



MAPPING SPACE, CONFLICT AND IDENTITY

Alternative education and art examples from Israel-Palestine

Anders Høg Hansen



In this article, the author addresses the negotiation and 'gestaltung' of space, identity and memory among Jewish and Palestinian Arab youth in alternative conflict education projects in Israel. Various pedagogic devices brought into play at a particular project at the educational centre Givat Haviva are discussed, as well as activities and spontaneous incidents besides the formal programme.

ISSUE 6
December 2006

INTRODUCTION

The article is part of a continuous rework (2006a+b) of fieldwork for my PhD (2003) –with newly added empirical material and reflections, e.g. interview, October 2006.

I draw upon a few conceptual takes on *map*, *territory* (Cohen, 2005, Wood, 1992, Corner, 1995) and *representation* which are explored alongside concepts relating to agency, alteration and identity such as *palimpsest* (Huyssen, 2003), and tactics (de Certeau, 1984). In addition, conflict-theory related perspectives on conflict education (Halabi, 2001, Hewstone & Brown, 1986) are applied in a discussion of these and related projects potential for creating awareness and unpacking identity in spaces where various groups are 'living together separately'. Various other examples of representations of conflict and heritage (Israeli cinema, notably) are also used.

MAP AND TERRITORY

As a way of looking at how ordinary people deal with conflict, we may take into consideration the concepts of 'map' and 'territory' to distinguish between the drawings and representations we make, i.e. *maps*, opposed to the actual *territories* of affiliation (Cohen, 2005). While the *map* is an abstraction, a sort of iconographic formula made upon particular systems of signs and codes and an interested form of selectivity (Wood, 1992), *territory* can be likened to life and the terrain itself: to move your feet in the territory involves other stakes and senses. Thus, on the one hand, we have the craftsmanship of mapping, which implies a perspective and an ordering: a 'mastery of measuring', which aims at making visible that

which is beyond the eye, on the other side of the hill (explored in Wood, 1992, and Corner, 1999). On the other hand, we may not be able to follow, or understand, the map when we move our feet in the terrain. Pedestrian manoeuvres – I also mean the routes of life in a wide sense – takes another concrete sensibility. Names, symbols and directions of the map, are ‘translated’ into images and stories and memories. By ‘playing’ with the very concept of the map in an expressive manner (various examples in the article center around this) – we bridge diverse ways of thinking and moving. In the case of conflicts, fortification mapping is prominent, but also networking, and both forms are present in some of the examples I use later. To return to the pedestrian manoeuvres, I think most people have had the feeling that life sometimes places you on tracks or pushes you in directions not chosen – and in this process you try to find your feet in the territory. *Maps* as well as the *territory* are of strong concern, and both contested, in conflict. Forms of mapping made in the office or from a planned, researched point of view, a plateau (in de Certeau called *strategies*, 1984), may attempt to create particular territorial practices and various spatial strategies, e.g. the West Bank matrix and prison-like check point system, the settlements, or the Israeli military’s spatially adapted forms of warfare. Bottom up changes on the ground also lead to reconsiderations or subversions of maps and ‘official representation of space’, and so forth.

In this article, I am concerned with other forms of rupture or temporary conversion where mapping ‘art’/gestaltung and debate are pursued to place the conflict in another context. The question is: how do young people attending alternative educational projects in Israel-Palestine figure out and negotiate *maps* and *territory*? How do students ‘map out’ what can be seen as re- or deterritorializations ^[1] of home and identity? Here I discuss ‘mapping’ exercises probing the various forms of, and limits of, representation and identity, including spatial representation ^[2].

The Palestinian Arabs with Israeli citizenship ^[3] alongside the Jews ^[4] in the state of Israel are almost completely segregated populations, with separate school systems, towns and cities. Apart from some overlap in workspaces, markets and a handful of mixed cities, the Palestinian Arabs (20% of the ca. 6.7 million population in 2006, not including the territories and the West Bank) and Jews of Israel in general do not interact (Nir and Galili, 2000, Gonen, 1996, Yiftachel, 1997). I will use the short form ‘Arabs’ from now on, although without neglecting that Arabs in Israel have begun to increasingly emphasize the *Palestinian* aspect of their identity (*Givat Haviva* survey, 2000). Sites for educational and voluntary educational exchange do however exist.

THE PROJECTS

The material for my discussion comes mainly from the high school

encounter projects held at the educational centre *Givat Haviva* ^[5], one of the pioneering institutions of alternative collaborative and educational projects in the country.

As research for my PhD, I looked at the peace and educational movements' development and history in the country. In this historical contextualisation, I also explored the change of pedagogies over time and picked a few case studies for closer exploration ^[6]. Despite the depressing and difficult situation –both today and then, co-operative educational work takes place. Around 3,500-4,000 students ^[7] per year participate in the Face to Face encounter program at *Givat Haviva*.

Despite some knowledge of Arabic, it would be fair to term my observation as 'blind ethnography'. However, in a certain sense other 'languages' were observed and became clearer due to my linguistic short-sightedness. Interviewing was done in English. The fact that Danish is my mother tongue actually helped: it placed interviewer and interviewee at a similar level, both linguistic visitors in the conversational exchange.

The observations of the non-discursive elements of the encounters were supplemented with frequent translations by the facilitators of mainly Hebrew conversation in the workshops. Most of the educational material from the field sites and elsewhere was available in English or German ^[8].

MAPPING HOME

Two small groups of Arabs and Jews gather on a floor in an ordinary classroom. They are engaged in a drawing exercise, the Jewish group portraying and creating their impressions of 'home' on a large board, using colours and ideas as they please. The Arabs do the same. What comes out is an emphasis on the region and country in which they live. However, it is not the same representation or image. Apart from both being sketchy drawings, they look different in several ways. The Jews have done a cartographic reproduction of the shape of the Sea of Galilee and placed some big fish in it. Around it, a range of carefully drawn, red-roofed houses, the typical style of the pioneering Israeli building in the countryside. A border to Jordan is clearly marked. The Star of David is placed on the map, together with a cactus. The Arabs have created hills and trees, and a small insert with a map of the region Israel-Palestine as a whole with no borders between the territories and Israel. The hilly character of northern Israel comes through.



Students engaged in a map drawing exercise at Givat Haviva (October 2001).
Photo by Anders H. Hansen.

The two groups present their maps to each other. All *bi-national* exercises, as they call them, are lead by a Jewish and the Arab facilitator (also Arabs with Israeli citizenship). Then, the facilitators present 'step two' in the exercise: to create a third map. A Palestinian girl eagerly grabs a new large blank card, a pen ready in her other hand. The facilitators stop her and explain that past and present values must be brought in and combined in a cooperative third map. The two groups must negotiate what they want to bring along from the first step, how to see the common world they both inhabit.

All students now take on the third map in an engaged and cooperative manner. The 'cut and paste' of a newly mapped 'home' takes shape. Arabs shift smoothly from Hebrew to Arabic; Jews only manage Hebrew. Facilitators translate. Images and ideas are thrown back and forth. The Sea of Galilee survives the scissors. Arabic trees and Jewish red-roofed houses are there. This mapping activity can indeed be used to discuss some of its inherent ideas and potentials in more detail.

THE PALIMPSESTIC REWORK OF THE PAST

One question is why the participants were not allowed to at least work on the drafts they had already done. This would allow for a *palimpsestic* attitude to the past and the *gestaltungs* of heritage and home, to borrow Andreas Huyssen's adaptation of *palimpsest* (2003). To preserve heritage is not necessarily just to store the object. When you place a Viking helmet in a display case in a museum, or keep your dead hamster in a freezer because the winter soil is too frosty to bury it properly, in both cases we are talking about forms of 'storage' that involve conservation and maintenance. Conservation involves a *palimpsestic* approach. The palimpsest in this adaptation is an 'over-writing', a repair on top of a former repair. New windows in an old building or even the fake trace of an ancient form implanted in a new building to add patina, 'heritage' and maturity. Just go to Berlin and see the transformation of the remnants of

the Berlin wall into a tourist walk with preserved graffiti, for example. In many cases, the point is creating and 'selling the backstage' (as phrased by Johanna Stenersen, 2006), and at the same time to give particular stories meaning and significance. In this sense, the spirit of the palimpsest may rest upon a series of emergences, i.e. *entstehung*, rather than *ursprung* (Foucault using Nietzsche, 1996). At Givat Haviva, participants were trying to unfold which stories to give significance to, and how. Which aspects of life should we continue to write (upon)?

My point is that many objects and memories inhabit a grey area between 'presence' and 'fade'. A domain of loss, so to speak. In Israel, streets with formerly Arab names changed into those of Zionist heroes can be found: *Rehov Jabotinsky* in Tel Aviv is just one example out of hundreds. Here we seem to have reached a point of erasure. The material sign/artefact is no more - but, importantly, some Arabs still use the former names in their oral vernacular (especially relevant to streets in mixed cities, Nir and Galili, 2000). Therefore, we can say they are using intangible tactics to 'restore' the loss. Another way of thinking about new life on old ruins is to think of the 1950s' *wirtschaftswunder* in Hamburg, where the Eastern parts were completely rebuilt after the Allied bombing of 1943. In the centre, however, the *Nikolaikirche* stands as a restored damaged church. Remedial action in the 1990s assured it would look like a *nice* ruin, and not fall apart completely: tourist attraction and heritage.

The intangible aspects, which exist in language for example, are like palimpsestic memories among material, physical traces that can act as memory triggers. If you interview people about their history, it is sometime easier to get them to talk if you begin with the photos on the wall or the family album, or the objects and letters in the drawer. Or could these 'things' perhaps also complicate matters?

In terms of 'troublesome triggering', Israeli filmmaker Udi Aloni tells in *Mechilot/Forgiveness* (2006) the story of an Israeli soldier, David, who accidentally shot a Palestinian girl –the child of a woman he had just met. In the aftermath, he is given a new memory blogger medicine to get on with his new life. When he meets a new Palestinian girl friend, stays in her flat and watches the TV news, he hears about a woman becoming a suicide bomber as a revenge for her murdered child. The past begins to surface dangerously in David's mind. He reaches for his medicine nervously, but is also curious to know what is too hard to know –and hesitates. He ends up again at a mental institution for Holocaust victims and soldiers, ironically placed on top of the now ruined Deir Yassin village (where ghosts speak with patients). Towards the end, the film reverses and a patient called *musulman* (the nickname for weak people at Auschwitz) recommends David to work through his past without the medicine. Various scenarios of mourning are played out. The past is now vivid- and torturing David's mind. As the brain works in 'cinematic ways', although with bumpier

editing, the movie makes the same visual crossings and time-crossings: a mixture of fantasy, musical and memory excerpts.

Another masterpiece example, in this case in the documentary genre, may be Amos Gitai's work *Bayt/House*. In this film, he sees himself as an "archaeological filmmaker" (Gitai, Sept. 2006). He re-visits a house in Jerusalem, speaking to former and coming residents there and in displaced surroundings. He follows the changes on the ground and the builders' comments on the site. Twenty-five years are covered. Gitai stitches a story of change and displacement while sticking to a focus on a particular site. This microcosm -its 'eroding' as well as new people, mortar and bricks- acts as a metaphor for the conflict.

OTHER MAPPINGS OF SPACE AND IDENTITY AT GIVAT HAVIVA

Going back to the drawing exercises and other forms of mapping games at Givat Haviva, I find it fascinating how these forms of drawing employ the participants' memories and the narratives they are fed with. The non-verbal approach may give them a chance to articulate what is too difficult to verbalize.

In a location exercise newly explained to me in a telephone interview with educational officer Yanai Shachar at Givat Haviva (October 2006), participants create a circle demarcated by a rope. The inside corresponds to 'Israel.' The question posed is: where do you locate yourself? The Jewish and Arab students try to find their place: in the centre, in the periphery, on the rope, outside... How far outside? This exercise uses the body to express location and belonging.

In another exercise, a range of big cards is spread on the floor, each with an identity inscribed instead of the signs that playing cards usually have. There are 16 cards with a name -an identity. They lie on the floor face up. My Arabic is good enough to read: Ashkenazi (German/European), Mizrachi (Oriental), Jewish, Israeli, Arabic, Palestinian, Muslim, Christian, Druze, Religious, Not religious, Zionist, teenager, human being, boy, girl. Students have to pick the ones they relate with most. Recently, they tried out a rearrangement of this game. They put symbols on the cards instead of names, such as Madonna, Mosque and so forth, the education officer Shachar Yanai explained energetically in an interview. These symbols may be more inclusive than some of the names -e.g. Mizrachim, Druze or Jew. A Christian can feel ok about 'Mosques' because he feels safe in Arab cities in Israel, and perhaps all of them listen to Madonna, Yanai explained. In this way, Madonna becomes a 'third text', not neutral, but something that Ashkenazi and Muslim Israeli youth may connect to equally.

In another drawing exercise, each group had to portray typical images of 'the other' that came to mind. This one was given up. 'It did not work', Shachar Yanai sighed (interview, October 2006). The exercise reproduced some standard stereotype issues, Yanai explained. I was not as critical when I was observing in the field: in my opinion, sometimes you have to expose the stereotype before you can discuss it and turn it upside down.

Among other typical activities, although not exercised in the encounters I observed, there are a photo association and a political simulation activity. In the former, they express their affiliations to photos depicting war and peace respectively. Usually, Arabs pick war and Jews pick peace. In the latter, students discuss and negotiate various issues relating to state administration, Jerusalem, borders, water resources, the flag, religious and cultural issues and other things that are partly related to the conflict and to Jewish-Arab relations in the region. Students discuss this as simulated political and administrative representatives, mirroring the present political reality of Israel-Palestine. They learn about how 'democracy' and the state work and how a minority - the Palestinians in Israel - negotiate. Each group is placed in situations that mirror its actual position in terms of power: the prime minister will inevitably be a Jew. Civil interactions work here as constructive bottom-up scenario making: micro level tests of a possible future ^[9].

INFORMAL *MISE EN SCÈNE* OF THE CONFLICT

In these projects, we can find many interesting pedagogic devices of conflict education – but just as important, or perhaps even most crucial, are the students' *voluntary* interactions. How do the students approach the breaks and the off-the-record and leisure phases of the days at the educational centre? In this 'no man's land', although still Israel, the strongly structured youth do not just reinvent themselves. Although puzzled to be in a not so habitual situation, they most often reproduce positions, separations, and anxieties.

During the evening break, a few Jews were caught in smoking pot and then thrown home (I unfortunately missed this form of 'participant observation'). Also, both groups did occasional strikes, staying away from a few activities until – in the case I observed – an Arab facilitator convinced the Arab students to enter the room and participate. This incident took place later in the programme.

In another incident, the Jews, interestingly, return to the classroom before the break is over. Prior to the break, participants were placed in two half circles facing each other, group vs. group. In re-entering, the Jews place themselves here and there, dotting the full circle with their presence (the Arab group is a minority in this specific encounter, although the organisers usually plan for some equality in terms of the amount of participants of each group). The Arabs enter the room with bewildered

looks. I have already placed myself in the corner, outside the circle, as usual. The Jews have a 'we-are going-to-lure-them' shrewd frown in their faces.

The students are playing with the format and the rules, adopting their own appropriating *tactics* (De Certeau, 1984) – agenda-moulding improvisations, a way of getting the best out of the offerings of the moment and the particular structure. The Arabs wander insecurely, back to the remaining seats. Now they have lost their last weapon: to stand together as a unit, at least in stormy times. The dominators divide the dominated. The macro reality is mirrored in this micro *gestaltung* of power. Arabs appear as enclaves.

Somehow, before the break, the Jews had felt a bit threatened by the Arabs' assertion of group identity and unity. As a majority –in reality as well as in the encounter I am referring to– the Jews use this tactic to regain the upper hand. A facilitator also shares my interpretation of the event: a cunning plan executed. At a conference presentation of an earlier version of this article, my commentator, Göran Bolin, interestingly suggested that such moves/tactics also might be derived from a wish to break with the clear group-division –Jews vs. Arabs- that is enforced and meet as individuals. It should be noted that the Jews are more in favour of what has been coined as an *interpersonal* or *contact theory* (Hewstone and Brown, 1986) approach, where participant learn face to face as humans, not necessarily discussing conflict. The group division, in the form of an inter-group approach, is a framework more common in the last decade. This framework is also maintained or adapted by the students from beginning to end. In general, they lived separated lives during the 'encounter', which then became a sort of *dialogue*, two parallel lanes. I doubt that the facilitator and I both misunderstood what was actually going on. In any case, it was an appropriating *tactic*. Whether the Jews attempted to promote an individual-to-individual meeting or a disempowerment of the Arab unity, one could say that the typical macro activity of e.g. judaizing the Galilee (Rabinowitz, 1998) or creating a matrix of disconnected Palestinian enclaves in the West Bank were mirrored here: students began to play with the possibilities of the terrain. In addition, the Central Bureau of Statistics divides Arabs into Muslims, Christians and Druze, and the state also restricts the mobility of Bedouins in the Negev (Abu-Saad, 2000) and places them in specific locations, *shanty town*-like.

/I can couple this with the situation of *Ungdomshuset* (*Youth House*) in Copenhagen, a cultural centre of punk culture and one of the remaining sub cultural 'abnormalities' of the city (the dismantling and 'normalization' of *Christiania* has slowly begun). In a strange twist of irony, the *Ungdomshuset* members who had created an 'island' and an original subterranean cultural industry at the place given to them by the

municipality in the mid 1980s, will be taken over by *Father House*, a religious sect who bought the house of the municipality. The authorities recently changed their mind and 'reversed' the gift. Somehow *Ungdomshuset* has come to inhabit alternative terrain-tactics for those (changing young members) not finding their feet on the map of normalization. It is a node in a network of particular forms of youth culture, crossing national borders. Some find them sectarian and see fortification tactics, but I think the young users of the house find themselves cornered on the map (I had though no problem getting in a year ago documenting a punk festival in black and white photography). The house is now to be emptied 14 December./

Back to Israel. In addition to the scattering *tactic* (de Certeau, 1984), the Arab language spoken by the full Arab group is a threat. The Arabs speak good Hebrew, but not as fluently as the Jews do. The Jews -even the facilitators- knew less Arabic than I did (they only learnt it for a year at school). The usual tendency is that the Arabs leave the stepmother-tongue, Hebrew, at later stages in the encounter, to use Arabic as a tool and tactic to gain ground and express themselves. An "art of the weak", as De Certeau names *tactics* (1984). Then, the translators/facilitators have more work to do, the Jews are left a bit insecure, and the conversation looses its 'ping-pong' element.

CONCLUSION

The projects do not create any landslides. They are just 'communication for development' of the frozen images of self and other, at best explorative learning processes, somehow disturbing or temporarily off-tracking individuals from their habitual mental lanes of understanding. On the one hand, educational *processes* are not really triggered in the brief encounters ^[10]. On the other hand, the briefer encounter projects offer a rupture or experience, despite the danger of reproduced narratives in the group vs. group approach. No conflict resolution: just dispute processing, which might reach a *translative* stage (using Kevin Robins after Bhabha, 1991). It could be interesting to see what would happen if the projects were a compulsory element in *ordinary* schools, part of the curriculum-for-all (as a student noted while talking to me recently), and not just rare bridging, an exception.

One could think of this as therapy or communication for development of an already over-written and maybe complicated friendship or marriage/relationship. Should we create a new 'third map', my dear? A common house where couples or friends live may be seen as one *gestaltung* of such a space. Still with the traces of former residents and former architecture –as an arch remaining in the now-and-then restored Jerusalem *House* in Gitai's movie, formerly mentioned. Surviving the former Arab owner displaced in 1948 was first a renting Yemenite Jewish couple, and then a Jewish professor living beneath the arch. In the latest

movie, Gitai interviews the almost 100-year-old Arab owner now residing in Jordan (Gitai, 1980/2006).

Pedagogies emphasising individual identity were for a while toned down (projects used to be structured more in this way in the past, see e.g. Hall-Cathala, 1990, Abu-Nimer, 1998 and Weiner, 1998). The *inter-group* approach mentioned earlier recognises that the conflict is group related, and not a person-to-person issue. However, the perspective tends to reproduce the confrontation and stuckness seen outside. Shachar Yanai at Givat Haviva says that neither a strict, interpersonal or group approach are sufficient. One needs to address the conflict, but somehow still create a 'safe' space where intimacy and empathy can be nurtured (Yanai, 2006).

Third space? Third maps? Third texts? A cultural form or art that somehow is mutual and shared without causing conflictive claims of belonging could be a way forward. Music? Dance? Food? As an example, the Israeli Daniel Barenboim and the Palestinian American Edward Said set up the musical initiative *East West Divan Orchestra* in 1999^[1]. By setting up a third type of activity, participants may experience not just trying to meet up and negotiating what is almost impossible to change - and thereafter continuing to *live together separately* and tolerate, bear with, each other - but actually the creation of something new together.

[1] In a special issue on the Middle East, art and the media of *Lettre Internationale* 12/2006, Eilat Galit interprets the artist as a person offering a subjective space and alternative narratives. Art disturbs, disrupts, couples or undermines the dominating narrative, and can be used to find symptoms in society before research locates it. 'Art often precedes theory' - an artist is using art as changing tool and practice, not just as mirror, argues Galit.

[2] Hundreds of projects and organizations exist relying mostly on Western and Jewish sponsors. Major organizations such as School for Peace (at the village Neve Shalom/Wahat al-salam) and Givat Haviva only receive a very small percentage of their funding from the state. Givat Haviva has a Jewish leadership, while School for Peace it is co-led by a Jewish and an Arab Israeli. Both have schools and students from all over the country participating (although there is a clear underweight of strongly religious schools). They often have to track and invite the schools. Arabs are as likely as Jews to participate.

[3] Palestinian Arabs in English mandatory Palestine -today's Israel, Gaza and West Bank- numbered 800,000 before the war in 1948. 100,000 remained following the Jewish-Arab war al-naqba/war of independence. The rest were scattered in bordering countries and the territories of Gaza and the West Bank (until 1967 under Egyptian and Jordan control, respectively). See e.g. Hiro, 1996, Pappé, 1999 and Schlaim, 2000.

[4] The Jews in Israel are made up of an equal mix of Ashkenazi i.e. European Jews, the pioneers, and Mizrahi, i.e. mostly immigrating oriental Jews and for decades the poorer strata of the Jewish population. There are native 'Palestinian' Jews among both groups. The Palestinian Arabs are mostly Muslim, but also Christian (Nazareth and Haifa in particular) and Druze (Galilee). During the 1990s, about one million Russians of debatable Jewish descent were brought in to fight the demography problem and help the Jews of the 'Diaspora'. Israel became a Jewish Diaspora made homely or homeland, although there are more Jews outside Israel. There are orthodox of various kinds as well as secular among the various European and Oriental Jews, although the founding Ashkenazi segment is largely secular. See e.g. Rabinowitz, 1998, Grossman, 1993, Hiro, 1996, Yiftachel, 1997.

[5] Givat Haviva (named after a fleeing WW2 Jew, Haviva Reik) is placed in the narrow strip of central Israel. Neve Shalom/Wahat al-salam was established as a minor campsite in southern/central Israel, on the hills bordering the West Bank, 5-10 miles away from Ramallah, in the early 1970s. Bruno Hussar, a Dominican monk of Jewish extraction from Egypt –a hybrid par excellence– established the village. The School for Peace at the village, a pioneering institution of conflict education, was established in 1982. See. e.g. Halabi, 2001.

[6] Written material from the settings, including course material and reports, as well as other researchers' accounts on the settings and related projects were used (Høg Hansen, 2003). In this article, I concentrate on a minor part of this body of material. See also *Social Identities* and *Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution* (2006a + b).

[7] Telephone interview, educational officer Shachar Yanai, Givat Haviva, 16 October 2006.

[8] Empirical work was conducted during four briefer trips between 1999 and 2001, before and during the latest intifada. The PhD was finished at Nottingham Trent University in England in 2003.

[9] According to Halabi (2001), the typical development pattern in the activity is that the Jews feel that the Arabs are making demands that are too strong. The Jews carry an image of themselves as tolerant and eager to dialogue cosily. This attitude faces a harsh test alongside the Arabs (we must remember that they are Palestinian Israelis who come to know the other to some extent, but are mainly there to affect the dominator and let them know that they do not support the Jewish character of the state) (Halabi, 2001).

[10] For this, Givat Haviva launched a 2-year project in the late 1980s that lay out opportunities for gradually working through of themes: Children Teaching Children. For a more detailed analysis, see Høg Hansen, 2003. The Givat Haviva educator Shachar Yanai says (interview, 16 October 2006) that he is aware of this project's strong potential, but poor funding has turned it into a rather small-scale project compared to the Face to Face encounter. In 2000, when I did my research, two project leaders who left it -and the organization- for lack of proper work conditions (Høg Hansen, 2003) led it.

[11] An orchestra of ordinary Jewish and Palestinian young musicians alongside other Middle Eastern and North African musicians. They have toured and played in Spain and Germany and Hebron – at least Arabs and Jews can play, make music, in harmony! Edward Said and Daniel Barenboim, both musicians and friends, facilitated the work. Edward Said died in 2003, but the project continues. The two initiators supplemented each other well. Said facilitated various discussions on identity while Barenboim worked as conductor and orchestral leader and supervisor.

Anders Høg Hansen is a lecturer at Malmö
University's School of Arts and Communication.
anders.hog-hansen@k3.mah.se

Aloni, Udi (2005) *Mechilot/Foregiveness* [Feature film]. Metro Communications: Tel Aviv.

Bhabha, Homi (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Cohen, Phil (2005) *Are we that name?* London East Research Institute, University of East London online publication
<http://www.uel.ac.uk/londoneast/publications/Discussion/AreWeThatName.htm>

Corner, James (1999) 'The Agency of Mapping: Speculation, Critique and Invention', in Cosgrove (ed) *Mappings*. London: Reaktion Books.

De Certeau, Michel (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Galili, Lily and Ori Nir (2000) 'Mixed Cities Series', *Haaretz* [11, 19, 27 Nov and 3 and 11 Dec.].

Foucault, Michel 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History', pp. 76-100 in P. Rabinow *The Foucault Reader*. London: Penguin [orig. 1971].

Galit, Eilat (2006) 'Kunst skal forstyrre', *Lettre Internationale* 12: 12-13

Givat Haviva (2000) *Survey on Palestinian identity in Israel*. Published on the

former Givat Haviva website www.dialogate.org.il accessed 2003.

Gitai, Amos (1980/2006) *Bayt/The House and News from House*. Israel. [Documentary films] +lecture on the films at Copenhagen Film School, 27 September 2006.

Halabi, Rabah and U. Phillips-Heck (eds) (2001) *Identitäten im dialog*. Schwalback: Wochenschau.

Hewstone, Miles and R. Brown (1986) *Contact & Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*. London: Blackwell.

Huyseer, Andreas (2003) *Present Pasts. Urban Palimpsests and the Politics of Memory* Stanford University Press.

Høg Hansen, Anders (2003) *Dialogue With Conflict. Jewish-Palestinian Educational Projects in Israel*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Nottingham Trent University

Høg Hansen, Anders (2006a) 'Dialogue with Conflict', *Social Identities. Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture* 12/3: 285-309.

Høg Hansen, Anders (2006b) 'Youth Negotiating Conflict and Life', *OJPCR The Online Journal of Peace and Conflict Resolution* 7/1:15-27.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen (2001) 'Hybridity. So What?', *Theory, Culture & Society* 18/2-3: 219-246.

Robins, Kevin (1991) 'Tradition and Translation' in Corner and Harvey (eds) *Enterprise and Heritage* London: Routledge.

Stenersen, Johanna (2006) 'Selling the Backstage'. Unpublished ComDev thesis.

Weizman, Eyal (2006) 'Byen som selve krigens medium', *Le Monde* [norwegian version], september.

Yanai, Shachar/Anders Høg Hansen (2006) Interview, Malmö-Givat Haviva. 16 October.

Yiftachel, Oren (1998) 'Nation-building and the Division of Space', *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 4(3): 33-58.

SUBMITTED BY: FLORENCIA ENGHEL

2006-11-20

