

Mobile Cartographies and Mobilized Ideologies: The Visual Management of Jerusalem

Dana Hercbergs

*The Joseph and Alma Gildenhorn Institute for Israel Studies, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA;
hercbergs@yahoo.com*

Chaim Noy

*Department of Communication, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL, USA;
cnoy@usf.edu*

Abstract: This article analyses a recent ideological shift in the visual management of Jerusalem. Through two case studies in the real estate and tourism industries we show how mobile technologies are shaping both actual settings in, and visual consumption of, Jerusalem. The analysis points at the creation of a “tunnel vision” for consumers and visitors, which promotes Jewish hegemony in the city and simultaneous detachment from Palestinian spaces and histories. This tunnel vision situates the viewers in physical and simulated enclaves within the city, creating a relationship of distance and elevation to promote their embodied identification with Israel’s Judaizing mission for the area, primarily the Holy Basin. This mode of viewing Jerusalem is evocative of Israel’s post-second intifada policies and the concurrent rise of right-wing ideologies, which relegate to the margins alternative readings of the contested urban landscape.

Keywords: Jerusalem, divided city, visualization, advertising, tourism, real estate

Introduction

This article coalesces around issues of visual representation and the management of urban landscapes, attending particularly to images that promote a sanitized perspective of cities marked by ethno-national conflict. Our discussion focuses on the divided city of Jerusalem, where an emergent mode of seeing seeks to shape the experiences of tourists and residents alike. Based on two case studies, we examine visual regimes advanced by tourism and real estate advertisements and the technologies they use to frame the cityscape. We demonstrate that they employ strategies and discourses of exclusivity and hegemony to advance Israel’s ethno-national agenda for Jerusalem.

Our approach is based on the recognition that the ability to imagine Jerusalem as a global and uncontested city and as a space of flows is intimately bound up with modern technologies’ rendering and enticement of particular modes of bodily and ocular movement, both real and simulated (Baudrillard 1994). At the same time, we show that this imaginary is undergirded by practices of enclave-making that induce a spectatorial relationship to urban spaces based on distant visual consumption from the enclosed interiors of double-decker buses and luxury

apartment buildings. The points of merger of the case studies we examine suggest that the dichotomous distinction between tourists and residents, and between tourism and real estate, does not hold in cities such as today's Jerusalem. At stake here is the fact that mobilities (of images and of people) stemming from policies that combine ethno-national dimensions with flows of private money, challenge the differences between the fleeting and the permanent that these categories index.

In the following, we situate a recent phase of ideological management of the landscape within the context of Jerusalem's ethnic tensions and divisions. In Jerusalem, municipal, state, and private entities collaborate in appropriating "the city apparatus to buttress its domination and expansion" in a process that Yiftachel and Yacobi (2003:673) refer to as urban ethnocracy. They define this as "a distinct regime type established to enhance the expansion and control of a dominant ethnonation in multiethnic territories". In such regimes, they argue, "ethnicity, and not citizenship, forms the main criteria for distributing power and resources" (2003:689). In Jerusalem, capitalism serves to further urban ethnocracy by attracting well-to-do diaspora Jews to this traditionally poor, divided city. We argue that the enclosing and exclusionary practices of urban ethnocracy and privatization are reshaping the ways of looking at and visually consuming the urban landscape of Jerusalem, a trend we believe is encompassing other cities as well.

Our analysis of visual narratives of place that are mediated for domestic and foreign consumption draws on approaches from visual studies, tourism (with an emphasis on the notion of the tourist gaze), urban studies, and folklore. As Urry (2007) and Sheller and Urry (2006) indicate, travel is part of the essential social dimensions and semiotics of urban spaces. Likewise, travel to, from and within Jerusalem constitutes important ways of understanding the city. Discussions of tourism in Jerusalem point to the ideological framing of tourists' experiences in religious/pilgrim travel (Feldman 2007), political tourism (Herbergs 2012), and solidarity visits (Brin 2006). In these cases, bodily movement in space combines with the moral instruction provided by guides and by written texts to shape visitors' experiences of the city. Increasingly, advertisements and travel websites anticipate as well as complement first-hand tourism experiences through their combined images, narratives, and movement-simulating technologies (eg mobile panoramas, virtual tours).

In light of this convergence, we focus on the real estate and tourism industries, both of which use a variety of media to promote an imaginary of Jerusalem that is resonant with national policy directives. These industries frame and direct visitors' vision of Jerusalem by positioning its internal landmarks and spaces within a stable narrative. As elaborated below, this narrative promotes a particular visual experience of the Holy Basin—which includes almost all of the major sites of the three monotheist religions in and near the Old City of Jerusalem, significantly situated in occupied East Jerusalem—whereby viewers are situated as elevated and distant onlookers primarily from West Jerusalem locations. While promoting Jewish-Israeli identification with the Holy Basin, this visual regime occludes or marginalizes alternative meanings, uses and attachments, amounting to a "tunnel vision" that zooms in on its object. This tunnel vision exemplifies Dorst's assessment of colonialist visual regimes where to colonize is "to occupy a position from which the colonial object could be seen coherently as an artifact, available for appropriation" (1999:195).

The elevated stance whence tourists and residents (both potential and actual) are positioned vis-à-vis the Holy Basin also recalls Weizman's discussion of "optical urbanism"—marking a direct connection between colonialism and vision in Jewish settlements in the West Bank, whose hilltop location serves military purposes of surveillance. Weizman (2002) notes the historical military link between elevation and defense in Crusade-era castles, but also the way that today's settlement homes are "shrouded in the cosmetic façade of red tiles and green lawns". This camouflage effect is relevant to the sanitized imaginary promoted by the real estate ads we discuss.

This study is informed by the politics and ethics of sight-seeing in a world that is increasingly dominated by sophisticated touristic imaginaries and their ideological effects on tourist mobilities and gazes. Nash (2001) asserts that the tunnel vision of globalization must be looked at obliquely, through peripheral vision, in order to apprehend what is excluded at its margins. Rendered peripheral in this case are the multiple (primarily non-Jewish) locations, histories and attachments to places in and around the Holy Basin, and their modes of erasure. We therefore adopt the notion of peripheral vision as a critical lens for understanding the mobile and immobile framing devices and their related narratives (MacCannell 2011). The benefit of adopting peripheral vision in Jerusalem is that it can deconstruct the hegemonic, commercial rendering of the city through a critical gaze that sees what is meant to be invisible. An example of using peripheral vision for ethical purposes is in the Palestinian neighborhood of Silwan, where Palestinian and Israeli activists work together to expose the disruptive impacts of the settler-operated archaeological park Ir David (City of David) on residents through alternative tourism (Noy 2012a) and inclusive archaeology (Greenberg 2009). Given that hegemonic narratives are not simply rhetorical but have actual repercussions on people's lives, we conceive of peripheral vision as an ethical intervention.

Changing Spatial and Visual Regimes in Jerusalem

Jerusalem's ethno-national divisions stem from a power struggle between unequally positioned actors: an occupying power and a minority struggling for national independence. Since the 1948 Arab–Israeli War, Jerusalem has been a divided city. In 1948–1967, East Jerusalem was in Jordanian territory while Israel controlled West Jerusalem, and the dividing border known as the Green Line was fortified in different stages and patrolled by soldiers on both sides. This barrier was dismantled following the 1967 War, when Israel occupied the West Bank, including Arab East Jerusalem, and incorporated the latter into the city's municipality—a move defined by UN Resolution 242 as illegal, and by Israel as the unification of its "eternal capital".

The city's population numbers nearly 800,000 with Palestinians constituting just over one-third of it. Jerusalem's divisions are evinced in social and residential separation by ethno-national identity, and are exacerbated by differential allocation of municipal services, resources, and funding to Israeli-Jewish and Palestinian-Arab sectors (Benvenisti 1996). Moreover, while Jerusalem remains a poor city, demographically Palestinians experience the most poverty (Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies 2014). Following the failed Oslo peace process of the 1990s, Israel continues to pursue measures begun since 1967 to Judaize the city and reduce its

Palestinian population through planning and building restrictions on Palestinian areas, revocation of Palestinians' residency status through "center-of-life policy" (Jefferis 2012), as well as Jewish-Israeli settlement building in East Jerusalem and the construction of the Israel–West Bank Separation Barrier—which removed large Arab areas from the city—to maintain a 70% Jewish majority therein (see Benvenisti 1996:125–127; Fenster 2004:96).

As the focus of religious and political yearnings throughout the ages, Jerusalem has been an object of changing depictions and gazes. The visual representation of the Old City (see Figure 1)—where the holy places of the Jewish prayer site of the Western Wall ("Wailing Wall") and the Muslim Noble Sanctuary (Haram ash-Sharif, including al-Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of the Rock) are adjacently located—is central to today's political struggles between Israel and the Palestinians. In this article we are interested in illustrating a particular turning point that can be traced to the immediate post-Oslo era and which is materializing—and visualizing—in front of our eyes (though deceptively, which is why critical vision is demanded). This turning point concerns a shift in the spatial and visual regimes of, and perspectives in, Jerusalem; namely from portraying the city for decades via a number of sites, most prominently the dual Western Wall/Dome of the Rock image—to promoting an exclusively Jewish-Israeli city, as the cases we chose to study evince.¹

In recent history, two major events have contributed to this shift, in which we situate our discussion: the retirement of legendary Mayor Teddy Kollek from the position he held for 28 years (1967–1993), and following it the demise of the socialist Zionist paradigm of Mapai²; and the second *intifada* (or the al-Aqsa *intifada*) of 2000, which was marked by widespread protest and violence across the Occupied Palestinian Territories following Likud leader Ariel Sharon's provocative visit to the Haram ash-Sharif. As we mention in previous work (Herzbergs and Noy 2013:241–242), since the mid-1990s the rise of a right-wing municipal government has propelled an acceleration of Jewish settlement-building in East Jerusalem. With the disintegration of the peace process, Jerusalem began to take on radical ethno-national significance, particularly following the second *intifada*. The latter prompted the construction of the Separation Barrier beginning in 2002 to control the entry of Palestinian West Bank residents into Israel purportedly for security purposes. These events both stoked and corresponded to Israeli fears, fueling a cyclical justification of violence.

Recent neoliberal policies augment and dovetail practices of urban ethnocracy in Jerusalem, amplifying social and economic divisions through further processes of spatial separation that are occurring in West Bank settlements and in other Israeli towns (Monterescu and Fabian 2003; Rosen and Razin 2009). As elsewhere in the country, affluent gated urban communities have been cropping in Jerusalem since the 1990s (Rosen and Razin 2009:1704), transposing an American form of urban distinction. These residential enclaves are linked to the "post-welfare state"; are driven by profit-motivated private construction; and, according to Rosen and Razin, are populated by those seeking "class and prestige", although the lines between class-based distinction and religious or ethnic exclusivity can be blurred. Their statistics (2009:1708) show that, as of 2007, at least seven high-end residential enclaves in the Jerusalem area had been built or were in the process of completion,

with the help of private funding (compared with 11 in Tel Aviv, Israel's global capital).³ The number of such residential projects has since grown.

These developments present a departure from the government-subsidized settlements built since 1967 on confiscated Palestinian land in and around Jerusalem, and a move towards a government–private sector partnership associated with neoliberal regimes and exclusionary forms of development (Caldeira 2008; Rosen and Razin 2009). As part and parcel of Israel's integration into the global economic system, Jerusalem's real estate and tourism industries are conspicuous in their appeal to foreign investment. These industries are directed respectively at wealthy, diaspora Jewish visitors and/or buyers of properties in Jerusalem as second homes or as investments, and at Israeli and foreign visitors to the city.

Real estate prices in Jerusalem are generally high, especially in the core neighborhoods. In particular, the area around the Green Line that is closest to the Old City (Mamillah) and to downtown West Jerusalem has been subject to intensive development since 2000, following the demise of the Oslo accords and coinciding with the beginning of the second intifada. One of our case studies, the King David Residence, is located in the area we refer to as the "Green Line Triangle", which also includes David's Citadel Hotel and the newly built Alrov Mamilla shopping corridor that leads to the Old City. These high-end structures, which cater to affluent visitors and occasional residents, embody the new visualization of Jerusalem as a biblical City of David (Herbergs and Noy 2013). Their clustering near the Old City, particularly on the Green Line, suggests an attempt to efface the old division of Jerusalem and thereby unify the city through images of historical continuity and affluence. The real estate boom in Jerusalem is therefore deeply implicated in nationalist efforts to erase the Green Line (see Handelman 2010:70–72; Herbergs and Noy 2013:248–251).

Real estate ads and bus tours (mis)represent Jerusalem through a visual narrative that emphasizes Jewish historical continuity and territorial contiguity at the expense of non-Jewish, specifically Palestinian presence and heritage. They do so by creating a (tourist/residential) bubble of Jewish Jerusalem and avoiding Arab areas by "zooming in" on the Holy Basin (and Jewish sites). These elegant attempts to reshape the city enhance efforts to fragment, isolate, divide, and encircle Palestinian neighborhoods in areas of the city that are less visible and often unvisited by most Israelis and Jewish visitors.

Case Studies

The two case studies we present below stem from fieldwork conducted between 2007 and 2010, as part of ongoing work which approaches the changing Jerusalem urban-scape through a combination of visual content analysis and ethnography (Herbergs and Noy 2013). This research is for us a political and personal point of merger, initiated with the first author's arrival in Jerusalem for fieldwork in 2007–2008. As a Jewish-Israeli living in the United States for many years, her periodic study and research visits led to ongoing reflections on the city's demographic changes—particularly the rising religious Jewish presence, due in part to immigration—and dizzying pace of real estate construction, along with the

increased visibility of street-level advertising for them. The second author is a Jewish native of Jerusalem, and reflecting on movement in the city amounts for him to a novel interrogation of spaces that are seen and presented as “familiar”: walking from West Jerusalem to the Old City through the Jaffa Gate has been pursued for years with friends (1970s–1990s), and then with family (2000s). Indeed, how one walks from one side of the city to the other has changed dramatically, and the practice of doing so is subject to both personal recollections and ethnographic inquiry.

In the following we interrogate the relationship between gaze construction and narrative of place through analysis of (1) a billboard advertisement and website of the King David Residence, and (2) website and ethnography of the 99 Bus tour. These cases are selected for their capacity to illustrate, through rich analysis and discussion, a phenomenon that we view as symptomatic of a broader trend in representations of Jerusalem: the embracing of a visual regime that simultaneously affords (particularly Jewish) visitors access to East Jerusalem and the Holy Basin, and avoids showing or engaging with non-Jewish others in these spaces. The perspectives of the Holy Basin we discuss are based on a Western Jewish gaze: this mainly orientaling gaze is launched from either side of the Green Line—from the luxurious residences in West Jerusalem, from similarly high-end settlements in East Jerusalem,⁴ or from pro-settlement bus tours in the West Bank (see Clarke 2000). We present a mode of gazing that the case studies share, which we argue are thematically united by the ideological perspectivalism they produce and the imaginaries they oblige (Dorst 1999).

Conventionally, bus tours present a visual narrative in time and space while real estate ads capture an idea in a single snapshot, promising a Zionist dream package through a modern medium. Moreover, the target audience of each venture is somewhat different in terms of its ideological conviction and affiliations: apartments are geared to very wealthy Jews, while bus tours cater to a more flexible clientele, hailing locally and from abroad. Yet these sites are no longer governed by traditional modes and parameters. Both work to anticipate and present the real through a combination of movement (both physical and simulated, as on websites and billboards), narrative, and sound. We will show that they enact a visual regime of Jerusalem by shaping the gaze of mobile/distant consumers, presenting an experience of mobility and modernity. In each of these examples, the framing of the sites and the network of routes that connects them, are selective in both what they contain and what they omit. Therefore we see these examples as two sides of the same coin.

We first address the centrally located and luxurious King David Residence (“the leading project in Jerusalem”)⁵ and analyze its website, focusing on billboard ads located on the construction site facing the street followed by an online video tour of the building. Moving on to the 99 Bus tour, we supply both information and ethnographic records thereof, based on three trips taken between 2007 and 2010. The discussion will demonstrate that both media exhibit an uneasy tension between *zooming in* on the Holy Basin and *distancing viewers from* the same terrain located at the heart of Arab East Jerusalem, which presents the threat of contention and the unstated potential for interaction and pluralism. This tension—between visual representation and physical distance—reflects a basic contradiction within

the Zionist narrative of Jerusalem as having always been Jewish versus the struggle to continuously affirm this desire to conquer the city. Although Israel claims all of Jerusalem to be its “eternally united capital”, the reality is that, since 1967, colonization has created in East Jerusalem a patchwork of Jewish and Arab spaces whose interaction is characterized by friction. The technologies of vision and movement of which we speak are attempting to resolve this contradiction by presenting the city as a Jewish product to be held up at a distance without being carefully examined.

Holy Land Views: In-situ and Online King David Residence Ads

The King David Residence (KDR) is located on King David Street, across and diagonal from the famous King David Hotel. It is a 5-minute walk from both downtown West Jerusalem and the Old City’s Jaffa Gate. Significantly, KDR is also a stone’s throw from the Green Line that divided Jerusalem in 1948–1967. Like Berlin’s former no-man’s zone and Beirut’s post-war downtown core, both of which became prime real estate for major corporations since the 1990s (Huysen 1997; Makdisi 1997), a similar infusion of capital investment, primarily in residential real estate but also in retail, has been occurring in and near Jerusalem’s former No Man’s Land visibly since 2005/2006.

The KDR complex combines high-end living with related amenities. It includes two residential buildings with 88 luxurious apartments, commercial areas and a Moroccan culture museum. It is adjacent to two other new and high-profile building projects in the area: King David’s Crown, a large round complex located behind the West Jerusalem YMCA, and the recently completed Alrov Mamilla mall, as well as across the street from the David’s Citadel Hotel. These properties are built for wealthy diaspora Jewish buyers and for high-end consumers and shoppers. While they are by and large not aimed at local, Israeli buyers, nonetheless, they are absorbed into the urban space of the area, affecting the feel of the city and its changing spaces.

The KDR billboard advertisement in Figure 2(a, b) was the first to be displayed prominently on the street since the early phases of construction (Spring 2008). While over the following months, more billboards were added which featured the interiors of the building and the apartments themselves, this ad’s first appearance on the scene indicates that, even before a single storey was constructed, the major selling point of the project was *the view offered* by the east-facing apartments. The ad displays a deck in one of the higher floors of the projected building with a view of the Holy Basin, as indicated by the recliner which points toward it. The leisurely lounge chair and the eating table and chairs, both empty, invite the consumers to imagine themselves in them, enjoying a commanding panorama spreading out beneath a lightly cloudy sky—a benevolent feature in this arid region.

The image refers back to the viewer as the egomimetic reference point, mimicking those adverts which cater to the tourist imaginary: It “return[s] the tourist ego to itself as the subject and object of its own desire” (MacCannell 2011:155), and thus precludes an interaction that would take the viewer outside of him/herself and beyond the confines of that imaginary. As we shall see below, this view simulates what tourists see on the double-decker tour bus, and even appears to replicate their



Figure 2: Billboard ad of King David Residence in 2008

elevated stance vis-à-vis the Holy Basin from the Mount Scopus overlook. Lastly, the clear glass balcony shields the potential apartment dweller while disappearing into the background, further suggestive of luxury and exclusive access to a million dollar view (according to the Jerusalem Homes website, a three-bedroom apartment in the complex of 121 m² starts at US\$1.1 million, and de facto, the price of a square meter in the project begins at US\$11,250).⁶

KDR's website elaborates upon the image sold on the static billboard and provides further indication of how its vision of a privatized luxury lifestyle translates and instantiates the Israeli policy of disengagement from the peace process into architecture, through the related processes of indoorization and omission. By indoorization, we refer to the mechanisms that serve to enclose the residents in a protected space while keeping out unwanted others, as well as to the ethos of privatization and individualization that signals the KDR as a separate universe, as opposed to an orientation towards the public space of the street (Caldeira 1996:308). To compensate for the loss of public life, fortified enclaves contain the necessary services that social urban planning placed in the public.

According to the website, the mechanisms of KDR's indoorization include architectural elements such as a central courtyard; windows which let in light but which appear to be tinted from the outside, offering unidirectional vision and privacy; surveillance technologies and personnel, such as the 24 h concierge service which implicitly connotes exclusivity; and lastly, the selling point of the balcony that offers views of the Holy Basin, which is the culmination of the virtual tour and the still image advertised on the billboard. The second aspect, of omission, is ironically integrated into the description and architectural design and motifs of the KDR, including the Andalusian courtyard and the "ancient building", which evoke a vague notion of Mediterraneanism while omitting references to local Palestinian Arab culture. This will be elaborated below.

KDR's website was initially bilingual: in English and French, but *not* in Hebrew (Hebrew was added much later). It mainly connects French and American Jewish-scapes to Jerusalem in that it addresses the large recent immigration of French and American Orthodox Jews to Jerusalem, mostly to well-off neighborhoods and building projects (Kaufman 2007). This recent immigration and the real-estate

effects it bears, join the traditional flow of North American money in the shape of real-estate purchases and investments in Jerusalem. The website suggests the KDR is a self-contained environment with elements that are taken from inhabitants of both elite and Orthodox Jewish populations: while the swimming pool, underground parking, wireless internet in the lobby, underground wine cellar and a special cigar-smoking room cater to wealthy potential residents, the synagogue, central Sukkah (a hut used during the Jewish holy day of Sukkot), and Shabbat elevator signify the complex's inner shared spaces (and technologies) as indoor religious-scapes. In addition, the website boasts an "Andalusian courtyard", which "serves to recreate the glory days of the neighborhood" and "creates a peaceful secluded internal space which most of the apartments face onto".⁷

This Andalusian courtyard, which also appears in detail in the video, is important for our analysis because it illustrates an indoor space which is at the same time a kind of outdoor space. It is a semi outdoor or public area; yet it is a captivated space because it is closed and exclusive. In the video and verbal description, it is spacious and allows activities that mimic outdoor urban activities: strolling, sitting for a leisurely coffee, etc. Further, the courtyard is conspicuously termed Andalusian, which is a way of marking it as an oriental and exotic space—indeed, one which echoes and mimics the Orient where the KDR is located, but in a way that is marked as "safe" (i.e. non-Arab) and distant (a dual scene emerges of here and not-here simultaneously).

The Andalusian theme forms a continuation of the "Mediterranean" and "neo-Oriental" aesthetic of post-1967 architecture in Jerusalem, similarly employing courtyards in the newly built settlements such as Giloh and Ramot (Nitzan-Shifan 2004:244, 246–247). While these neighborhood settlements represented a status upgrade for low-income residents living across from Palestinian villages (Nitzan-Shifan 2004:246), the KDR affords its wealthy clientele the promise of flexible urbanity (Ghannam 2008:272): simultaneous access to and detachment from the heart of the city and the Green Line, via the amenities it contains.

Related to the atmosphere of enclosed, protected and comfortable interiors of KDR is the access it affords to residents to the Old City by virtue of the complex's proximity to it. Significantly, it is within walking distance of the Western Wall, which captures some needs of the Orthodox Jews who live there, as they can pray there in the high holy days. This aspect of the project is communicated verbally in terms of convenience, and visually as a panoramic overview to the Holy Basin. The Old City is rendered as a landscape that can be captured by the viewer's gaze (Dorst 1999), framed by the luxury building whence it is beheld.

As Thurot and Thurot (1983:176) point out, advertising is a "standardizer of experience", whereby "little by little [it has] led the people's stories to conform with the discourse itself, with the themes and the ideological contents which it expresses", thereby displacing alternative meanings. An important visual element in constructing the visual spaces and particularly this "tunnel view" of which we speak is the site's video tour.⁸ The English video tour presented on the website during the advertisement phase of the project begins with the sound of classical music which accompanies a middle-aged male voice with a distinctly American accent: "Overlooking the walls of Jerusalem in the proximity of Talbiyeh and

Rehavia neighborhoods lies the beautiful Mughrabi quarter, the first Jewish neighborhood built outside the walls of the old city...”.

The narrative relies heavily on the cliché of old meets new. In this case, an Orientalized notion of Jewish history is merged with a specific and relatively recent chapter of Jewish settlement in the city. It appears that the name Mughrabi is substituted for the neighborhood of Mishkenot Sha’ananim, established as a philanthropic initiative for Ashkenazi and Sephardi Jewish inhabitants in 1855–1860 (Kark and Oren-Nordheim 2001:82).⁹ The so-called “ancient building” is slated as the site of a museum for Moroccan Jewry “abundant with sacred relics and sacred artifacts”. The building was part of the Jewish neighborhood of Mahane Yisrael, which was established in 1854 and was the second Jewish neighborhood built outside the Old City, by North African Jews (hence “Mughrabi”).¹⁰ It thus presently appeals to an Ashkenazi crowd as well as to a North African French orthodox clientele. The decision indicates an appeal to a sense of rootedness, and hence suggests a moral claim to the city.

A second aspect of the old-meets-new theme is the “traditional ceramic” which we surmise relates to the Andalusian element; the video shows inlaid plaster and tile work with Muslim architectural motifs. Later, a damascene style wooden door shaped like a *mihṛāb* (a prayer niche in a mosque) surrounded by Moroccan-style tiles opens, and the narrator’s voice continues: “the ancient building also serves as a lobby of the building and its architectural design is a masterpiece of restoration and decoration, returning the building to its past grandeur”. There is no mention of what this past is, only a patina of its age and illustriousness. The narration sets up a teleology such that the old is a logical precursor to the current demolition and “restoration” work.

A final aspect of the video tour relates to the notion of a one-sided view. When one looks at the building from the outside (on the website and on the actual street), it is evident that the windows are not completely transparent: individuals within can look out, but outsiders cannot look in. The narrator states that “the windows are big and wide, displaying a view of the Old City in most of the apartments, and of the patio in the Independence Park ...” In a sense, this feature is a further indication of prestigious and exclusive amenities. The large windows are indicative of modernity, light, and panoptic views, including those of Independence Park, which contains the Muslim Mamillah Cemetery. On the other hand, the notion that one can look out with a one-sided view to a contested territory that bears multiple histories, suggests unilateralism rather than dialogue. In a recent interview, the project’s chief architect (Amir Kolker) described the project’s potential residents with the expression: “Urban Cliff Dwellers” (originally in English), and added that these are residents who will “live on cliffs and are detached from the urban environment” (Dvir 2011). Writing about “edge cities” in Sao Paulo, Caldeira states that “[t]hese buildings reject the glass and transparency of modernism and their disclosure of private life ... Finally, sophisticated technologies of security assure the exclusivity of the already isolated buildings” (1996:318). This inference is further supported by the announcement of an “imposing lobby [which] provides concierge services and impressive elevators, including Shabbat elevators”. Similar to their Los Angeles counterparts in their distaste for explicit racism, the advertisers

of KDR convey to their clientele the sense that they are secure and that, with the absence of explicit security guards, the architecture and the 24-hour personnel are enough to deter anyone other than themselves from entering.

The material aspects (location, architecture) together with visual ads and representations of the luxurious KDR suggest that it is a clear instance—an embodiment—of the Jerusalem municipality's re-orientation to an ethno-national agenda, combined with the recent impact of globalized capital on urban economic, spatial, and ethnic disparities. We now continue to the next case study, where we examine these tropes in the form of a city bus tour.

Tourism's Mobile Visualizations: Tour Bus 99

Jerusalem boasts a tourism industry that brings more than a million visitors each year, many of whom are religious pilgrims who also visit nearby religious sites (eg Bethlehem).¹¹ As Brin (2006) outlines, tourist outfits in Jerusalem range from the hegemonic to the subversive. These include a variety of state-sponsored tours (eg Birthright, Ir David National Park); Jewish heritage tours supported directly and indirectly by municipal and local cultural organizations (eg Yad Ben-Zvi, Beit Shmuel); and alternative tours operated by Palestinians and by Israeli NGOs (eg Jerusalem Hotel, Ir Amim). Among the unspoken premises of tours facilitated by state and municipal bodies in Jerusalem—including the City Tour enterprise we discuss here—is the effort to steer visitors away from not only interactions with Palestinians but also from Palestinian-owned businesses (hotels, bus companies, shops) (see Bowman 1992).

Since the summer of 2005, the major Israeli bus company, Egged, has partnered with City Tour to create a bus tour of Jerusalem. The bus tour has been labeled with the number “99” and verbally with “*Sovev Yerushalayim*” (literally “round Jerusalem”, which references a known verse from Psalms). There are four tours per day, which depart from across the Central Bus Station near the western entrance to Jerusalem, and last for about 1 hour and 45 minutes. The price for a ticket during the time of fieldwork was 45 NIS (US\$12) or 65 NIS (US\$17)¹² for adults—the higher price includes the option of getting off at any of the 28 stops along the route and re-boarding all day, while the lower price entails one trip alone. On the City Tour website, the leading icon is that of the moving red double-decker, pictured against the Tower of David.¹³ Egged's Line 99 website reads: “Come discover Jerusalem and its historic and tourist sites in the most comfortable and pleasant way”.¹⁴ It informs the surfer that the “touristic red double-decker bus resembles the buses in London”, thus evoking a certain type of touristic vision and experience, relating to culturally marked technologies of mobility.¹⁵

The route is marked on a map on the site,¹⁶ which the bus replicates in a standardized format; there is one route and no live guide. Rather, the orienting narrative emanates from an audio recording that provides short explanations of each sight in one of eight languages,¹⁷ accessed in one of two ways, either through a disposable earphone which passengers receive upon payment to the driver as they board or through a general transmission loudspeaker. In the authors' experience, the narrating voice was accessed exclusively through the ear-piece

during a trip in a covered double-decker bus (see Figure 3), while an open-air bus involved the general speakers, which transmitted in Hebrew. The ear-piece would then be used by non-Hebrew speakers. The earphone is plugged into a jack above the passengers' heads (or on the side, if sitting on the open-air second level). There is a dial for volume and another for selecting the language. The recording alternates between an official-sounding male voice announcing the sites encountered along the way, and Hebrew songs that fill the time in between the announcements. Both options are flexible in that they enable the passengers to listen to the recording while being open to other aural stimuli, mainly interacting with companions.

The voice of the narrator is similar to that of a radio announcer: the descriptions of the sites are brief, informational and rather dry, while a soundscape of nationalistic music (songs are mostly about Jerusalem) is up-beat, celebratory and at times contemplative or meditative. While the narration gives passengers options in terms of where to direct their gaze, it also assures that the music is informing their experience by providing a thematic subtext through patriotic songs.

The authors attended a bus tour together in December 2007, with each taking a second, separate tour in August 2008 and August 2010. All trips were taken on different days of the week. During the 2007 bus trip, each author sat next to strangers, and focused on interacting with the other passengers, casually inquiring about their origins and motivations, as well as sharing reactions to the tour's route, narrative, and stops. In addition to observing the passengers, the driver and the route, and taking notes, photos and videos, the authors recorded the automated narrative emanating from the loud speakers. Most of the passengers on the December 2007 tour appeared to be Israeli families and couples, while an American couple was observed; the (Caucasian) passengers on board in August 2008 were from abroad, and the 2010 tour was characterized by a more or less equal number of local and international tourists. The Israelis on the latter tour consisted of families and a group of firemen, both from Israel's northern and peripheral regions. No Arab Israeli or Palestinian passengers were noted.



Figure 3: Second level on the open-roof bus

For some on the bus during the December 2007 tour, the Old City was the main attraction, as the following field notes convey:

The woman next to me says she wanted to walk around the Old City: "It's written on the internet that you can, and the bus driver told me no." I say it depends on the price. There's a discussion about it with the woman beside me, the man in front, me and Chaim. She says: "That was the whole point, to descend to the Old City and walk for two hours." I ask the woman how much she paid. She says the difference in price (45NIS for not descending versus 65NIS for descending) is a lot just to be able to alight. A woman at the front of the bus, a friend of the mother beside me, tells her about cheaper parking near Binyanei ha-Umma [Buildings of the Nation, a cultural institution]. She replies that she didn't have time to look for it. She talks about the costliness of the parking, especially because it's more than two hours. She came with a group from Tel Aviv. But she knows Jerusalem because she used to have a boyfriend here so she visited a lot. This tour is for the kids. It's her daughter's first time in Jerusalem; she wanted her to see in general how the city looks, but later they'll drive with the car to the Kotel. You can't come to Jerusalem without seeing the Old City (field notes by first author, December 2007).

The exchange described above illustrates for us that even Tel Aviv-based Israelis consider a visit to the Old City and the Kotel (Wailing Wall within it) a special experience and one that is important for educational purposes—in this case, visiting the Old City is the pinnacle of their visit to Jerusalem. The discussion of the price also affirms that (unlike the clientele for the aforementioned estate ads) this is not a luxury tour bus: while the cost of a ticket is relatively affordable to most, it is nevertheless a bone of contention for the Israeli visitors who believed they were getting a package deal that would enable them to tour and alight at whim.

Stopping Points, Visual(ized) Narratives, and Photo Ops

Eged's Bus 99 manages Jerusalem visually and enacts a hegemony of Zionist spaces through soundscape, stops, and narration. Nationalist songs mainly about Jerusalem saturate the mobile (sound) bubble of the bus, presenting the city as a benignly positive Jewish space. They set the scene, as it were, for how passengers are to receive the narration of landmarks. In turn, the bus route, selection of stops and their narration, and the ways passengers are directed to gaze and take photos define what is worth viewing and what is viewable, all the while instructing them on how to perceive what they see. On the whole, the tour emphasizes landmarks related to Israel's national and cultural heritage, the three monotheistic religions, and wars, ultimately creating an upshot of Israeli victory and morality.

One site that combines all of these elements is Mount Scopus, an elevated location on the eastern edge of Jerusalem. The bus ascends to this first of two stopping points in the entire tour (the second being the Haas Promenade with a southern view of the Holy Basin) from Road Number 1, and parks on the side of the road behind the Hebrew University overlooking the Holy Basin. On the way there, the narration elaborates on the various landmarks that we pass which are situated on Mt Scopus, including hotels, a British cemetery from WWI, the Hebrew

University and Hadassah Hospital. These are built up as if in a montage (Fariás 2010:389) to the pinnacle of the narrative, namely, the “return” of Mt Scopus and its important sites to Israel after the 1967 War, leading to a conclusion of Israeli sovereignty on the site that is presented as self-evident:

In 1925, the Hebrew University was opened ... the ceremony was attended by Chaim Weizmann [Israel’s first president], the British High Commissioner Herbert Samuel, Lord Balfour, Chaim Nachman Bialik [Israel’s “national poet”] and others. In 1939 Hadassah Hospital on Mt Scopus was also dedicated. In the *Independence War* the area became an enclave in Jordanian territory, and from 1948 to 1967 only Israeli police could ascend it once every two weeks with the permit of the Jordanian army. On 13 April 1948 a [Jewish] convoy went up to Mt Scopus and was attacked by an Arab mob while the British forces did not interfere at all. In this attack, 78 people were killed from the crew, including nurses, chaperones and the hospital director. The Hebrew University and the hospital on it returned to Israel after the Six Day War (translated from Hebrew, emphasis added).

As a network of landmarks and a site in itself, Mt Scopus and its narrative incorporate educational, cultural and medical institutions with wars, bloodshed and victory, culminating in a naturalized moral claim to Mt Scopus following the 1967 War. The juxtaposition of the Arab attack on Jews with the Israeli conquest of East Jerusalem suggests the post-67 conquest was morally justified, and underscores the Zionist narrative of victory over Jerusalem, while making no mention of East Jerusalem being under occupation since 1967. Also notable is the moniker *Independence War*, which is the official Israeli term for the 1948 Arab–Israeli War, termed the *Nakba* (catastrophe) by Palestinians. Further omitted is the context in which the massacre on the Jews was committed; namely, as a retaliatory measure four days after the notorious massacre in the village of Deir Yassin, where the extremist Zionist militias Irgun and Stern Gang killed over 100 women, children and elderly men. This and other omissions yield a simple, seamless and linear narrative that leaves little room for questioning by passengers unfamiliar with the details of the 1948 and 1967 wars, or by those who already accept the dominant Israeli perspective.

Another case when the Arab presence impinged on the route and entered the bus bubble occurred once the bus reached the point on Mt Scopus that overlooks the Holy Basin (see Figure 4). When the bus stopped, what followed was the longest narration segment of the tour (about 2 minutes straight during which the bus was at a standstill), which included churches, mosques, the Mormon Brigham Young University as well as sites beyond our vision—the Jewish Ma’aleh Adumim settlement city, the Dead Sea and the Jordan Valley—suggesting again, Jewish territorial sovereignty and contiguity with no mention of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, or the Israel–West Bank barrier. At the conclusion of this recording, we suddenly heard the live voice of the bus driver over the loud-speakers—the only time besides mentioning an earlier rest stop—announcing in English, followed by Hebrew: “Excuse me passengers, we have changed the route because of Friday prayers”. On all three occasions when the authors were on board, a similar announcement was made and the bus skirted the Holy Basin, opting for an alternative route to the one depicted on the website which shows the bus descending from the



Figure 4: Overlooking the Holy Basin from a stop on Mt Scopus (December 2007)

Mt Scopus lookout into East Jerusalem and around the Old City, and back to the southern extension of Road Number 1. The Israeli passengers on the first tour seemed annoyed by this; some let out a sigh and others grumbled. The second author, on her second trip when this occurred, noted this repetition to a pair of friends who came along, one of whom was puzzled. However, it was unclear how the other, few and largely foreign passengers reacted. Nevertheless, it is clear that Friday Prayers index Muslims, and the announcement suggests that it is an *interruption* of the regular route.

Our understanding of the driver's announcement is that, in the context of media representations of Friday prayers in Jerusalem, their evocation connects to violent demonstrations and interruptions. The bus encases tourists in a safe and isolated environment that affords a superior (over)view and subsequently, a sense of control. Crucially, this is in contrast to the public buses in Jerusalem which have been conceived as sites of danger and targets of terrorism, especially during the second intifada. In the present case, the elevated and comfortable interior (enhanced by the elevated lookout point) enacts a tourism enclave, policed and disciplined by modern technologies wherein "tourists are characteristically cut off from social contact with the local populace and are shielded from potentially offensive sights, sounds, and smells" (Edensor 2000:329). We suggest that the bus's interior space enables passengers to consume the site of the Holy Basin "from a safe distance", accomplishing an "indoorization" similar to that of the KDR.

Further, the absence of a guide to afford live instruction means that tourists do not have the opportunity to interactively question the omission. If we extend the disciplining of the space within the bus to the space we are directed to look onto, we can see that passengers are encouraged to similarly support the "disciplining" of Muslim/Arab spaces. While the mobile-physical avoidance and omission of Arab areas leads to a certain form of blindness for the passengers, the strategic and elevated position of Mt Scopus situates them as panoptic (over)viewers who simultaneously embody the ideological/physical position of the Israeli state and its military. These are moments when the spectral and potential danger of an

ethnized (Arab) other is mobilized affectively as that which may contaminate the relative safety, fluid mobility, and protected spatiality of the bus.

Cumulatively, the Mt Scopus segment's plot development begins by depicting the Jewish community in Jerusalem, and by extension the State of Israel, as vulnerably situated, and culminates by asserting its superior position, which is effectively timed to coincide with the bus's arrival to the point of elevation for beholding the Old City. This montage communicates that Israel "owns" this particular spot and (over)view. At the same time, it bears the consequences that for tourists journeying to the Holy Land, an experience of Arab people and spaces predicated on avoidance may result in their going home without knowing of its "contemporary traumas" and with a sense of Israel as a western democracy within an enclave of "Arab" tyranny (Bowman 1992:121). As the bus did not enter East Jerusalem, tourists had to settle for a commanding view from Mt Scopus overlooking the Dome of the Rock. A recent look at the updated route map on the website reveals that between 2007 and 2014, some of the stops have been slightly altered and a few have different names. Nearly all of the stopping points near the Old City were removed save for the stop by Ir David (Stop 12), to which the website provides a link. Ir David, formally a national park, is the first of its kind to be managed and run by a private Orthodox Jewish settler organization (since 2002). This fact, combined with its inclusion on the itinerary of Jerusalem's official Bus 99 tour, indicates the close relationship between the ideological settlement project and the municipality, whose website advertises the bus tour and the Ir David site itself. This partnership is another crucial development that reflects the ongoing nature of the ideological project.

From Omission to Peripheral Vision: Concluding Thoughts

Ocular technologies of representation and simulation have intensified dramatically since Baudrillard's (1994) treatise on the hyperreal, as has their use by the real estate and tourism industries. In Jerusalem, these industries are merging in the way they frame the Holy Basin as an object for gazing and of longing, while at the same time avoiding physical engagement and potential interaction with non-Jewish—primarily Palestinian Arab—inhabitants and their histories. This is exhibited by Bus 99's visual-cum-verbal narrative and by its general avoidance of East Jerusalem, and its detour in response to Muslim prayers, as well as by KDR's practices of architectural enclosure and simultaneous visual orientation to the Old City. While representing different industries, the Bus 99 and KDR ads merge in their visual management of Jerusalem in attempts to create a tunnel vision; that vision is directed via a combination of both mobile and immobile technologies towards the Holy Basin as the place whence other discourses emanate temporally and radiate spatially. This analysis employed a critical perspective of both categories, suggesting that wealthy sojourners can purchase a luxurious apartment in touristic spots, to be occupied infrequently, while displacing the very "local" lower and middle class urban residents: the latter are evacuated from residential neighborhoods

that are then torn down in order to be rebuilt, or worse—“renovated” and sold to those who can afford them.

Referring back to Nash’s (2001) notion of peripheral vision as the potential starting point for an ethical approach to sight-seeing, we draw attention to KDR’s appropriation of Arab and Islamic motifs—the courtyard fountain, arabesque tiles and geometric shapes, as well as the Mughrabi museum—into a recognizably Israeli hybrid form, which displaces their historical associations and contexts through a vaguely celebratory nod to the *convivencia* of Andalusian Spain, the “golden age” of intercultural production and tolerance among Muslims, Jews and Christians. Using peripheral vision to promote a critical understanding of KDR’s narrative of historical depth reveals its physical and semiotic flattening of the Arab buildings and histories in the area, including the Green Line and the Muslim Mamillah Cemetery nearby. Likewise, displacing the moving narrative of Bus 99’s tunnel vision, which promotes Israeli-Jewish hegemony, is accomplished by looking literally below the encased and elevated mobile bubble into the fragmented urban landscape.

Examples of peripheral vision are offered by various grassroots agents, including Palestinian and Israel NGOs and alternative activists’ and artists’ groups, which offer tours and other means of contesting and resisting hegemonic vision (Brin 2006; Hercbergs 2012). One illustration is supplied by Noy (2012b), which examines a spatial installation created by the Jerusalem-based Salamanca artist-activist group that took place in Ein Karem in the winter of 2009. Ein Karem was a Palestinian village that, after the 1948 war/Nakba, was transformed into a Jewish “neighborhood” of Jerusalem. Salamanca’s spatial installation allowed hundreds of visitors to tour Ein Karem’s scenic alleys while listening to three alternative, at times conflicting, audio-guides: the formal, municipality-produced guide; another created by a Jewish resident of the neighborhood; and a guide produced by the NGO Zochrot (dedicated to promoting awareness among Israelis of the Nakba), narrated by a Palestinian resident of the pre-1948 village. The installation lasted for three days and allowed an embodied experience of multiple kinds of mobilities, foregrounding the politics of sightseeing in a site that is not commonly viewed as contested. In this case, the mobile installation took the notion of peripheral vision beyond the “critical lens” application we adopted, and expanded it to include historical layers and perspectives that are ignored by hegemonic itineraries.

In the foregoing, we have addressed the immediate experiences that we as residents are trying to understand as we grapple with the changes to the cityscape. While we focused on the actual visual narratives that viewers see, further inquiry into the “backstage” of policy-making, urban design, architectural and transportation decisions would shed light on the links between these industries. The visual management of Jerusalem by the mobile and ocular technologies of real estate and tourism are not only abetting the practices of ethnic cleansing, but erasing their traces; they assist in the denial of agonism to the extent that urban ethnocracy “seeks to establish identities free of any relation to difference: ethnically pure, homogenous identities that do not have to exist in a relationship of provocation with their others” (Coward 2004:168).

Thus, the proliferation of so-called oriental motifs masks the history of historically Arab and Muslim buildings in the vicinity, including KDR’s adjacent Palace Hotel

(built in 1929 by the Mufti of Jerusalem Haj Amin al-Husseini), which has been hollowed out of its contents to become but an edifice emptied of historical and excavational depth, swallowed and incorporated into the new Waldorf Astoria Hotel. What we have in this case is a twofold movement consisting of the denial of the Palestinian presence and history of Jerusalem, coupled with appropriation of its architectural, artistic and cultural motifs into something of an orientalized, vaguely Mediterranean Israeliness. A surprising contradiction appears in relation to the traditional Jewish longing for Jerusalem: the contemporary Jewish viewer is still viewing the Old City from the pre-1967 position. This distance strikes us as a final warning against short-sighted attempts to actualize divine plan, the utopia-in-the-now of ethnocentric urban planning.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the editor and anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on this paper.

Endnotes

- ¹ Elsewhere, we observe and discuss how the Tower of David is becoming the emblematic icon of Jerusalem, conceived as an ethno-national capital (Hercbergs and Noy 2013).
- ² Socialist Zionism was the ideology of the labor Zionist party Mapai, which dominated the Knesset since Israel's establishment until the emergence of a right-wing coalition in 1977. It expressed a combination of national (Zionist) and universal (socialist) elements. Socialist Zionism's sharp decline in relation to Jerusalem was due to the end of Mayor Kollek's era.
- ³ They include Ir David ("City of David") National Park—also an Israeli settlement—in the Palestinian village of Silwan, Nof Zion in East Jerusalem, and the King David Residence in West Jerusalem.
- ⁴ See the website of Nof Zion: <http://www.nofzion.co.il/>
- ⁵ See <http://www.king-david-residence.com/Home/VideoTour/tabid/60/Default.aspx> (last accessed 21 October 2011).
- ⁶ See <http://www.jerusalemhomes.com/english/info.php?id=105307> (last accessed 15 April 2011) and Nachum-Halevy (2011).
- ⁷ See <http://www.king-david-residence.com/Home/TheResidence/TheAndalusianCourtyard/tabid/61/Default.aspx> (last accessed 19 October 2012).
- ⁸ See <http://www.king-david-residence.com/Home/VideoTour/tabid/60/Default.aspx> (last accessed 21 October 2011).
- ⁹ The area known as the Mughrabi Quarter was established in the twelfth century in the Old City and was demolished in 1967 by Israeli authorities to form the esplanade before the Wailing Wall.
- ¹⁰ In the 1990s, the run-down building was converted into a heritage museum of North African Jewry. Promising to renovate the hidden museum and celebrate Jewish Mughrebi (*sic*) heritage was what made the KDR entrepreneurs successful in obtaining the building rights from the museum's Jewish-Moroccan owners.
- ¹¹ According to the Central Bureau of Statistics, three-quarters of the tourists to Israel visit Jerusalem, which, in 2010, amounted to 2.6 million tourists. See http://www.cbs.gov.il/reader?Mlval=cw_usr_view_SHTML&ID=432 (last accessed 17 January 2014).
- ¹² Prices have since risen.
- ¹³ See <http://city-tour.co.il/ntext.asp?psn=8374> (last accessed 2 May 2012).
- ¹⁴ See <http://www.egged.co.il/main.asp?lngCategoryID=3027> (last accessed 2 May 2012). Egged bus company (est. 1933) is formally a cooperative; it holds a monopoly on public transportation in Israel, and has cooperated frequently with the Israeli military and with other state authorities.

- ¹⁵ See http://www.goisrael.com/tourism_heb2/Articles/Attractions/bus+99.htm (last accessed 2 May 2012).
- ¹⁶ See <http://www.egged.co.il/eng/main.asp?lngCategoryID=2773> (last accessed 2 May 2012)
- ¹⁷ The languages are arranged in the following order: Hebrew, English, Spanish, Russian, French, Italian, German and Arabic.

References

- Baudrillard J (1994 [1981]) *Simulacra and Simulation* (trans S F Glaser). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Benvenisti M (1996) *City of Stone: The Hidden History of Jerusalem*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Bowman G (1992) The politics of tour guiding: Israeli and Palestinian guides in Israel and the Occupied Territories. In D Harrison (ed) *Tourism and the Less Developed Countries* (pp 121–134). London: Halsted
- Brin E (2006) Politically-oriented tourism in Jerusalem. *Tourist Studies* 6(3):215–243
- Caldeira T (1996) Fortified enclaves: The new urban segregation. *Public Culture* 8(2):303–328
- Caldeira T (2008) From modernism to neoliberalism in Sao Paulo: Reconfiguring the city and its citizens. In A Huyssen (ed) *Other Cities, Other Worlds* (pp 51–77). Durham: Duke University Press
- Clarke R (2000) Self-presentation in a contested city: Palestinian and Israeli political tourism in Hebron. *Anthropology Today* 16(5):12–18
- Coward M (2004) Urbicide in Bosnia. In S Graham (ed) *Cities, War, and Terrorism: Towards an Urban Geopolitics* (pp 154–171). Oxford: Blackwell
- Dorst J (1999) *Looking West*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- Dvir N (2011) The luxurious KDR in Jerusalem is directed mainly at foreign residents. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.co.il/hasite/spages/1232196.html> (last accessed 3 July 2011)
- Edensor T (2000) Staging tourism: Tourists as performers. *Annals of Tourism Research* 27(2):322–344
- Fariás I (2010) Sightseeing buses: Cruising, timing, and the montage of attractions. *Mobilities* 5(3):387–407
- Feldman J (2007) Constructing a shared Bible Land: Jewish Israeli guiding performances for Protestant pilgrims. *American Ethnologist* 34(2):351–374
- Fenster T (2004) *The Global City and the Holy City: Narratives on Planning, Knowledge, and Diversity*. London: Pearson
- Ghannam F (2008) Two dreams in a global city. In A Huyssen (ed) *Other Cities, Other Worlds* (pp 267–287). Durham: Duke University Press
- Greenberg R (2009) Towards an inclusive archaeology in Jerusalem: The case of Silwan/the City of David. *Public Archaeology* 8(1):35–50
- Handelman D (2010) Folding and enfolding walls: Statist imperatives and bureaucratic aesthetics in divided Jerusalem. *Social Analysis* 54(2):60–79
- Hercbergs D (2012) Narrating instability: Political detouring in Jerusalem. *Mobilities* 7(3):415–438
- Hercbergs D and Noy C (2013) Beholding the Holy City: Changes in the iconic representation of Jerusalem in the 21st century. *Quest: Issues in Contemporary Jewish History* 6:237–263
- Huyssen A (1997) Voids of Berlin. *Critical Inquiry* 24(1):57–81
- Jefferis D (2012) The “center of life” policy: Institutionalizing statelessness in East Jerusalem. *Jerusalem Quarterly* 50:94–103
- Jerusalem Institute for Israel Studies (2014) Statistical Yearbook 2014. Extent of Poverty in Israel, Jerusalem and Districts, 2011, 2012. http://www.jiis.org.il/.upload/yearbook2014/shnaton_F0114.pdf (last accessed 20 December 2014)
- Kark R and Oren-Nordheim M (2001) *Jerusalem and its Environs: Quarters, Neighborhoods, Villages, 1800–1948*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press
- Kaufman D (2007) Choosing Israel, not the Hamptons. *New York Times* 9 March. <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/03/09/realestate/greathomes/09israel.html?emc=eta1> (last accessed 13 March 2011)

- MacCannell D (2011) *The Ethics of Sightseeing*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Makdisi S (1997) Laying claim to Beirut: Urban narrative and spatial identity in the age of Solidere. *Critical Inquiry* 23(3):660–705
- Monterescu D and Fabian R (2003) “The golden cage”: On gentrification and globalization in the luxurious Andromeda gated community in Jaffa. *Theory and Criticism* 23:141–178
- Nachum-Halevy R (2011) A one-year delay in occupation of Azorim’s flagship project in Jerusalem *The Marker* 16 March. <http://www.themarker.com/realestate/1.605758> (last accessed 1 July 2011)
- Nash J (2001) Globalization and the cultivation of peripheral vision. *Anthropology Today* 17(4):15–22
- Nitzan-Shifan A (2004) Seizing locality in Jerusalem. In N AlSayyad (ed) *The End of Tradition?* (pp 231–255) London: Routledge
- Noy C (2012a) The political ends of tourism: Voices and narratives of Silwan/the City of David in East Jerusalem. In I Ateljevic, N Morgan and A Pritchard (eds) *The Critical Turn in Tourism Studies: Creating an Academy of Hope* (pp 27–41). Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Noy C (2012b) Narratives and counter-narratives: Contesting a tourist site in Jerusalem. In T Jacqueline and R Tijana (eds) *Narratives of Travel and Tourism* (pp 135–150). Aldershot: Ashgate
- Rosen G and Razin E (2009) The rise of gated communities in Israel: Reflections on changing urban governance in a neoliberal era. *Urban Studies* 46(8):1703–1723
- Sheller M and Urry J (2006) The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38(2):207–226
- Thurot J and Thurot G (1983) The ideology of class and tourism: Confronting the discourse of advertising. *Annals of Tourism Research* 10(1):173–189
- Urry J (2007) *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity
- Weizman E (2002) The Politics of Verticality: Chapter 5, Optical Urbanism. https://www.opendemocracy.net/ecology-politicsverticality/article_804.jsp (last accessed 8 October 2014)
- Yiftachel O and Yacobi H (2003) Urban ethnocracy: Ethnicization and the production of space in an Israeli “mixed city”. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 21(6):673–693