

Preface

Eitan Bar-Yosef

The forty-eighth issue of *Theory and Criticism* is published in the summer of 2017, fifty years after the 1967 war, whose aftereffects continue to shape almost every aspect of political, social, and cultural life in Israel and in the territories conquered in that war. For many Israelis, and certainly for the government of Israel, the beginning of the fifty-first year is marked by total repression of the occupation – its effects, its repercussions, indeed, the very fact of its existence. As I am writing these lines, the Knesset is celebrating the jubilee anniversary of the war under the rubric of “the renewal of settlement in Judea, Samaria, and the Jordan Rift Valley,” actively orchestrated by the Yesha (Judea, Samaria, and Gaza) Council and with no mention whatsoever of the Palestinian population living for more than five decades under oppression; and the minister of culture and sport is scolding the IDF’s chief of staff because the army’s Education and Youth Corps has prepared activities commemorating the “unification” of Jerusalem – and not, as the government has demanded, the “liberation” of the city.

The reality of the lives of Palestinians in “unified” Jerusalem and the implementation of the Israeli colonial project in the city is the focus of two articles in this issue. Other texts in the issue deal with various aspects of the occupation and the power relations between Israelis and Palestinians. Jerusalem (both the real and the imaginary) also emerges in an article that explores Baghdad in the second half of the nineteenth century – a discussion that touches on another article in this issue, examining the Orientalist dimensions of Jabotinsky’s novel *Samson*. And from here it is but a short step to the connections between gender and ethnicity, examined in several other articles and essays. The result, we hope, is a mosaic of theoretical perspectives and critical commentaries that converse with each other, highlight little-known aspects of society and culture in Israel and the occupied territories, and thus aim to disrupt the tendencies toward repression, denial, and silencing.

Dafna Hirsch’s article, which opens the issue, turns a critical gaze on theories of masculinity, examining two sociological proposals and the research perspectives

derived from them. The first, Raewyn Connell's, has long been hegemonic in studies of masculinity, certainly in Israel. The other proposal, Pierre Bourdieu's in his book *Masculine Domination*, has been fiercely criticized by feminist scholars, but Hirsch argues that Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and capital offer a helpful way of advancing the study of masculinity. Thus, while the sociologist Michael Schwalbe adopts Bourdieu's idea of gender habitus and defines "manhood acts" as acts that signify ability to control and resistance to being controlled, Hirsch invites us to follow Bourdieu and see masculinity as a repertoire of modeled actions. Thinking about masculinity in terms of habitus and repertoire shifts the focus from multiple "masculinities" to various practices of "doing masculinity." At the same time, the inherent contradictions in the masculine repertoire, and the fact that not all the types have equal status in terms of signifying the "masculine self," explain why the social hierarchy and the hierarchy of masculinity are not always in alignment.

Dana Grosswirth Kachtan also deals with the performance and construction of masculinity, examining them in the context of the study of ethnicity in Israel. In recent years scholars have begun researching the processes of acting and becoming Ashkenazi (*hishtaknezut*—that is, "Ashkenization"). Nevertheless, there are hardly any studies of acting and becoming Mizrahi—namely, the process of adopting Mizrahi behavior and identity in an attempt to pass as Mizrahi. Grosswirth Kachtan shows that, contrary to conventional wisdom, alongside the phenomenon of passing from Mizrahi to Ashkenazi, the reverse phenomenon also exists, in which Ashkenazim perform cultural practices associated with Mizrahiness (for example, speaking with a guttural *het* and *ayin*). The article is based on a study of two infantry brigades in the IDF—the Golani Brigade, which is perceived as Mizrahi, and the Paratroopers Brigade, which is perceived as Ashkenazi—and focuses on the process of becoming Mizrahi among Golani soldiers. In this case, the soldiers learn and adopt the ethnic organizational culture of the brigade, creating an identity that functions as an alternative to the dominant, hegemonic identity and thus challenging the stigmatization of Mizrahi identity.

Shira Stav's article examines the critical perspective of the poet and author Bracha Serri (1940–2013), with specific emphasis on what Stav calls Serri's critique of the "incestuous order"—the symbolic regularization of incest in the power arrays that shape the relations between the sexes. The article focuses on the story "Kri'a" (Tearing, 1980), which describes the horrific experience of a young girl on the night she is wed to an old widower. Commentaries on the story have tended to focus on

the feminist criticism of the traditional practices of subjugation. Stav's reading, in contrast, shows that by writing about the marital customs in her community and by employing the girl's point of view to sharply defamiliarize these customs, Serri exposes the structural congruence between the patriarchal order and the incestuous order. Reading the story through this prism deepens and broadens its critical aspect: establishing a Mizrahi, anti-racist voice of protest in the core of liberal feminism, Serri also touches the very heart of gender relations and opposes the underlying structures of the Hebrew literary canon and the Zionist project.

Rafi Tsirkin-Sadan offers a postcolonial reading of Vladimir (Ze'ev) Jabotinsky's novel *Samson* (1926) and of his broader journalistic oeuvre. The article focuses on Jabotinsky's contribution to the construction of the East in Zionist discourse, against a background of connections between Jewish nationalism and imperialism – both British and Russian. On the one hand, the article shows how the conceptualization of the imperial frontiers and representations of masculinity in Russian literature influenced Jabotinsky's Zionist literary imagination. The representation of the Mediterranean space in *Samson* is actually grounded in Russian imperial discourse, in the tradition of representing East and West in Russian literature, and in the intricate relations between Russian imperial orientation, poetic ideology, and national aesthetic education. On the other hand, the article pinpoints Jabotinsky's revision of the role of the Russian Empire and of Russian literature in the Jewish liberation project, describing the author's search for an alternative in the British Empire and in British literature. Tsirkin-Sadan deals, therefore, not only with Jewish identity in the age of imperialism, but also with the place of Russian literature and the Russian Empire in imperial discourses and in postcolonial studies.

Avi-ram Tzoreff's article juxtaposes the experience of wandering which developed in the modern European city with a similar experience that emerged in Ottoman Baghdad in the same period. An expression of this experience is found in a Talmudic exegesis of Rabbi Yosef Haim (1835–1909), one of the greatest nineteenth-century halakhic adjudicators and philosophers in the Jewish communities of the Ottoman Empire. R. Yosef Haim's exegesis distinguishes between “one who is walking along the way” and those who “pass by the way.” Like Charles Baudelaire's “flâneur,” the character of “one who is walking along the way” – seeking to gather and redeem the sacred sparks hidden in the corners of the city – subverts the purposeful, urban rhythm that depletes walking and underplays the unique events that occur along the way. Tzoreff explores the experience described by R. Yosef Haim in light of the

urbanization developments that changed the Baghdadi space in the second half of the nineteenth century. This examination, which considers the shaping of the modern Ottoman urban space and of contemporaries' temporal perceptions, may point to a new model of *flânerie*, created by R. Yosef Haim.

The connection between space, urbanism, and control is discussed in the two pieces that focus on Jerusalem and conclude the articles section of this issue. Exploring Israel's persistent policy of discriminating and marginalizing the Palestinians in East Jerusalem, **Oren Shlomo** demonstrates how, since the beginning of the 2000s, the involvement of the Israeli state apparatuses in Palestinian urban services has deepened and intensified. This trend – called “governmentalization processes” – marks a change in the urban relations that, from 1967, were characterized by a great degree of managerial and functional autonomy of the Palestinian urban institutions and services. Consequently, the relations of control in East Jerusalem in recent years are based not only on sovereign means of enforcement but also on “softer” governmental power manifested in various means of managing the population – or, in this case, through municipal functions and services. On the one hand, the processes of governmentalization strengthen the state's ability to control functional aspects of Palestinian urbanism; on the other hand, they inculcate in the Palestinian population administrative norms that bring them closer to Israeli systems of governance. The article examines these processes both from a historical and geopolitical perspective and by focusing on one specific case-study: the reorganization plan for the Palestinian public transportation system between 1998 and 2004.

Israel's attempt to transform Al-Quds into “Urshalim” is explored by **Honaida Ghanim**.¹ Her article examines the status of the Palestinians in the city and the processes of Judaification of East Jerusalem as a case of emergent settler colonialism. The research methodology combines an analysis of colonial practices – demographic, legal, and symbolic – aimed at creating a hegemonic Jewish ethnic reality in East Jerusalem with a personal phenomenological description of the author's experience of Judaification and her individual coping with institutional persecution. Ghanim analyzes the status of permanent residency of Jerusalem Palestinians – a status that

1 As this issue goes to press, we learned of two new books dealing with the same subject: Nir Hasson's book *Urshalim: Yisraelim ve-palestinim be-yerushalayim, 1967–2017* [Urshalim: Israelis and Palestinians in Jerusalem, 1967–2017] (Tel Aviv: Yediot Aharonot and Aliyat Gag Books, 2017), and Amnon Ramon's book (with Yael Ronen), *Toshavim, lo ezrahim: Yisrael ve-arvi'ei mizrah yerushalayim, 1967–2017* [Residents, not Citizens: Israel and the East Jerusalem Arabs, 1967–2017] (Jerusalem: The Jerusalem Institute for Policy Research, 2017).

imposes temporality and structural liminality on them, situating them between accepted citizens and rejected subjects. At the same time she describes how, contrary to several theories that view the colonial settler project as a deterministic process, native Palestinians can, through their power of resistance, disrupt the colonial process of the Judaification of the space.

As in other issues of *Theory and Criticism*, the essays in the “Essays and Criticism” section converse in complex ways with the articles. Archaeology’s role in increasing the Jewish presence in East Jerusalem is explored by **Alona Nitzan-Shiftan**, whose essay examines the conceptual reversal embedded in the oxymoron “developing the past”—that is, the attempt to implement infrastructural development and sweeping modernization of sites whose entire power is rooted in the authentic embodiment of their antiquity and their resilience to the ravages of time. This reversal lends legitimization to Elad’s plan to build an immense (16,491 sq. m.), privately owned visitor center in the Givati parking lot next to Dung Gate. Nitzan-Shiftan argues that the power of this reversal is rooted in the coupling of archaeology and tourism, thus transforming political capital (Judaizing Silwan) into economic and cultural capital (developing the national park and its antiquities). This transformation requires a creative and expensive implementation of Israel’s Antiquities Law—an implementation that brutally violates city planning and preservation principles at the foot of the Temple Mount.

Omri Grinberg reviews Gil Hochberg’s new book, *Visual Occupations*, that deals with issues of gaze and visual representation as a key to understanding the colonial relations between Zionism and the Palestinians. Proposing a critical examination of the academic discourse about the occupation, Grinberg argues that the focus (both methodological and analytic) of “occupation studies” on visual and symbolic dimensions has marginalized the explicit, and necessary, study of violence and physical contact. As a result, the academic literature that criticizes the occupation remains isolated and ignorant of the reality of Palestinian life, and this isolation and disregard are in line with the hegemonic Zionist demand for separation. In order to demonstrate the “ghost” of the violence, Grinberg examines its representations in two nonacademic texts: the film *Eduyot* [Testimonies] (Ido Sela) and the book *Meshorerim lo yichtevu shirim* [Soldiers in the Land of Ishma’el: Stories and documents] (Rolly Rosen and Ilana Hammerman).

Questions relating to the visual representation of the territories are discussed also in **Gilad Reich**’s essay that introduces the portfolio he curated for this issue –

works by Jewish-Israeli artists dealing with the Palestinian city Rawabi, which is being built in Area A, north of Ramallah. The critics of Rawabi see it as an economic project aimed at constructing a Palestinian bourgeoisie based on consumerism and individual advancement, while at the same time erasing the occupation from the public discourse and the physical space. It is no surprise that Rawabi is sometimes referred to as a “Palestinian settlement.” Following conversations he had with the artists Gaston Zvi Itzkowicz, Nir Evron, and Etti Schwartz – who worked in the city and documented it – Reich raises a series of questions: how does the resemblance between Rawabi and the city of Modi’in or the neighborhood of Har Homa affect the stereotypical perceptions through which Israelis view Palestinians? What is the meaning of such a heavy-handed architectural-spatial development when it is carried out by the Palestinians themselves, in the name of national goals? And how would the artists themselves respond to the claim that their work is based on voyeurism, control, and exploitation?

Yuval Benziman’s essay deals with the Geneva initiative – the draft of a permanent Israeli-Palestinian agreement, signed in 2003. The initiative grew out of the failure of the second Camp David summit in the summer of 2000, a failure that led to a loss of faith on both sides in the very ability of reaching a peace agreement. The aim of the Geneva initiative, at least for the Israeli participants (who were in the opposition to the government, whereas the Palestinian participants were identified with the Palestinian leadership), was to refute the “truth” the government disseminated, according to which there was “no partner” on the Palestinian side to a peace agreement. However, Benziman shows that in order to agree on a formulation that on the face of it ends the conflict absolutely, both sides launched silencing mechanisms regarding the issues that they believed would jeopardize the possibility of reaching an agreement. In other words, the price of achieving an agreement that would present a different “truth” from that of the hegemonic government was the silencing of voices and truths – and, above all, avoiding issues of a historic-narrative nature.

Esther Hertzog presents a contemporary reading of the anthropologist Emanuel Marx’s work *The Social Context of Violent Behaviour*, on the occasion of its republication in Hebrew. The concept of “state violence,” which is at the heart of Hertzog’s essay, serves as the basis for a comparison between Marx’s study, which was first published in 1976, and the book *Eretz Muvtahat* [Promised Land] by Erella Shadmi (2012). The comparison demonstrates that trends toward neoliberalization

and privatization have changed the ways in which the state applies violence, but have not reduced its intensity. Nevertheless, Hertzog warns against presenting as fixed the power relations between the state and its citizens and reminds us how relevant are Marx's exhortations that we understand them in the context of dynamic situations and two-way relations.

Yali Hashash points out the need to develop theoretical frameworks that will help to decipher the social structures that bind many Mizrahim in the periphery to the margins – or, alternatively, help them to prosper. According to Hashash, the affiliation of Mizrahim in Israel to the Jewish hegemony shapes and dictates their lives no less than the processes of exclusion. To understand this complex dynamic – and, in doing so, to restore the historical connections between poverty and colonialism back into postcolonial studies – Hashash proposes the American concept of “white trash” as an analogous conceptual framework. Pertaining to poor, ignorant, and loud white people – who, despite these negative associations, are nevertheless constructed as “white” – the derogatory image of “white trash” allows us to rethink the connection between affiliation and exclusion of Mizrahim in Israel. Hashash examines this analogy by offering a fascinating blend of theoretical observations and autobiographical recollections.

The issue concludes with a review essay by **Michal Shapira**, revisiting some of the theoretical gender questions discussed at the beginning of the issue. Shapira reviews several books dealing with modern LGBT history in Western Europe and discusses the characteristics of what she defines as the second wave in LGBT history. She argues that these second-wave studies, published in the last two decades, reassess some of the assumptions of the first wave while emphasizing the connection between LGBT history and related areas – spatial histories of the modern city, the development of lesbian historiography, and probing the question of historical validation. On the basis of this discussion, Shapira proposes new research directions that will reflect the current moment in the history of gay politics and activism.