

CONTESTED LANDSCAPE AND SPIRIT OF PLACE: THE CASE OF THE OLIVE TREES AND AN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD IN ISRAEL

Irit Amit-Cohen

Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Department of Geography and Environment,
Bar-Ilan University
Ramat Gan, 52900 Israel
e-mail: amitcoi@mail.biu.ac.il

UDK: 911.53(569.4)

COBISS: 1.02 – Review article

Abstract

Contested Landscape and Spirit of Place: The Case of the Olive Trees and an Urban Neighborhood in Israel

Cultural heritage and cultural landscape are a set of human products reflecting the needs, thoughts and memories of society. They represent and symbolize relationships of power and control, from which they emerged, and the human processes that transformed and continue to transform them. Such transformations create new cultural landscapes and cultural heritage that often conceal the processes – political, social, cultural, ideological and economic, that have created them. The purpose of this paper is to analyze a contested geographical environment, where two cultures, the Jewish Zionist culture and the Arab Moslem culture, compete over the land and its cultural heritage, and therefore each of them, has its own interpretations. The aim is to define the landscape, its spirit and its representation, which emerge from these competitions and disputes; characterize it and analyze its symbols and its uses, primarily for the purpose of forming and constructing identities.

Keywords

Contested Landscape; Cultural Landscape; Icon; Symbol

The editor received the article on 26.12.2009.

1. Preface

Cultural landscapes and cultural heritage sites developed in a geographical area for the needs of a specific community may undergo a change and become icons. In other words, they will not only reflect customs, events and ideology of the community, but in their manifestations they will represent values and messages to the in-group and to others. These values and messages will thus signify belonging to a group and testify to the ownership of the territory by the group. In the words of Jean Gottmann (1952),

The abstract strength of an existing order is rooted in the spirit of the nation and its place or of the group of nations involved in their space.... What it signifies here is a psychological attitude resulting from a combination of actual events with beliefs deeply rooted in the peoples' mind. ... These symbols are many and varied. A national iconography usually stops at a boundary; the frontier line is in grave danger when such is not the case.

This quotation expresses the idea that observing the landscape is a matter of subjective reference. This reference stems from the emotional attitude that society develops toward landscapes, sites and places.

The emotional attitude to cultural landscapes and cultural heritage sites and monuments is shaped by historical events, influential figures, religious and national characteristics, and fashionable effects and tendencies. Emotional attitudes to places and landscapes can be strengthened by education directed by national leaders and by interested bodies. As Gottmann (1952) claimed, the historical factor and local iconography combine to support the establishment of political authority over a certain area.

A cultural landscape or heritage site that has become an icon will change in status to a symbolic landscape. As such it can be analyzed in different ways. First, it may be analysed as a text (Duncan and Duncan 1988; Duncan 1990), and according to Terkenli (2001) as a valuable text, or as an irreplaceable archive (Holdsworth 1997; Ewald 2001) which reflects the society – its works of arts, its vernacular innovations, its ideas and its mores – at a specific time and place. Second, it may be according to its role in helping to coalesce community values and reconstruct social identities and local pride for certain groups, while excluding or erasing others. Such a role has been described by researchers who have emphasized the power of interpretation in modeling the societal image and identity (Duncan 1973; Cosgrove 1984; Duncan and Duncan 1988; Daniels 1993, 2004; Lowenthal 1991; Rose 1995; Duncan and Lamber 2002; Amit-Cohen 2008). A third possibility is to view the cultural landscape and cultural heritage sites as cultural products: a consumer product which, like any other economic or industrial product, undergoes refinement and improvement. Rowntree and Conkey (1980) developed this approach and claimed that the cultural-symbolic landscape and sites not only reflect a social structure, but also are an inseparable part of society, its landscapes and products. Finally, the formation process of symbolic landscapes and sites may be analyzed according to four criteria: 1) heritage and memory – historical documentation and observing the changes of the status of cultural heritage landscape and sites through time scale; 2) commemoration – the process that transforms the cultural landscape and sites into a symbolic landscape involving classification and categorization of the landscapes through the choice of values and messages to be preserved; 3)

representation and modeling – the means chosen to represent memory and its messages; and 4) purposes and functions.

These four components – history and memory, commemoration, representation and functions – occupy a significant place in the formation of society's identity as expressed and reflected in the symbolic landscape. Choosing the commemoration, the presentation, and how to "use" a symbolic landscape or a cultural heritage site often arouses broad public interest where opposing ideologies attempt to persuade each other. Perhaps more than any other cultural phenomenon, these attempts reflect the spirit of the era, its conflicts and sensitivities, and the political and national interests of various social groups.

The purpose of this article is to present the four components comprising the cultural-symbolic landscape and examine their expression in a contested geographical environment. Additional to the main purpose, a second objective is to suggest a new definition of cultural heritage or cultural landscape. To do so, I have chosen two geographical localities in Israel containing cultural heritage sites and cultural landscapes that have become symbolic. Prominent in these environments is an encounter between two societies, Jewish and Arab, both with a culture of memory, heritage and myths encompassing the four components of memory, commemoration, representation and function. The first such environment is an urban area, which encompasses two very dominant landscapes adjoining each other: a new commercial and business center alongside historical remnants consisting of a mosque and an old building which became a historical museum. This area and the commercial project are known as "Manshiya", the name of the former Arab neighborhood. The second environment is an agricultural area planted with olive trees with a contested significance for the two cultures.

2. History and Memory, commemoration and representation – theoretical background

Heritage and memory serve three primary functions – to supply continuity from the past to the present, to represent the culture, and thus create self-identity (Schwartz 1982). At the same time, memory and heritage are not permanent; they assume different forms and are shaped according to the mood of the time. Each memory begins as an intimate historical story, amended due to constraints of time and space, then additional layers are added to create "a mosaic of personal memories that are distinct from one another" (Ohana and Wistrich 1996, 27). It finally becomes a collective memory, part of the identity of the social group, whether small or large. To preserve its memory, the group needs to resort to commemorative activity. Such activity is vital for consolidating a social-cultural identity. Commemoration combines social, cultural, political, ceremonial and artistic activities constituting various representative expressions. These can be an original site or landscape, or a carefully designed artificial element with ceremonial and textual components. The choice of the landscape and its representation, the filtering and the caution exercised in their selection, are designed to guarantee the survival of the ethos within local and national memory. The representative function chosen for these means, sites, landscapes or objects is what transforms them into intermediaries of memory. These intermediaries include tombstones, monuments, sculptures, ceremonies, memorial days and holidays, street names and signs, historical structures slated for preservation, gardens, and natural or cultural sites and landscapes. Historical events and figures are often connected to these

"intermediary agents". Over time, they were sanctified and became a focal point of ritual (Lissofsky 2004).

Following this approach, research involving memory and heritage, commemoration and representation, can be divided into three groups: 1) sets of memory and the links between them which in turn form the basis for classifying subjects worthy of commemoration; 2) the form of their representation, which presents a choice of commemoration landscapes; and 3) cultural heritage sites and landscapes, their purpose and function.

3. Symbolic landscapes – their purpose and function

Often the functions of the cultural-symbolic sites and landscape expand and the landscape and site evolve into vicinity that meets contemporary needs. Such development stems from the social-cultural potential of the cultural heritage landscape and site, with their historical subject and design providing added value, which in turn contributes to the economic development of the sites and their significance. Expansion of the functions of cultural sites sometimes leads to a situation where sites and landscapes adopted by the larger community change their status by being perceived in the community consciousness as active landscapes rather than just symbolic sites.

The expanded designation of cultural heritage sites and symbolic cultural landscapes can be divided into three parts:

- The strengthening of communal identity, both on the local and the national levels (Troyansky 1994; Ashworth 1994).
- Economic development adjacent to the site that reinforces memory (vacation and leisure, assembly site, educational center) (Newcomb 1979; Ashworth and Larkham 1994).
- Advancing power and vested interests (Tudor 1972; Cohen 1989; Young 1990; Zerubavel 1994).

Since its war of independence in 1948, these three aspects have significantly affected the landscape of the State of Israel.

4. A Contested Landscape in Israel

Contested landscapes can be created in two ways:

- A common environment for more than one cultural or interest group, within which each group has its own separate cultural-symbolic landscape. Each group thus possesses the territory of its symbolic landscapes.
- An environment containing a joint cultural landscape for multiple groups, but to which each group ascribes different significance and purpose.

When an environment is contested, or when there is a struggle between two groups, with each group claiming ownership of the area, a struggle also ensues between the different icons of the groups. In the event of one group taking over the contested area, the result may well be a deletion of the symbols and icons of the group evicted from the disputed territory.

The geographical area called the Land of Israel by the Jews and officially named Palestine during the British Mandate (1918-1948), was populated by two principal

religious-ethnic groups: Jews and Arabs. All residents of this territory – Jews as well as Arabs – were Palestinians, i.e., residents of Palestine under the rule of the British Mandate for Palestine. Each cultural group developed its environs while shaping its unique symbols and iconography. Jewish society relied on symbols and icons about 3000 years old, some of which were located within the residential environment of the Arab population. Added to these were the icons of Zionist settlements, which began in the 1880s and were concentrated in the Jewish territory. The decision of the United Nations on November 29, 1947, to partition Palestine into two states – Jewish and Arab – was rejected by the Arabs who launched a war to thwart the partition. This war, which ended with ceasefire agreements signed in the summer of 1949, left some Jewish areas in the hands of the Arabs and some Arab areas in the hands of the Jews.

The Jewish areas taken over by the Arabs were emptied of all their Jewish residents. This happened to the residents of the Jewish Quarter in the Old City of Jerusalem, residents of the Gush Etzion settlements, the residents of Beit HaArava near the Dead Sea, and other areas. Arab rule erased almost every vestige of Jewish identity in its territory. All the old synagogues in the Old City of Jerusalem were destroyed, the tombstones in the old Jewish cemetery on Mount Olives were uprooted and Jewish settlements were razed to the ground.

In Arab areas taken over by the state of Israel in the same war, various processes transpired. Some areas were abandoned by their residents, with the encouragement of the Arab leaders in the unfulfilled hope of returning after the anticipated Arab victory; some fled or were chased out by the Israeli army, while some remained where they were under Israeli rule. Wherever Arabs remained under Israeli rule, their icons remained as well. Abandoned places usually lost their symbols and most of the villages were destroyed. However, in some instances religious structures (mosques) remained untouched, even if there were no worshippers.

Many studies have devoted considerable attention to the deletion of Arab and Jewish icons, cultural heritage and cultural-symbolic landscapes. A good example is the research of Azaryahu and Golan (2001), Levine (2004), and Yacobi (2003). Shai (2002), for example, analyzed an initiative adopted by the Israel Land Administration (ILA) to demolish uninhabited houses in abandoned villages in Israel in the years 1965-1967. Since the summer of 1967, the Jewish areas and Arab areas, their symbols and icons are not only in contact but they are under dispute and a reason for violent incidents.

5. Manshiya Neighborhood in Tel-Aviv-Jaffa an Authentic-Historical Remains in an Urban Area

5.1. History

Until the year 1948, the Arab neighborhood of Manshiya (Fig. 1) was situated between the old Arab city of Jaffa and the new Israeli city of Tel Aviv. The neighborhood was established in 1870s following the razing of the old Jaffa city wall by the Turkish authorities and the development of new neighborhoods for both Arabs and Jews outside the old city. At the end of the 19th century, a number of Jewish families settled in Manshiya, some quite famous (see Glass and Kark 1991, 161-163). In 1916, the Ottoman rulers built a mosque at the northern end of Manshiya (Hasan Bek Mosque).



Fig. 1: Picture of Manshiya, 1932.

On November 29, 1947, after the UN decision to partition Palestine into two states, the Arabs of Manshiya began to fire toward the southern Jewish neighborhoods of Tel Aviv. In these events the mosque served as an outpost for Arab snipers who would often shoot at the Jewish-populated neighborhoods. According to the partition plan, Jaffa was to be part of the Arab state. In order to prevent this from happening, the "Irgun Tzvai Leumi-Etzel" (Etzel), a nationalistic military organization with a paramilitary force that operated against both the British and Arabs to win Jewish sovereignty, decided to conquer Jaffa and the neighborhoods along the seashore, between Jaffa and Tel Aviv. On April 27, 1948, the neighborhood of Manshiya was taken, followed by the conquest of Jaffa.

On May 12, a delegation of Arab notables arrived at the Hagana (the Israel Defense Forces) headquarters, and following negotiations signed a surrender agreement. On May 13, 1948, the British left Jaffa and in 1950 Tel Aviv and Jaffa were joined into one city, renamed Tel Aviv-Jaffa. The Arabs of Manshiya fled and Jewish immigrants were settled in the abandoned houses. The neighborhood deteriorated and became part of the Tel Aviv-Jaffa southern slums.

5.2 Commemoration, Representation and functions

Over the years, the houses of Manshiya were destroyed, and in the mid-1970s, the Tel Aviv-Jaffa municipality removed 3,100 residents from Manshiya Neighborhood, mostly Jews who immigrated to Israel in the 1950s. Instead, the municipality built a park and planned a business center on 600 dunams (60 hectares). Only two authentic remnants were left untouched: the village mosque and a house in whose ruins the Etzel Museum was built. The business center planned to be part of a large project and meant to represent the modern developing city in contrast to Old Jaffa. Ultimately, however, the large project was not approved by the regional planning authorities, although part of it was already built. Since then the area where the two buildings are located became a symbolic landscape. For some it reflects a border where the new and modern Tel Aviv ends and the old neglected Jaffa begins. For others it symbolizes a contested landscape.

The museum and the exhibit in it do not represent the history of the neighborhood or that of Jaffa and Tel Aviv. It rather describes the activities of Etzel in the War of Independence from November 29, 1947, until its dismantling on September 22, 1948. In September 1948, Etzel was incorporated into the Israel Defense Forces. A

room in the Etzel Museum commemorates the history of the organization, which existed for 17 years, and honors the liberators of Jaffa. The exhibition includes historical documents, photographs, maps and movies which describe the Etzel organization and the battle to liberate Jaffa.

The Mosque was left untouched next to a parking lot and beside a small memorial park. The park and the memorial monument in it were erected in 1957 for soldiers who fell in the battle for Jaffa in the War of Independence (Azaryahu 1993). During the 1980s, the Tel Aviv-Jaffa planning authorities planned to convert the Hasan Bek mosque into a tourist attraction as part of the new image of the business center. Public objections of both cultures, Arab and Jewish organizations (youth movements, religious parties, local leaderships, put a stop to the plan, but the adjoining tall modern buildings overshadow the mosque, making it difficult to discern the old building from afar.

On June 3, 2001, a major anti-Arab demonstration took place next Hasan Bek Mosque. Over one thousand Israelis participated in sporadic rock and fire-bomb attacks toward the mosque, calling for revenge against Arabs. This was done following a Hamas suicide bombing across the street. On August 19, 2005, another confrontation occurred beside the Mosque and since then the mosque, with its unique Ottoman style architecture contrasting with the contemporary modern high-rises that are situated nearby, has been a symbol of contested landscape. As with the mosque, the museum became also a symbolic landscape. On one hand it remained an isolated island in the large park along the seashore; a park which is part of the open urban space of Tel Aviv-Jaffa, on other hand it symbolizes an urban area in which two societies have their own separate cultural-symbolic landscapes.

6. Symbolic Landscape in Rural Area in Israel – the Olive Trees

6.1 History and Description

Different rituals, messages and values of the two cultures, Jewish and Arab, surround the olive tree (Fig. 2), a symbolic feature in many cultures. The tree plays an important role as an Arab-Jewish icon in that it is common to both cultures. However, it has acquired different meanings over time. And in today's Israeli reality, it represents different and even opposing values in the two cultures.

The Israeli olive is a relatively short tree, up to six meters high, evergreen and long lived. The tree is distinguished by its thick gnarled trunk and silvery-green leaves and is very prominent in the Mediterranean flora. Its appearance arouses interest and easily explains its sacred status in the various communities. It is often planted – alone or in a grove – next to the grave of a righteous or a holy person. The tree has deep roots and can thus grow almost anywhere. It quickly takes root in the mountain slopes and rocky areas of Galilee. Frequently, when natural and manmade disasters injure or destroy orchards and forests, the olive tree remains standing.

A few olive trees in Israel (Galilee) date from the Roman period, two thousand years ago, and there is testimony that olives were cultivated in the Land of Israel and Syria more than six thousand years ago. The old trees turn hollow inside as they age. These characteristics make the olive tree unique and also explain its values: its deep roots, hopes, aspiration for peace as well as providing security, light, beauty and health, a statement of control and victory and so on. Nations, states, cultures, religions - all have utilized the olive tree, its branches and leaves,

to present their messages, creating many visual symbols which give expression to the tree, its branches and leaves.



Fig. 2: Old Olive Tree in Israel.

6.2 Heritage, Commemoration and Functions

The olive tree occupies an important place in Jewish tradition. It is one of the seven species with which *Eretz Israel*, the Land of Israel – "a land of olive oil and honey" (Deuteronomy 8:8) – is blessed. We learn of the status and significance of the olive tree from many sources. One is the parable of Yotam (Judges 9:8-10) "The trees went out to anoint a king over them; and they said to the olive tree, reign over us. But the olive tree said to them, Should I leave my fatness, with which by me they honor God and man, and go to hold sway over the trees?" The olive tree symbolizes fertility and rootedness: "Thy children like olive plants round about thy table" (Psalms 128:3) and its economic importance is emphasized in a harsh reproof: "Thou shalt have olive trees throughout all thy borders, but thou shalt not anoint thyself with the oil for thine olive shall cast its fruit" (Deuteronomy 28:40). The olive is a basic agricultural product (Babylonian Talmud, Brachot, 41, a). Many laws from the areas of agriculture and Jewish ritual are connected with the olive and its oil. Olive oil is the best of oils and is thus used for religious ritual.

The connection between the olive branch and the striving for peace originates in the story of Jonah and the olive leaf and the story of Noah and the ark (Genesis 8:11). The olive branch also had a great influence on Zionist renewal. The branch appears as the symbol of the state of Israel (Mishory, 2000, 139-164; Figure 3) and in the symbols of the IDF (Israel Defense Force). It represents the striving for peace and security: in the IDF emblem the olive branch embraces the sword. The olive tree does not only appear in national symbols. It also appears in paintings, shields of local authorities, and in names of settlements. Its appearance in the local Jewish landscape, especially the Zionist settlements, symbolizes the hope for survival and the ability to cope with the difficulties of striking roots and settlement.



Fig. 3: Olive Tree in Israel State Symbol.

The striving for peace and the relationship to the olive branches as symbols of peace are also expressed in international symbols. Among these symbols, the UN symbol stands out with its double motifs: the map of the world and the two olive branches next to it. The symbol expresses the UN's aspiration of spreading peace throughout the world.

In Christian tradition as well, the olive – the tree, its branches and fruit – has a symbolic meaning (for example, Christian tradition identifies the Garden of Oils on the Mount of Olives as the garden in which Jesus walked, surrounded by his students). The olive tree is also important in Muslim tradition. In the Koran, the olive is mentioned six times, as one of the fruits given by Allah. Olive oil is mentioned once in the chapter which talks about the divine light which will shine in the hearts of the believers.

The hollowness of the olive tree generated one of the legends in Islam: When the prophet Mohammad died, all the trees mourned for him and as a result of all the pain and suffering, their branches fell to the ground. Only the olive tree's branches remained green. The other trees asked the olive tree, "Why aren't you mourning the death of the prophet?" The olive tree answered, "I mourn him greatly, but you wither on the outside and my heart is burnt on the inside".

Despite the importance of the olive tree in both Jewish and Arab cultures, time brought with it many changes. To a great extent, Israeli-Jewish society underwent the processes of secularization, modernization and post-modernization. Today, this society is primarily urban, secular and post-modern. As such, it emphasizes the "Lexus" from the well-known title of Tom Friedman's book, i.e., the most up-to-date model of the prestigious car is more important than the symbolic old olive tree. The tree has lost its actual significance and only its symbolic significance remains.

In contrast, in Israeli-Arab society, the olive tree is not only a symbol but a central component in the life of the village and the community. In many villages the olive tree is an important part of the economic base and the olive harvest is the most important economic period of the year in village life. The family and its olive trees

are deeply connected. The tree connects the villagers to their land and signifies their ownership of the land and its boundaries.

In the territorial competition between Jews and Arabs over spatial dominance, the olive tree serves as a first class instrument for expressing Arab ownership of the land. Planting the olive tree is a sign of a boundary, and its uprooting by Israeli groups for security purposes symbolizes an attempt to evict the Arabs from their land, to deny their territorial rights.

In recent years, the olive tree symbolizes the aspiration for shared life and coexistence in the same territory in the State of Israel. Every year, on October and November, the Galilee olive festival is held; the festival offers a family celebration of the olive harvest, together with Galilean tours, its nature and its cultures. The participants are taking part in a variety of creative activities: they learn about oil and trees; they visit an authentic olive press; they are lodged in Arab and Circassian villages; meet and discuss of Israel political, social and cultural issues. The event has twin goals: economic-tourist and social-cultural.

7. Interpretation of Landscape: Discussion and Conclusions

The landscape, like a written text, has many readers, and therefore can be interpreted on many levels. The different interpretations can lead to disputes and arguments, but also may advance understanding and co-existence.

The historical museum on the Jaffa-Tel Aviv border displays an architectural encounter of natural building materials from the environment with synthetic building materials – limestone at the base of the building, and on the top, glass and metal (Fig. 4). The modern-artificial materials grow out of the original natural materials. The building is a landscape relic in the area of contact between Tel Aviv and Jaffa. The foundation of the building is a remnant of a Jaffa neighborhood, Manshiya, which was erased from the landscape. On this foundation, a new addition takes over, adapted to the needs of a historical museum in a modern city.



Fig. 4: The Etzel Museum

The structure that serves the historical museum not only gives expression to the national Jewish-Arab encounter, it also expresses a process of urban renewal. In this process, old relics are ignored and new modern and post-modern structures are preferred, without the historical context and cultural tension.

The mosque, an authentic remnant of the Arab Manshiya neighborhood, is also outside its natural environmental context. Consequently it loses some of its urban and communal relevance and remains solely a monument (Fig. 5).



Fig. 5: Hasan Bek Mosque and a new commercial center.

The encounter between Jaffa and Tel Aviv as it is described by the landscape remains, also raises a historical paradox. Until 1948, Tel Aviv functioned as the core of Zionist settlement in the Land of Israel. As such, it was not a frontier area. Jaffa was an Arab enclave that bordered the Jewish city. The area of contact between the two cities became the front line during the establishment of the State of Israel. The decision to build the historical museum atop a structure which remained from the Arab neighborhood, as well as the decision to leave the mosque as it is, was intended to document this historical encounter. Over the course of time, alongside the historical encounter, a new urban encounter began to develop in the form of the business center. At the present stage, the historical encounter is already serving as decoration for the urban renewal.

The olive tree's branches and leaves are of universal status, symbolizing peace and hope, unity and healing. Contrasting with this universality, we can discern here the cultural differences between Jews and Arabs in respect to the olive tree. In a picture of a Zionist landscape, the olive tree will appear in the background or adjoining other landscape symbols, such as a water tower, houses, orchards, etc. The sign is implicated and illustrative. These signs symbolize renovation, new settlements and a willing to strike roots in the land of Israel. In a picture of an Arab village, the olive tree will always appear involved with a significant action - olive picking or planting - in order to display continuity of working the land and ownership of the old territory

as well (Cheavlier and Gheerbrant 1996). "The olive tree is known to have important social and economic impacts during its harvest season, with its ability to gather a large number of working hands, especially among women, when Palestinian families including children, women, men, students and the elderly all gather in their olive groves to harvest their trees while bringing alive Palestinian traditions and folklore with cultural evenings and activities. These activities represent our identity and therefore they are part of our symbols (Kayali 2007).

The olive tree, a universal symbol of peace has been the object of conflict in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The uprooting of the ancient olive trees, as a byproduct of war, has had tremendous affects on the Palestinian agriculture, economy and identity. In Palestine, the olive tree is prized for its historical presence, its beauty, its symbolic significance and most importantly for its economic significance. Olive trees are a major commercial crop for Palestine, and many families depend on it for their livelihood. For the Jews the olive tree is a symbol of stability and sign for holding the land.

An examination of the two landscapes indicates that although the geographical environments are different, the struggle for cultural dominance between Arabs and Jews is the same struggle expressed by the different cultural landscapes. In some instances, the two landscapes may coexist in the same geographical area. In other instances, each community acquired different messages in respect to the same landscape. This approach shows that the cultural heritage and cultural landscape possess somewhat different and varied facets. Each community chooses for itself the components of the landscape that can be used for its cultural identity and the message it wishes to transmit, and uses them to weave a tapestry of its unique cultural landscape. In this weaving process, the community ignores and abandons the components that are foreign or do not belong. In this way, two cultures can exist side by side in the same area and relate to the same landscape with different interpretations. One interpretation of the landscape does not of necessity lead to the deligitimization of the other interpretation. A definition of "Contested Landscape" can be used as an added criterion to describe an outstanding value of cultural heritage sites or cultural landscapes. In other words, the very fact that the sites or the landscapes are contested, bestows upon them their uniqueness and singularity.

References

- Amit-Cohen, I. 2008: Silicatescape – Preserving Building Materials in the Old Urban Center Landscape: The Case of Silicate Brick and Urban Planning in Tel Aviv. *Journal of Cultural Heritage* 9, 367-375.
- Ashworth, G. J. and P. J. Larkham 1994: A Heritage for Europe: The Need, The Task, The Contribution. In *Building a New Heritage, Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*, edited by Ashworth, Gregory John and Peter J. Larkham, 1-9. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ashworth, G. J. 1994: From History to Heritage: From Heritage to Identity: In *Search of Concepts and Models*. In *Building a New Heritage, Tourism, Culture and Identity in the New Europe*, edited by Ashworth, G. and P. J. Larkham, 13-30. London and New York: Routledge.
- Azaryahu, M. 1993: A Tale of Two Cities: Commemorating the Israeli War of Independence in Tel Aviv and Haifa. *Cathedra* 68, 98-125 (Hebrew).

- Azaryahu, M. and A. Golan 2001: (Re)naming the Landscape: the Formation of the Hebrew Map of Israel 1949-1960. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 27 (2), 178-195.
- Cheavlier, J. and A. Gheerbrant 1996: *The Penguin Dictionary of Symbols* (translated by J. Buchanan-Brown), London: Penguin Group.
- Cohen, W. 1989: Symbols of Power: Statues in Nineteenth-Century Provincial France. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 31, 491-513.
- Cosgrove, D. 1984: *Social Formation and Symbolic Landscape Totowa*. New Jersey: Barnes and Noble.
- Daniels, S. 1993: *Fields of Vision: Landscape Imagery and National Identity in England and in United States*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Duncan, J. S. 1973: Landscape taste as a symbol of group identity: A Westchester County village. *Geographical Review* 63, 334-355.
- Duncan, J. S. 1990: *The City as Text: The Politics of Landscape Interpretation in the Kandy Kingdom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duncan, J. S. and N. Duncan 1988: (Re)reading the Landscape, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 6, 117-126.
- Duncan, J. S. and N. Duncan 2004: *Landscapes of Privilege: The Politics of the Aesthetic in an American Suburb*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Duncan, J. S. and D. Lamber 2002: Landscape, Aesthetics, and Power. In: *American Space/American Place: Geographies of the United States on the Threshold of a New Century*, edited by J. Agnew and J. Smith, 264-291. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ewald, K. C 2001: The Neglect of Aesthetics in Landscape Planning in Switzerland. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 54, 255-266.
- Glass, J. B. and R. Kark 1991: *Sepharadi entrepreneurs in Eretz Israel: The Amsalak Family 1816-1918*, 1991, Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Gottmann, J. 1952: The Political Partitioning of our World: An Attempt at Analysis, *World Politics*, 4 (4), 512-519.
- Holdsworth, D. W. 1997: Landscape and Archives as text. In: *Understanding Ordinary Landscapes*, edited by P. Groth and T.W. Bressi, 44-55. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Kayali H. 2007: Olive trees in Palestine: The story of a drop. *This Week in Palestine*, Nov. 4 2007.
- Levine, M. 2004: Planning to Conquer: Modernity and its Antinomies in the 'New-Old Jaffa'. In *Constructing a Sense of Place: Architecture and the Zionist Discourse*, editing by H. Yacobi, 192-224. London: Ashgate,.
- Lisovsky, N. 2004: Sacred Trees – Holy Land: Cultural, Natural and Visual Characteristics of the Sacred Geography of Eretz Israel. *Cathedra* 111, 41-74 (Hebrew).
- Lowenthal, D. 1991: British identity and the English landscape, *Rural History* 2, 205-230.
- Mishory, A. 2000: *Lo and Behold: Zionist Icons and Visual Symbols in Israeli Culture*, Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).
- Newcomb, R. M. 1979: *Planning the Past, Historical Landscape - Resources and Recreation*, Hamden Connecticut: Archon Books.
- Ohana, D. and R. S. Wistrich 1996: Jewish and Zionist Myth. In *Myth and Memory*, edited by D. Ohana and R. S. Wistrich, 11-40. Tel Aviv: Am Oved (Hebrew).
- Rose, G. 1995: Place and Identity: A Sense of Place. In *A Place in the World? Place, Cultures, and Globalization*, edited by D. Massey and P. Jess, 87-132. Oxford: Open University Press.

- Rowntree, L. B. and M. W. Conkey 1980: Symbolism and the Cultural Landscape. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70 (4). 459-483.
- Shai, A. 2002: The Fate of Abandoned Arab Villages in Israel on the Eve of the Six-Day War and its Immediate Aftermath. *Cathedra* 105, 151-170 (Hebrew).
- Schwartz, B. 1982: The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory. *Social Forces* 2 (61), 374-402.
- Terkenli, T. S. 2001: Towards a Theory of the Landscape: The Aegean Landscape as a Cultural Image. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 57, 183-196.
- Troyansky, D. 1987: Monumental Politics: National History and Local Memory in French Monuments aux Morts in the Department of the Aisne since 1870. *French Historical Studies* 15(1), 3-11.
- Tudor, H. 1972: *Political Myth*, London: Mcmillan.
- Young, A. R. 1990: We Throw the Torch: Canadian Memorials of the Great War and the Mythology of Heroic Sacrifice. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 24 (4), 12-21.
- Yacobi, H. 2003: The Architecture of Ethnic Logic: Exploring the Meaning of the Built Environment in the "Mixed" City of Lod – Israel. *Geografiska Annaler* 84 (B), 171-187.
- Zreubavel. Y. 1994: *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

CONTESTED LANDSCAPE AND SPIRIT OF PLACE: THE CASE OF THE OLIVE TREES AND AN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD IN ISRAEL

Summary

Cultural Heritage and Cultural Landscape are a set of human products that reflect the society needs thoughts and memories. It represents and symbolizes the relationships of power and controls - out of which it has emerged - and the human processes that have transformed and continue to transform them. These transformations create new cultural landscapes that often hide the processes that have made them - political, social, cultural, ideological and economic.

The purpose of this lecture is to analyze a contested geographical environment, where two cultures compete over land and its cultural heritage and therefore each of them has its own interpretations: the Jewish Zionist culture and the Arab Moslem culture. The aim is to define the landscape - its spirit and its representation - that emerges from these competitions and disputes; to characterize it; to analyze its symbols and its uses - mainly for the purpose of formation and construction of identities.

The two geographical areas containing cultural heritage sites and cultural landscapes that have become symbolic that present four components: memory, commemoration, representation and function for the two societies. The first such environment is a rural area, which encompasses two very dominant landscapes adjoining each other - a new commercial and cultural center which was built for Jewish settlement alongside historical remnants of an Arab village, a mosque and 'Bustan' - an Arab plantation. The second environment is an agricultural area planted with olive trees with a contested significance for the two societies.

An examination of the two landscapes indicates the struggle for cultural dominance between Arabs and Jews is the same struggle expressed by the different cultural landscapes. In this way, a definition of "Contested Landscape" can be used as criteria to describe the value of cultural heritage or cultural landscapes. This definition might serve also as a solution for cultural landscape or cultural heritage sites which present disputes or uncertain national proprietorship. In other words, the very fact that the sites or the landscapes are contested, bestows upon them their uniqueness and singularity.

