remarkable to me as I write on the cusp of 2021 that we must put our energies into fighting against the exclusion of Arab American studies from California’s ethnic studies model curriculum, and must call out the absence of culturally competent mental health trainings and institutional invisibility on college campuses (both of which deprive Arab and Muslim Americans access to needed resources), that quotes about bullying from interviews I conducted some fifteen years ago are being used to educate high school teachers today, and that colleagues and I had to struggle for the inclusion of SWANA-identified junior scholars, who were referred to by one committee member as foreigners, in a campus-climate study conducted by our professional association’s task force on minorities.

Our scholarly ranks were thin because heading into the 9/11 moment, scholars and potential scholars of Palestinian and Arab Americans had countless negative experiences that had real impacts on our scholarly careers, on imagining possibilities for ourselves in the academy. We were shouted down at academic conferences, told by our mentors that we would never get
jobs, and dissuaded from studying topics of our choosing if they were about Arab Americans. Until the post-9/11 era, there were few places we could publish scholarly research on Arab Americans, except in books on Arab Americans, published by Arab Americans, that were mainly read by Arab Americans and scholars of Arab America. We were sidelined, siloed, and institutionally silenced. We had no home. We were not part of Middle East studies, were rejected by race and ethnic studies, and fought for decades for inclusion in the programs of our professional associations.30 There were almost no places we could teach Arab American studies or obtain research grants to do our work, let alone be considered for any type of recognition or award.31 Clearly, a field of study with few academic positions and little access to research funding, whose scholars are hampered and harassed and find difficulty publishing in mainstream scholarly venues, will not grow and will lack mentors, further impeding its robust development. For my part, when I finished my dissertation on Palestinians in Chicago, I left academia and became an activist-scholar, working in various paid and unpaid capacities to advance justice for Palestinians.32 I continued to publish my work in popular and scholarly venues (largely within the Arab American market to which we were restricted) because it was still important to do so, and in case I would ever be permitted to return to the academy.33 I took with me a skeptical attitude toward academics and their gatekeeping and a commitment to continue writing in a style that is legible beyond academia, an approach nourished by my teacher, noted sociologist Howard S. Becker.

From Existence to Resistance and Solidarity

When I was first conducting research on Palestinians in Chicago, scholars of Arab America and Arab American activists (most scholars were both, and most were affiliated with the Association of Arab American University Graduates [AAUG]) thought community studies were crucial to asserting their existence, both historically and contemporaneously. If known at all, Arab Americans were seen mainly through the lens of the terrorist trope, or as foreigners. In order for them to take their place on the racial and ethnic map of the United States, Arab American scholars encouraged the production of ethnographic studies and the documentation of what we might call “social facts,” such as how many there were; their histories of settlement; range of locations; and social, economic, and political characteristics. My mentors at Northwestern University, Janet and Ibrahim Abu-Lughod, also felt it was important to specifically say the name “Palestinians” and to count their numbers in the United States as part of the project to document the growing forced diaspora.

Scholars and activists believed that Arab Americans would not be so easily vilified if they were known, and that more knowledge production was the answer. But as we know, facts alone do not produce change; power does. The facts of anti-Black racism, Black poverty, and abusive policing of Black communities have been known for many decades, but that knowledge has changed little; a powerful, broad-based social movement is needed for change to occur. Our post-9/11 studies showed that decades of marginalization, demonization, policing, and political exclusion of Arab Americans and Muslim Americans had left them few allies with whom to protest the wide-scale surveillance, interrogation, special registration, deportation, arrests, and hate crimes to which they were subjected. After 9/11, existence was no longer in question; it was now undeniable that Arab and Muslim Americans (and persons perceived as such) were the subjects of collective and state-sponsored disciplining
and repression. They were, as I wrote in a 2002 piece for *Middle East Report*, “no longer invisible.”

The authors of the initial post-9/11 studies were scholars seasoned in Arab American or Asian American Studies. They knew that Arab and Muslim Americans faced collective punishment for the attacks because they had already been essentialized and racialized. In other words, they knew the history that preceded 9/11 and that it marked a “turning point, as opposed to a starting point,” in the words of Naber. But based on the many articles and books I have been sent for review over the past few years, I see that a new storyline has emerged: that the racialization of Arabs and Muslims was a result of the 9/11 attacks. All of the history I presented above has enabled this erroneous argument, including the sparsity of courses and scholarly mentors well versed in the field, as well as the marginalization of our scholarship in the academy, in race and ethnic studies, and by our professional associations. This claim about 9/11 defies everything we know about racialization; no entire group of people pays the price for the acts of a few unless they have already been collectively racialized as monolithic and inferior. For example, widespread support for Japanese internment in the United States would not have been possible in the absence of anti-Asian racism.

This new narrative comprises a number of problems, not least of which is that Arabs and Muslims (like other BIPOC communities before them) are held responsible for their own racialization, at the center of which lies the Arab/Muslim terrorist, effectively giving this social construction even greater traction and power. Most importantly for our discussion here, not only is thirty years of prior scholarship on Arab Americans made irrelevant, the centrality of Palestine to the racialization process is wiped off the map. This type of revisionism and its accompanying erasure of historical facts has been experienced by every group racialized as inferior by white supremacy (it’s called “blaming the victim”), so we should not be surprised by it. Just as the “threatening” Black man eviscerated a white reckoning with slavery and Jim Crow, the Arab/Muslim “terrorist” frees conquest and empire from accountability for the oppressions faced by Palestinian and Arab Americans. From the histories of others, we also know the impacts of historical erasures: further criminalization and justification for segregation, policing, and all types of walls (prisons, borders, bans). As Qutami argues in her article, we must make the effort required to restore history; doing so necessitates maintaining a continuous thread in scholarship before and after 9/11 and preventing the erasure of Palestine from its critical place in Arab and Muslim American Studies. Silencing efforts from the powers above remain a serious obstacle not only to the growth of Arab American and Palestinian diaspora studies, but also to pro-Palestinian activism, as the work of Palestine Legal attests.

Yet facts on the ground reveal another story: robust and expanding solidarity movements locally, nationally, and globally that do not bend to—indeed, on principle, would not bend to—pressures to exclude Palestinians and Arabs. It is this agitation from below that ignites new scholarship in Arab American studies, forefronts the scholar-activist praxis witnessed in Qutami’s and Desai’s pieces in this issue of the *Journal*, and provides hope from a liberatory perspective. This growing body of scholarship, characteristic of critical race and ethnic studies, focuses on resistance, solidarities, and the interconnected struggles that situate Palestine in the context of broader anti-racist, anti-colonial, and anti-settler-colonial movements. We see in this literature a radical rethinking of Arab American positionalities within transnational spaces and more complex understandings of the intersections of race, gender, sexuality, activism, and identities. We find deeper explorations of the global and intersecting dimensions
of violence that do not detach local experience from imperial conquest or separate one group’s experiences from another’s, and that reveal how the militarization of policing affects all communities oppressed by white supremacy, albeit in different forms. Other studies complicate the notion of borders, when Latinx and Palestinian perspectives are put in conversation with each other, and expose the role of landscape transformations and environmental degradation brought about by global capitalism, empire, and settler colonialism in forcing population movements. This work also includes recent scholarship featured in the special JPS issue on Black-Palestinian transnational solidarity published in 2018 and scholarship on Arab American activism within the Third World liberation struggles of the 1960s–80s, as well as the Jadaliyya roundtable on anti-Blackness and Black-Palestinian solidarity. We also find a sense of power and optimism in new scholarship on South/South alliances, on the global flows of artistic and cultural forms of resistance that build internationalism from below, and in the stories being uncovered by scholars that reveal the historical breadth of these ties.

In this issue, we feature scholarship that is interested in understanding the contexts and challenges that frame the hard work of building larger and more powerful movements in North America for the liberation of Palestine, as those efforts must engage with the liberation of other oppressed communities. Qutami and Desai underscore parallels between earlier revolutionary formations fighting for Palestinian freedom and current structures. They identify the challenges these mobilizations faced and consider them for the lessons learned and complexities that must be grasped in order to expand in size and liberatory effectiveness. Lybarger brings our attention to the fact that Palestinian communities in North America are ideologically multidimensional, providing a range of challenges to and opportunities for solidarity work. Each of these pieces recognizes the institutional voids that were produced when the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) ceased to be a global liberation movement, voids now being filled by new organizational vehicles and alliances.

Qutami’s article is a detailed exploration of the Palestinian Youth Movement (PYM) grounded in the histories of its predecessors, the Organization of Arab Students (OAS) and the General Union of Palestinian Students (GUPS). Noting that students and youth in exile have always played major roles in the Palestine liberation project, she argues that an effective movement must be grounded in knowledge of the past. Palestinians have been in a perpetual position of starting over their pursuits of liberation, she notes, and youth organizers are too often presented with fragments of the past because it has been subjected to persistent annihilation. Anchoring the work of OAS and GUPS within their transnational formations and funding streams, she pays particular attention to ways in which transnational events required repeated reconfigurations of organizational structure and liberatory scope; she also articulates the similarities between these and the challenges faced by the PYM in its own transnational configuration. Qutami points to the significant differences in vantage points between OAS and GUPS activists—who were, for the most part, born in the Arab world and had an intimate, organic, and emotional relationship to Palestine—and U.S.-based PYM activists, who share a degree of “linguistic, cultural, social, and political distance” from Palestine while also facing racialized oppression in the United States. Thus, while OAS activists worked in Third World liberation coalitions largely from the standpoint of the colonization of Palestine, coalition work for PYM activists is also rooted in their personal experiences of racism and in local and U.S. national anti-racist and anti-colonial struggles. As she elaborates on the damaging impacts of partisanship on OAS and GUPS, Qutami argues that the nonpartisan character of PYM
means it will face fewer internal challenges. She identifies the “main task at hand” for PYM as learning how to function at multiple scales—local, national, transnational, and in the context of both U.S. and Palestinian liberation struggles—while at the same time working at great distance from Palestine and without the transnational linkages once provided by the PLO. Those severed linkages were an outcome of the Oslo Accords and the ruptures leading up to them that all but liquidated the Palestinian liberation project and required the U.S. PYM to step into an institutional vacuum. Qutami’s piece is at once scholarly and prescriptive; as she unearths the past to inform the future, she calls for the rebuilding of grassroots institutions and renewed cultivation of youth activism, much of which, I argue, needs to be done at the local level.

Desai’s exploration of Indigenous/Palestine solidarity in Canada from the 1970s to the present is grounded in a sense of shared struggle and deeply informed by Indigenous scholarship. She identifies the first significant wave of this solidarity as occurring during the era of Red Power and the Third World anti-imperialist, anti-colonial movements of which the PLO was a part; after a period of decline, these joint struggles witnessed a resurgence in the first decade of the twenty-first century. While identifying “key historical, juridical, and political-economic distinctions between the settler states of Canada and Israel,” Desai’s work complicates narratives of sameness, which she argues obstruct joint struggle. Her objective is to avoid collapsing the specificities of each context, especially with reference to capitalist social relations and hierarchies of race, class, and gender. More specific to her scholar-activist praxis, she problematizes the settler-colonial framework of analysis, arguing that it lacks the capacity to incorporate widespread capitalist violence and elides race and class differences in settler societies. By denying the complexity of such societies, the settler-colonial framework misforms the bases for resistance and solidarity. The settler-Indigenous binary flattens history, “obfuscates the dialectical social relations of colonialism, racial capitalism and imperialism on a global scale,” and delinks settler colonialism from slavery, war, occupation, and the racist oppression of Black and immigrant communities, therein shrouding both the connectedness and necessity of joint struggle and creating an “oppression Olympics” that inhibits mass popular resistance. In complicating the settler-Indigenous binary, Desai argues for a more complex understanding of the relationship between migration and colonization, one that has the power to mobilize “arrivants”—a term Jodi Byrd used to describe newcomers to settler colonies who are themselves colonial and imperial subjects—in “radical possibilities of relationality and joint struggle, instead of leaving them behind in confusion or false consciousness. As she identifies a range of Palestinian Canadian positionalities that take into account being both victims of settler colonialism and immigrants who benefit from it, she argues for work on the ground that promotes a better understanding of the larger forces at play which produce a wide range of injustices and injured peoples, because therein lies the potential for growing a radical resurgent solidarity based on the vision of “worldmaking.”

Lybarger’s focus is the local level of the Chicago metropolitan area, where he analyzes transformations in diasporic Palestinian institutions and activism since the 1990s. He argues that these are significantly different from “earlier PLO-aligned” institutions and orientations, which met their demise in the wake of the Oslo Accords and in the context of the rise of Muslim institution building in Palestinian diaspora communities. Having previously studied post-Oslo changes in the occupied Palestinian territories, Lybrager finds parallels in the diaspora context but also unique features produced by domestic racialization and systematic
policing. He argues that “despite the mosques’ undeniable dominance and the community’s correspondingly widespread embrace of piety-minded orientations and practices, secularism . . . has not disappeared,” even if the internal workings of secular organizations have been reshaped to accommodate “the new religiosity.” He similarly argues that mobilizations for Palestine that ground themselves in Islam “bear the marks of secularism” in their platforms, suggesting that here too secularism never really went away. Turning his attention to the ways in which youth and young adults have responded to this climate, he finds a wide range of individualized and hybridized forms of identity and performance, which are often accommodations to and reactions against “the new piety-minded orientations” in the diaspora enclave. He suggests that these new forms of subjectivity offer new possibilities for solidarity and for the “emergence of a new, broader secularism” in Palestinian activism.

**Community-Based Work Still Matters: Power and Solidarity Is Locally Built**

Whether considering Qutami’s call for rebuilding grassroots organizations, once the hallmark of the PLO in North America, or Desai’s invitation to promote more complex understandings of the bases for solidarity, all of this is work that must be done locally if we want to create strong and enduring movements that are interconnected nationally and transnationally. I thus conclude this journey through Arab American and Palestinian diaspora studies, which sought to explain why over the course of fifty years we have only a handful of studies of Palestinian American communities, by making the point that community-based research is still important and that we also need scholar-activist praxis at this level. All oppressed communities need to persistently “take their temperature” and continuously make a public record of it. Effective activism and solidarity work require communities that are not beaten down by poverty, mental health issues, or fear, and that have youth who feel lifted up. We need to write our stories as our own stories but also link them up to those of others. We need to advocate for community access to resources, and to be able to do that, our grassroots institutions also need access to resources. We need to grow strong and active Palestinian and Arab American communities that do not have to keep fighting for recognition and cannot be so easily wiped off the map. We also need to advance our work in coalition with other communities to build that sense of shared struggle and to jointly demand access to transformative power.

My final autobiographical vignette demonstrates the power of local-level scholar-activist praxis and what it can mean for communities. In the mid-1990s I came back (after working on Palestinian rights, documenting the impacts of sanctions and the first U.S. war on Iraq, and then the expulsions of Palestinians and Jordanians from the Gulf) to research in a new way and in a new role, as director of research for the Arab American Action Network (AAAN). I occupied a largely unpaid position in this new community-based organization that emerged during the period Qutami describes as the “post-Oslo vacuum” and Lybarger refers to as the “hollowing out of the PLO as a framework for organizing and orienting the diaspora.” The AAAN established itself within Chicago’s Markaz al-jaliya al-arabiyya, a Palestinian-led community center with strong ties to the Palestine Solidarity Committee and to the Union of Palestinian Women’s Associations of North America that focused on advocacy for Palestine, youth formation, and left-oriented Arab nationalist and progressive politics. (See Lybarger’s article in this issue for more details.) AAAN founders sought to continue advocacy for Palestine but also to focus on the community in Chicago where many families faced serious economic
struggles, youth reported bullying in schools and police harassment, and both a Palestinian street gang and theft ring (that mainly victimized other Palestinians) had formed. For the reasons I discussed above—marginalization, stereotyping, political exclusion, surveillance, and efforts to deport community leadership—community members felt alienated and voiceless, and they were locked out of access to social services and community development resources.

When the AAAN looked for funding to address these and other issues, it faced total rejection. It represented a largely unknown community (to mainstream funders) that could not produce a single piece of data on what its members were experiencing. The AAAN applied for and received a $10,000 grant from the Chicago Community Trust (CCT) to conduct a needs assessment that would document the community’s existence and lay out its socioeconomic and political conditions. This study, which I conducted over a two-year period in partnership with community members, was not only a piece of research, it was a major political step forward for Palestinians and Arab Americans in Chicago. In our report, titled *Meeting Community Needs, Building on Community Strengths*, we offered demographic, socioeconomic, and qualitative data; we provided a history of Arab immigration; we tied Palestinian migration to “continuing de-Arabizing policies by Israel” and its increase to the Oslo Accords; and we loudly proclaimed that Arab Americans were “voiceless,” “misrepresented,” and “shut out” on multiple levels due to efforts to advance “the U.S. government’s pro-Israel, anti-Arab policies.” We called for an end to hostile stereotyping and the political and social exclusion of Arab Americans. We demanded Arab American participation in decision-making bodies, planning committees, and boards. We called for schools to end the use of educational materials that stereotyped Arabs. We recommended that external service providers working in areas of Arab residential concentration hire Arabic-speaking staff and train non-Arab staff in cultural competencies. We recognized that only when we built up the communities’ strengths would they be more empowered to act against injustice and the intersecting systems of oppression they faced on local, national, and transnational levels. Our report generated special coverage in the *Chicago Tribune*, titled “Arabs Build Solid Base in Chicago,” and the CCT, a dominant funder in the area, now said of us:

The Arab American Action Networks [sic] vision is for a strong Arab American community, whose members have power to make decisions about actions and policies that affect their lives; and have access to a range of social, political, cultural, and economic opportunities in a context of equity and social justice. Formed in 1995 by community activists, organizers, academics, professionals, and non-Arab allies, the AAAN became one of the very first non-profit organizations providing services and advocacy to the Arab community of greater Chicago.

Chicago’s Palestinian and Arab communities were on the map. Once armed with the data funders wanted, the AAAN was able to grow significantly in resources; expand youth development; offer social, translation, immigration, citizenship, and domestic violence support services; and increase community outreach. The post-9/11 moment brought about another major advance for the AAAN when, while organizing in defense of besieged Arab and Muslim American communities and in opposition to the ensuing war in Iraq, the organization convinced key foundations seeking to fund local community mobilizations that it had a history of organizing and solidarity work (such as within the Third World liberation struggles mentioned above), as well as a “rich history of organizing from our countries of origins. . . . We didn’t have to be exclusively Alinskyists to do effective,
impactful work.”\textsuperscript{52} Resuturing the activism of the PLO era with the present, and indeed pointing out the line of continuity between them, the AAAN was able to secure financial support for organizing women and youth in the community and broadening its solidarity work, locally and nationally.

In this way, community studies conducted in partnership with grassroots organizations evidence a liberatory methodology that fuses existence with resistance. Funding for community studies is often difficult to obtain and poorly paid, and we need joint activism to demand that these investments be continually made by funders. Such studies not only evince a scholar-activist praxis; they can also be transformed into the type of scholarly talks and publications required for promotion in academia.\textsuperscript{53} After serving as AAAN’s acting director for one year, I was hired by the Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights (ICIRR) to conduct research in twenty-seven immigrant communities as part of an organizing effort to gain access to a committed pool of state funds dedicated to immigrant communities. The success of this effort resulted in a $1 million annual pool of money, distributed and administered by ICIRR, that continues to this day to build the voice and power of immigrant communities who, for example, insisted that Chicago and Illinois become immigrant sanctuaries.\textsuperscript{54}

Studies of Palestinian American communities are not only important for these reasons of empowerment. Circling back to how we got where we are—the many-faceted efforts directed at silencing and erasure that effectively steered research away from Palestinians in diaspora—there are enough reasons, scholarly and otherwise, to foster a climate in which such studies can flourish. I identified above some of the research we could have been conducting if our field of study had been allowed to grow in an unhindered and robust manner, such as comparing Palestinian communities across different urban settings and theorizing about how local context shapes patterns of inclusion, exclusion, activism, and power.\textsuperscript{55} That example is from sociology, but the possibilities for research are wide, considering the range of disciplinary perspectives that could be engaged. This growth is unlikely to happen, however, without change from above: institutional change. Scholars still need jobs and funding for their research, and recognition in race and ethnic studies is still a work in progress (American studies has witnessed the most positive change in this regard, and we see small movement in Asian American studies, English, history, and comparative Latinx studies). This means that our best hope for growth right now is in unfunded doctoral theses, but this avenue too is limited by the systemic lack of mentors. The institutional changes needed can be mobilized from below, as with the birth of race and ethnic studies, but until that time, our most promising possibility might be imagining a field of global Middle East, Palestine, or SWANA studies that has a broad lens and includes diasporas. That too needs advocacy.
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