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Overview

Minerva Humanities Center (MHC) at Tel-Aviv University was established in October 2009. Organized as three main research groups: The Migrating Knowledge, The Lexicon for Political Theory and The Living Together Group, which are led by three academic directors—Prof. Rivka Feldhay, Prof. Adi Ophir, and Dr. Raef Zreik—the Center is home to about fifty researchers, including M.A. students, doctoral and postdoctoral students, junior and senior fellows, and serves as a periphery of at least two dozen additional scholars. The scholars come from a wide range of disciplines in the fields of the humanities, social sciences and law, and share common interests and research methods related to the thematic core of each of the three main research groups (http://mhc.tau.ac.il/).

The membership is not restricted to the students and faculty of Tel Aviv University only - the Center’s scholars belong to diverse Israeli academic institutions as the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Bar Ilan University, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, the University of Haifa and other research institutes such as the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute.

About thirty of the Center’s members receive salaries, grants, stipends, and fellowships of varying amounts. Some have been granted scholarships from their university departments with the Center’s matching.

The Center is located at Tel-Aviv University Campus, Rosenberg building, rooms 213 and 407.
International Scientific Board

- Prof. Dr. Jürgen Renn, Max Planck Institute for History of Science, Berlin, Germany (Chair)
- Prof. Dr. Gerd Graßhoff, Professor for History of Ancient Science, Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany
- Prof. Dr. Kostas Gavroglu, Department of History and Philosophy of Science, Athens University, Athens, Greece
- Prof. Dr. Yaron Ezrachi (Emeritus), Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel
- Prof. Dr. Ora Limor, Open University, Raanana, Israel
- Prof. Dr. Leo Corry, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

Staff and Faculty

Academic Directors: 
Professor Rivka Feldhay
Professor Adi Ophir
Dr. Raef Zreik

Executive Director: 
Ms. Yulie Litov

Secretary: 
Ms. Anat Zion

Research group coordinators: 
Ms. Yael Atia
Ms. Dikla Bytner
Ms. Chen Shtrass

Webmaster: 
Mr. Udi Edelman
1. About the Group

Structure

Learning, research and writing about “migrating knowledge” is a peculiar way of practicing the humanities. It purports to be simultaneously empirical, theoretical, methodological and ethical-political. It also shifts the focus of attention from a fascination with the creation of new knowledge – a hallmark of modernity – to questions concerning the transmission of knowledge.

In the past five years our work was first and foremost conducted within small research teams of three people, who defined and constructed their research in terms of the following main clusters:

a) Transmission and transformation of mechanical knowledge from antiquity to early modernity, led by Ido Yavetz

b) Migrating knowledge in the Mediterranean basin in early modernity, led by Tzvi Langermann

c) Reviving classical ideas, unsettling socio-political orders, cultural dislocation and the transit to modernity in Renaissance Humanism, led by Hanan Yoran

d) Importing and recycling knowledge into and within South East Asia, led by Asaf Goldschmidt.

At the same time, inter-team discussions as well as interventions of guest lecturers in the framework of our departmental seminar, have attracted new researchers from both within and outside our university, and stimulated new forms of scientific co-operation among different academic institutions in Israel alongside international collaborations. These initiatives have given birth to three individual projects:
a) Ivor Ludlum, a classicist suggesting to restructure our idea of the transmission of Platonic knowledge to the Stoics

b) Roni Weinstein, who conducts an analysis of the most important Jewish legal Summa and Encyclopedia Shulchan 'Aruch of the 16th century in its European as well as Ottoman contexts

c) Shaul Katzir, who works on the interactions among inventors, engineers and scientists who transformed the science/technology field in the early twentieth century.

A further development of our department concerns the emergence of three new collective research projects that consist of 10-17 scholars each:

a) *Metamorphoses: Experience, Representation and Performance between Renaissance Baroque and Enlightened Europe*, led by Rivka Feldhay. The project was funded with a special support from the Minerva Foundation on the basis of a competition.

b) *Therapy in Translation*, headed by Jose Brunner. This project is now collecting its results in a new book publication (see below).

c) The Formation of the Humanities and the Order of the Disciplines, led by Rivka Feldhay, together with Gal Hertz and Naveh Frumer, and co-sponsored by the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute.

**Rationale and Development of the Group**

In the last ten years, the problematic of “knowledge on the move” has preoccupied scholars in many fields of the humanities and the social sciences. This preoccupation with practices of transfer, transmission and diffusion of knowledge was born out of epistemological, historiographical and political concerns. On the epistemic level, the idea that “knowledge” does not simply mean pure, theoretical, “epistemic” knowledge in the narrow sense has infiltrated the humanities with the demise of positivism and the rise of interest in practices of producing knowledge not reduced to the “creation of ideas”, usually by individual genius. Many of us would agree that theoretical knowledge itself is a product of specific practices; that the boundaries between theoretical and practical knowledge are socially and culturally dependent; that when we talk of knowledge we are actually speaking about different discursive levels which include ideas, objects, instruments and representations; that knowledge also implies the practices of its organization into fields,
recognition of disciplinary boundaries and their possible transgression, along with values, norms and the articulation of authorities. On the historiographical and political-ethical level, questioning the practice of privileging the cultural heritage of the West over all other cultures has led to a sense of malaise regarding the configuration of the West/East relationship in dichotomous terms. This has had far-reaching implications for the conceptualization of time-space parameters in framing research problems. The grand narratives of knowledge-development along a time arrow leading to Western science have been undermined, as have been the spatial configuration of West and East as center and periphery, in which information are moved from the periphery to the center, enabling the center to then diffuse “ideas” and “knowledge” to the periphery.

Our group is situated between East and West; between the Jewish and the Palestinian people, who have both experienced a history of migrations and cultural mediation. We are located within a Center whose mission includes not only multi-disciplinarity but also reflection on the way concepts are constructed within particular, local contexts, and how they diffuse globally and shape their surrounding reality (the Political Lexicon group). In addition, this mission also includes reflection on the mutual gaze of Israel on the Arab World and vice versa (the Living Together group). Thus, our choice to work on the complex issues relating to the migration of knowledge empirically, theoretically, methodologically and politically is deeply rooted in our background and context as a Humanities Center.

Our point of departure was a series of empirical case-studies that delineate the intricate, contingent ways by which science and the humanistic undergo a series of constructions and dissolutions that converge into some idea of European/Western culture in the seventeenth century. This gave birth to the projects Transmission of mechanical knowledge and Humanism as Transit to Modernity. These two projects naturally led to a second-order reflection on the political structures, especially under the concepts of sovereignty, personhood, religion and knowledge, in the project Metamorphoses. These three research teams have crystallized their work into a form of common publication either as a book, or as an issue of an academic journal. As a counterbalance to the emphasis on Western civilization by these teams, the two remaining teams have been simultaneously working on knowledge production outside Europe, in the Eastern Mediterranean basin on the one hand and China and Japan on the other, and on knowledge travelling between Asia and Europe.
Shared Methodological and Theoretical Insights

On the basis of empirical case-studies as well as discussions within the teams and in the group seminar, several methodological/ theoretical insights have been articulated by the group. Our most recent, collective research projects have already embraced these methodological insights into them, combining an archaeology of historical knowledge (Genealogies of the Humanities) with orientation towards problems of the present (Therapy in Translation).

a) Knowledge is by nature never static but in transition. It is always “on the move”, exchanged among practitioners either orally or in writing, transferred from practitioners to theoreticians and vice versa, transformed in the process of transmission through time and space. As knowledge is appropriated from a particular group of professionals into society at large, from one particular culture to another, or from local to global contexts, it may be naturalized or rejected. When crossing boundaries—class boundaries, disciplinary or geographical ones—it changes the identities of its users. Sometimes knowledge disappears from its local context only to be recycled later on with a different interpretation and for different purposes. Finally, knowledge is always translated from the language, conceptual universe or professional group into wider societal contexts.

b) The theoretical vocabulary of knowledge-migration. Each of our teams developed its own terminology through which to articulate and represent various manners of knowledge transmission. Among the concepts that emerged were transmission, transformation, circulation, appropriation, naturalization, rejection, migration, translation, recycling, canonization.

c) Knowledge producers/consumers are also in transition. Knowledge is not transferred like merchandise. It is not an object in translatio where transmitters and receivers are mere channels, unaffected by the act of transmission. The dynamics of transmission modifies gradually, and in non-obvious manners, not only knowledge itself as the object of transmission, but also the boundaries between transmitters and receivers.

d) Transition challenges the center/periphery model. The whole discourse on center and periphery is undermined through the development of the epistemology and methodology of “migrating knowledge,” in a way that requires us to revise some of our entrenched historical and geographical preconceptions.
2. Group Publication: *Migrating Knowledge: Selected Articles*

*Migrating Knowledge: Selected Articles.*

**Participants**

- Rivka Feldhay and Gal Hertz (introduction)
- Tzvi Langermann
- Ofer Elior
- Ori Sela
- Jose Brunner
- Roni Weinstein
- Muhammad Abu Samra
- Tali Frastai
- Stav Kaufman

**Abstract**

This unique collection of articles, currently in preparation, is the direct product of the past five years of research activity of the Migrating Knowledge group. The selected articles reflect both the rationale and development of the group, and engage with a rich spectrum of questions related to the thematic of knowledge migration in various contexts, cutting across historical, philosophical, literary, theological, and psychological perspectives. By presenting a wide, interdisciplinary methodology on the one hand, and a close examination of case-studies on the other, the collection offers not only a set of unique insights, but a conceptual-theoretical framework through which to examine the very idea of knowledge and knowledge-agents as essentially in transition, including transitions across languages, cultures, and geographical locations, as well as between disciplines and epistemologies.
3. Group Research Seminar

1st Meeting (29/10/2013): Introduction
Introductory meeting and setting of yearly research goals.

2nd meeting (17/12/2013): Different approaches to the transformation of knowledge to the Arab speaking world

Speaker: Shaul Katzir

The discussion revolved around different historical approaches to the transformation of knowledge to the Arab speaking world. At the center of discussion were the claims and arguments put forward by Dimtri Gutas and George Saliba, presenting different approaches to this case of knowledge transformation.

Texts


3rd meeting (14/1/2014). Musical harmony as Political harmony: The Renaissance in Venice between myth and reality in the 16th century

Speaker: Raz Binyamini

My presentation introduced a musicological case in point for several aspects of migration of knowledge: the crystallization of the aesthetics, theory and practice of 16th-century Venetian music school in light of the Myth of Venice, as summarized in the notion of Harmony. In the field of music, Harmony was the foundational concept of the transition from the Middle-Ages to the Renaissance. Originating in the works of 15th-century Franco-Flemish composers and theorists, the new concept of harmony had put down roots in Italian soil via many of those northern musicians who immigrated to various Italian states. Its most comprehensive codification was formulated in one of the most important and influential Renaissance music treatises, namely Le istitutioni harmoniche (1558) of the Venetian theorist Gioseffo Zarlino. This treatise can be read as an amalgam of migrating
knowledge from two main sources. On the one hand, ancient music theory as learned by Zarlino through various ancient sources. On the other hand, the 15th-16th century Franco-Flemish music practice as transferred to Venice by Zarlino’s teacher, Adrian Willaert, who immigrated from the Netherlands to Italy around 1515 and was appointed to the office of mastero di capella at St. Mark’s Cathedral in 1527, and is commonly considered as the founder of the Venetian music school. At the same time, 16th-century Venetian political discourse, inspired by the ancient concept of the mixed government and emanating from the long tradition of the Myth of Venice, hailed the harmonious constitution of the Republic of Venice, while using musical metaphors. Calling for a rehabilitation of the glorious political and social harmony of Venice that had been undermined due to several significant crises that Venice had experienced during the early 16th-century, this political discourse can be compared to Zarlino’s glorification of Willaert as the reviver of ancient harmony and the rescuer of music from its abyss.

This case in point encapsulates several essential aspects of the question of migration of knowledge:

1. Migration of ancient theoretical knowledge through textual sources.

2. Migration of practical knowledge by specific travelling individuals (in this case – a compose)

3. Migration of knowledge between theory and practice.

4. Migration of knowledge between disciplines (in this case – politics and music)

5. The political context for the implementation of migrating knowledge – in this case: crisis and the quest for rehabilitation.

6. The institutional forums for migration, implementation, discussion, elaboration and distribution of migrating knowledge, in this case, 16th-century Venetian academies. These academies are relevant also to the political context for the migration of knowledge.

7. Instruments for distribution of theoretical and practical migrating knowledge, in this case, theoretical treatises, musical works, music schools (mentor-disciple relations).

8. Migrating knowledge as a factor in canonization of artistic aesthetics and repertoire.
Texts


4th meeting (4/3/2014). Knowledge as Migration: a Case Study in an Anthropology of Knowledge/ Directed

Speaker: Stav Kaufman

The talk traced the emergence of a new mathematical object, a certain “duality transform” in the field of functional analysis, in the social-mathematical space. The duality transform’s “biography” was based on an ethnographic observation of research conducted by two leading mathematicians at Tel Aviv University in the years 2007-2009. My research shows that the process of production of the new mathematical object is neither “purely” mathematical, nor “purely” social. It is a combination of factors that are not easily classified in either category, factors that together shape the new transform. In place of the traditional classification into social elements and natural elements, my narrative follows the study objects wherever they go, disregarding categorical boundaries. In the spirit of *Actor-Network theory*, the object’s coming into being was described as a process of becoming an ‘immutable mobile’ (a stable object able to move from context to context), through its translation to various forms, and through the association of various actors to the emerging web of translations. The story of this duality transform exemplifies the way pieces
of knowledge do not pop out of someone’s “head” in their full-fledged form, but are in a constant process of change, affecting and being affected by all the elements they come into contact with. The idea of knowledge migration was thus extended from its literal, spatial, meaning, to include also the migration of concepts from one person to another, and from one context to the other. In the process of migration, not only does the migrating object go through various modifications, but also the original context, the origin of migration, is changed. It was therefore suggested that migration and knowledge formation are inherently linked: formation of new knowledge being a process of constant movement which is material, social and conceptual; and migration (whether material, social or conceptual) transforms the moving element, as well as the origin and the destination of the migration.

Texts


5th Meeting (8/4/2014). Interpretation as an Intercultural practice

Speaker: Gideon Freudenthal
Discussant: Menachem Lorberbaum

The discussion revolved around Freudenthal’s thesis regarding Salomon Maimon’s unique hermeneutics, as drawing on Jewish hermeneutical practices as a way of engaging with modern, rationalist philosophy (e.g. Kant). This raised questions regarding the nature of the migration of interpretative practices from one textual-intellectual context to another, as well as regarding the applicability and validity of such transitions, and their possible affect, positive or negative, so to speak, on the textual subject-matter.

Speaker: Ori Rotlevy

In this meeting, dedicated to George Makdisi’s renowned book *The Rise of Colleges*, Ori Rotlevy presented the influence of the Islamic college on the foundation of colleges in Europe as migration of knowledge from the Islamic world in the middle ages to Europe on three levels. First, as a migration of an institutional structure and its legal status. Second, as a migration of practices of learning and methods of thinking. Third, as a migration of communal structures and practices such as “the license to teach”. Makdisi’s thesis is radical in the sense that it suggests that an entire model has moved from one culture to the other. In this sense, this case allowed the research group to address some of the basic questions regarding migrating knowledge. To what extent a migration of an institution, its practices and communal relations as a whole is possible at all? What is the benefit of the spatial term migration in relation to the term “cultural borrowing” Makdisi himself uses? What motivates the research of knowledge migration and how does it differ from comparative research? Does it produce a wide narrative or does it allow a historical perspective that is not obliged to a narrative form? Is it aimed merely to fill “missing links”, as Makdisi’s research fills in the missing link of the evolution of the “sic et non” method, or is it aimed to provide a better understanding of the cultures involved? What is the political significance of this form of research and to what extent it has the potential of changing our perspective on relations between cultures?

Text


7th meeting (20/5/2014). Evolution of the Arabo-Persian corpus in Late Imperial China

Speaker: Dror Weil (guest Lecturer)

My talk intended to bring to light the presence of Arabo-Persian knowledge in the intellectual discourses of late imperial China, and thus to incorporate China’s intellectual history in a wider trans-regional and even global framework. By reading history backwards from the late 17th century to the 13th century, I attempted to construct a historical narrative, describing the circulation of Arabo-Persian texts in public and private libraries throughout that long period, as well as the
perpetuating effect of these texts, and especially those related to cosmology and astronomy, on late imperial China’s intellectual environment. The talk discussed references to the circulation and utilization of the Arabo-Persian corpus of texts as well as some of the patterns of their transmission across Asia into China.

**Texts**


4. Sub-Groups and Research Projects

4.1 Migrating Knowledge in the Eastern Mediterranean Basin during the Late Medieval and Early Modern Periods

Director: Prof. Tzvi Langermann.

Group members: Keren Abbou (McGill University), Leigh Chipman (Hebrew University in Jerusalem), Ofer Elior (Tel Aviv University), Tzvi Langermann (Bar-Ilan University).

The group has continued its work along the lines established during the past three years. Results were presented at the Minerva bi-weekly seminar, the group’s annual symposium, and various international conferences. This year, our research has borne fruit, as the following list of publications and activities indicates.

4.1.1 Group Member Activities

Tzvi Langermann

My work focuses on the achievements of the productive polymath, Joseph Solomon Delmedigo, who was born in Crete and spent his formative years in various places along the eastern Mediterranean. In this academic year I presented papers on Delmedigo at two international conferences, and one paper has appeared in print.

Publications


Leigh Chipman

Dr. Chipman’s main focus as part of the group is cryptography, alongside her ongoing work on medical texts from the Cairo Genizah (the famous repository upon which Professor Goitein built his classic multi-volume work, A Mediterranean Society). She is currently preparing a manuscript based on her current research in these fields.
Ofer Elior

Dr. Elior (Geneva University, TAU) researches Hebrew philosophical literature from the Byzantine cultural orbit.

Publications


“‘The Conclusion Whose Demonstration is Correct is Believed’: Maimonides on the Possibility of Celestial Sounds, According to Three Medieval Commentators.” Forthcoming in Revue des Études Juives.

4.2 Renaissance Humanism

Director: Dr. Hanan Yoran.

Group members: Raz Chen-Morris (Bar-Ilan University), Hanan Yoran (Ben-Gurion University in the Negev), Gur Zak (Hebrew University, Jerusalem).

During the previous year we continued our individual and joined researches on Renaissance humanism as the source of modernity, assuming both to be fields of tensions and ambiguities pregnant with diverse, indeed contradictory, potentials. Our point of departure is the common understanding of Renaissance humanism as an expression of cultural dislocation: A revival of classical ideas and literary forms that unsettled accepted truths and convictions; a reformation of historical consciousness that revealed the contingency of any historical period; a thorough critique of the primacy of metaphysical speculations cherished by the scholastic tradition, most notably undermining the assumption that human reality was part of an objective – metaphysical and divine – order of Being.

The unifying goal that lies behind our various research project is the attempt to bring to light these internal strains, set them in a tight conceptual framework, and explore the new modes of life and thought that they generated. The rejection of the traditional view of man as a creature with an objective telos within a rational kosmos, for example, undermined the notions of human sociability and rationality that lay at the basis of traditional ethics and political thought. It thus opened up the questions concerning the very foundations of morality and politics and produced a variety of new – sometimes radical – political theories. The rejection of traditional anthropological premises also generated new reflections on and techniques of care of the self – as can be seen, for instance, in the
changes of the tradition of spiritual exercises – as well as new educational theories and practices. Humanism also challenged the fundamental epistemological presupposition of classical and medieval philosophy, namely that knowledge was possible because external reality was rational (or infused with the rationality of its creator) and accessible to human senses and comprehension. Humanism, together with other intellectual currents, thus undermined the basis of traditional natural philosophy and encouraged the restructuring of the realm of scientific knowledge. These new modes for producing knowledge about Nature were intimately associated with the humanists’ self-fashioning and with their aspirations for social and political renewal.

4.2.1 Group Publications and Research Activities

During the past academic year we concentrated our collective efforts on two projects.

(1) Renaissance Historical Consciousness Conference (RSA, New York)

Hanan Yoran has organized a session at the RSA in New York on “Renaissance Historical Consciousness and Its Discontents”. Gur Zak chaired the session, Hanan Yoran presented a paper on “Machiavelli’s Humanist History”, and Raz Chen-Morris on “History, Allegory, and Kepler’s New Science.” These two papers followed the group’s line of research to detect the lines of friction in the Humanist program where ideals of imitation of past exempla clashed with the humanist conviction that history is made by humans and their image of themselves as innovators.

(2) Essay Collection: Humanism and the Ambiguities of Modernity

Abstract

The second project is the final edition and publication of the papers presented at the Humanism and the Ambiguities of Modernity conference that took place at Tel Aviv University, June 19-21, 2011. The essays to be published in European Legacy are now under review. The essays in this volume reassess the question of the modernity of humanism. Rather than accepting the view of modernity as ipso-facto benevolent and enlightened, the essays examine the humanist project from a reflective and critical perspective, uncovering the ambiguities and internal tensions that dominated it. The point of departure is that the heterogeneity of humanism’s cultural manifestations cannot be reduced to fixed body of knowledge or to a set of accepted beliefs and convictions. Various works written by various humanists were characterized by sanguine cultural energies and optimistic anthropology; they produced and propagated the original views and modern modes of thought.
attributed to humanism by Garin and Baron. But side by side with these, there are texts—sometimes the same texts—written by humanists, which betray uncertainties and doubts, expressions of contempt for the human condition, ideological mystifications and theoretical perplexities.

The basic assumption of the contributions to this volume is that both aspects of humanism are related. They are the both sides of the same coin, as they stem from the same presupposition of humanist discourse, namely the undermining of the metaphysical mooring of human reality. Humanist discourse rejected—usually implicitly—the fundamental assumption of mainstream western philosophical tradition that behind phenomenal reality lay an intelligible and unchangeable substance. It assumed instead that human reality was an artifact that can be fashioned by human efforts; hence humanism’s sense of liberation, creative cultural energies and anthropological optimism. Hence also the novel historical, ethical and political theories elaborated by the humanists. But the undermining of the traditional metaphysical order of things necessarily threatened basic beliefs and convictions and created a sense of cultural dislocation and psychological anxiety. At the intellectual sphere, it gave rise to fundamental questions: questions concerning the ultimate foundation of ethics and the ultimate legitimation of the political order. It is this ambiguity that characterizes humanist discourse and establishes it as the foundation of modernity itself. In this respect, Renaissance humanism should justifiably be seen as the cradle of the modern age.

Table of Contents

Raz Chen-Morris, Hanan Yoran and Gur Zak. Introduction: The Historiography of Renaissance Humanism and the Question of Modernity

Timothy Kircher. Renaissance Humanism and Its Discontents

Ronald G. Witt. The Poeta-Theologus from Mussato to Landino

Hanan Yoran. Glory, Money, and the Foundations of the Community in Alberti’s Della famiglia

W. Scott Blanchard. Leonardo Bruni and the Poetics of Sovereignty

Andreas Niederberger. Human Dignity between Platonism and studia humanitatis: Ambiguity in Renaissance Humanism or Path to Modernity?

Nirit Ben-Aryeh Debby. The Preacher’s Agenda: A Dominican versus the Italian Renaissance

Cedric Cohen Skalli. Reflections on the Jewish Destiny of Humanism
4.2.2 Group Members’ Publications and Research Activities

Hanan Yoran

Yoran’s current research focuses on Machiavelli’s historical thought in Discorsi and Istorie Fiorentine. In both works Machiavelli explicitly adheres to humanist historical notions, notably the idea that history teaches by exempla and the scheme of eternal historical recurrence. However, Machiavelli’s actual historical narratives undercut these notions by highlighting (among other things) the uniqueness of historical events and the linear process of corruption. Machiavelli’s insight thus threatened to undermine the didactic value of the studia humanitatis and the relevancy of the classical heritage—both crucial for the humanist cultural project. Machiavelli’s historical narratives realize, nevertheless, deeper insights of humanist discourse. They imply the irreducible contingency of political reality. Moreover, they perceive the writing of history—and political activity—as a means of enforcing order on ever fragile and chaotic reality.

Yoran’s contribution to the special edition of The European Legacy investigates Leon Battista Alberti’s dialogue Della famiglia, one of the few humanist works that consider the foundations of politics. This polyphonic text explores several views while critically reflecting upon them. Alberti presents the traditional view of human natural sociability, yet suggests that it cannot be squared with the premises of humanist discourse. Likewise, Della famiglia utilizes the notion of glory as the basis for politics, but simultaneously exposes the anti-social potential inherent in the notion. Finally, Alberti examines the implications of the radical possibility that humans may not be made social creatures.

Publications


Gur Zak


Publications

Ethics and Literary Form in the Italian Renaissance, 1350-1500. (Manuscript in preparation)


Conference Papers

Raz Chen-Morris

Conference Papers


4.3 Mechanics Group

Director: Dr. Ido Yavetz.

Group members: Michael Elazar (Tel Aviv University), Rivka Feldhay (Tel Aviv University), Ivor Ludlam (Independent Scholar, currently teaching at Haifa University), Ido Yavetz (Tel Aviv University).
4.3.1 Group Publications

(1) Aristotle, Galileo and the Jesuits on the Persistence of Forced Motion
(in preparation)

Short Abstract
The volume, currently in preparation, is dedicated to tracking the migration of a single problem, namely the idea of inner impressed force, i.e. "impetus theory," through various localities, periods, and contexts.

Table of Contents
Chapter 1. The Theory and Praxis of Migrating Knowledge: a Historiographical Prologue
Chapter 2. The Universe of Aristotelian Physics
Chapter 3. Impetus Theories as a Late Medieval Solution to the Problem of the Persistence of Motion
Chapter 4. Galileo's Pre-Classical Dynamics and the Persistence of Motion
Chapter 5. Galileo in Context
Chapter 6. The Appropriation of Galileo's Dynamics by Jesuits Impetus Theorists
Chapter 7. Historiographical Epilogue

(2) Emergence and Expansion of Pre-Classical Mechanics
Rivka Feldhay and Michael Elazar have both contributed papers to this volume, which will be published by Springer in the Boston Studies series in 2013.

4.3.2 Group Member Activities

Michael Elazar
Michael has been working on a knowledge-migration case-study concerning the reintroduction of non-Aristotelian ancient ideas to sixteenth century neoscholastic thinking: the adoption of the Hipparchian impressed force by the Coimbrian Jesuits, in their influential commentary to Aristotle's Physics.
Conference Papers

“Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Portugal: The Cursusconimbricenses”, delivered at the workshop Stages of Knowledge, Spaces of Faith: Allegory, New Science and Baroque Theater, Tel Aviv University, February 2013.

“Jesuit Dissemination of the ‘Hipparchian’ Impetus: A Step towards the Mathematization of Motion?”, delivered at the workshop Teaching and Publishing Mathematics and Science in the Society of Jesus in Early Modern Europe, the Interdisziplinäres Zentrum für Wissenschafts und Technikforschung, Bergische Universität Wuppertal, June 2013.

Rivka Feldhay


Conference Papers


4.3.3 Special Seminars

“The Emergence of Science in the Early Modern Period”: Dr. Matteo Valleriani
(May 2014)

Dr. Matteo Valleriani, a research group leader from the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science (Berlin, Germany), delivered a seminar entitled “The Emergence of Science in the Early Modern Period”. This seminar consisted of three meetings, held in May 9, May 16, and May 23, 2014. This series of meetings endeavored to determine the role of the relations between practical knowledge, and especially technology, on the one side, and theoretical knowledge on the other, in the framework of the processes of emergence of new theoretical knowledge. The overall focus of all
The meetings was the history of mechanics during the Renaissance. The three meetings constituted a single argument structured on three levels. The first level consisted of an epistemological approach aiming to formulate an epistemic theory of practical knowledge. The second level specifically explored the role of practical knowledge in the process of transformation of scientific knowledge in the framework of longue durée visions. The third and last level analyzed the inherent points of contact between practical and theoretical knowledge and investigated the mechanisms of the processes of emergence of new scientific knowledge.

“Aristotle’s Motion in Three Levels”: Dr. Ido Yavetz (April 2014)

During April 2014 Dr. Ido Yavetz presented elements of his new survey of Aristotle’s theory of motion, as part of a Cohn Institute course taught by Prof. Rivka Feldhay and Dr. Michael Elazar, titled “Scientific and Artistic Discourse in Renewed Sites: The Court, The Scientific Societies, The Universities.” The presentation was divided into two four-hour sessions, and included a long and fruitful discussion between the lecturer and the course teachers and students. Yavetz’s review of Aristotle’s physics is an important component of the Minerva Institute’s general project on Migrating Knowledge. One of its main concerns is to trace the transformation of Aristotle’s thought into the Aristotelian doctrine, as received and further communicated from the Hellenistic period, through the Islamic and Christian Middle Ages, to the early-modern period, and ending with Galileo’s work and the response to it in the Italian scientific community. Yavetz suggests that Aristotle’s scattered observations on how material bodies move in space, naturally or under force, can be put together in a considerably more coherent fashion than usually considered. Notably, Aristotle’s surviving texts point to a central, dynamic role assigned to the medium through which motion takes place. While this medium-dynamics solves several difficulties in Aristotle’s theory of material bodies in motion, it is not developed in the Hellenistic, medieval, or early-modern periods. This does not make the many Aristotelian commentaries written during these periods inferior. Rather, it suggests that they represent attempts to fit Aristotle into problematic contexts that favored other readings. In other words, besides raising intriguing possibilities with regard to Aristotle’s ideas, this renewed interpretation suggests that what we may consider of prime importance with regard to moving bodies may not have been of such importance to Aristotle’s readers in previous periods, regardless of what Aristotle himself might have considered. Flushing out these contexts should reveal intellectual priorities that may explain why Aristotelianism took different forms as Aristotle’s texts were read and transmitted at different times and places.
4.4 Therapy in Translation: Knowledge, Culture, Politics

Directors: Prof. Jose Brunner (Buchmann Faculty of Law and Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, Tel Aviv University); Dr. Galia Plotkin-Amrami (Safra Center for Ethics, Tel Aviv University)

4.4.1 Rationale

This working group explores a variety of ways in which therapeutic discourses, originating and developing in the Western private world of the clinical, are appropriated outside the professional boundaries of the therapeutic field in order to interpret and conceptualize collective processes as well as the inner, emotional world of individuals, as they appear in and shape the public arena of Western and non-Western cultures. Conversely, the group examines mechanisms by which non-therapeutic and often non-Western ways of thinking have entered into the professional therapeutic discourses of the West.

In order to inquire into the manifold forms of translation by which concepts are transposed from the realm of the clinical to the broader social sphere as well as vice versa, we focus on the transformational processes, in which models and categories from one realm are given a new life in another, as well as on the purposes they serve in their new context. We consider such processes, which we put under the general metaphorical heading of “translation”, to be interpretive, interactive and creative, for rather than reproducing pre-existing patterns in a new cultural environment, such translations generate new meanings and re-shape socio-cultural hierarchies.

4.4.2 Group Publication: Essay Collection

Therapy in Translation: Therapeutic Discourse between the Local and the Global

Abstract

The book seeks to contribute to current discussions regarding the scientific, social, and cultural position of the mental-therapy discourse in Israel as well as globally. The book presents a complex position that regards this discourse neither as disclosing universal truths, nor as a cover for interests, but as the outcome of an interactive cycle of translation, constantly moving between the local-particular and the general-global, intersecting various spaces that give rise to various combinations between science and culture, which allow this discourse to both develop and renew.

Editors: José Brunner and Galia Plotkin-Amrami.
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### 4.5 Metamorphoses: Experience, Representation and Performance between Renaissance Baroque and Enlightenment Europe

**Director:** Prof. Rivka Feldhay.

**Group Members:** Prof. Rivka Feldhay, Tel Aviv University; Prof. Raz Chen-Morris, Bar Ilan University; Prof. Eli Friedlander, Tel Aviv University; Dr. Ilit Ferber, Tel Aviv University; Dr. Ronnie Mirkin, Tel Aviv University; Dr. Roni Weinstein, Van Leer Institute Jerusalem; Ph.D. candidate Michal Brosh, Tel Aviv University; Ph.D. candidate Gal Hertz, Tel Aviv University; MA candidate Dikla Bytner, Tel Aviv University; MA candidate Tali Frastai, Tel Aviv University; MA candidate Daniel Matiuk, Tel Aviv University.

**Rationale**

The aim of this project was to provide a conceptual and historical framework through which to investigate Baroque sciences and arts in association with each other within their proper context: namely, the emergence of sovereignty and subjectivity, which challenged accepted scientific and artistic norms but were instrumental in the attempt to cope with the socio-political crisis of the Baroque. In the long run, such an investigation of Baroque has led us to a re-reading of the grand narrative of the origins of modernity in terms of a series of “metamorphoses” from the Renaissance of the sixteenth century, through the crisis of the seventeenth and up to the Enlightenment. Such metamorphoses represent the peculiar historical avenues through which knowledge in the sciences and in the arts migrated in early modern Europe, modifying the identities of its carriers and giving birth to new cultural forms.
4.5.1 Group Publication: Baroque Ghosts: Metamorphoses of Scientific and Artistic Discourses in Early Modern Europe

Background

After a series of workshops that were held over the past years, bringing together the group members with researchers from Germany and the U.S. (September 2010; March 2011; January 2012: see previous reports), a concluding workshop was held in February 2013 titled Stages of Knowledge, Spaces of Faith. The workshop was held in collaboration with Tel Aviv University and Bar Ilan University. The core group of researchers was joined by scholars from other Israeli and German universities (Bar Ilan University, Hebrew University and Freie Universität Berlin) with a view to publish the different essays presented at these workshops in a collected volume. We are currently in the process of finding a venue for the publication of this volume, which will include the papers presented in both the former Allegory as a Way of Life and the Stages of Knowledge, Spaces of Faith workshops.

Below is a description of the book manuscript currently in preparation.

Book Abstract

The seventeenth-century cultural and intellectual scene presents the historical gaze with a fractured image: bitter religious wars and the emergence of the New Science; new modes of political action and novel philosophies of law together with the consolidation of absolutism; rational city planning conflated with excessive and ecstatic visual modes of representation; and more. No unifying label, such as Enlightenment or Renaissance, is suggested by the historical actors themselves, and the period’s cultural identity is determined through consecutive episodes of intellectual conflicts and polemics. The purpose of this collection of essays, currently under preparation, is to fill this nameless historiographical void between the years 1550-1650 by systematically applying the notion of Baroque to capture the inner dynamics that shaped the fragmented cultural landscape of those years. It seeks to do so by examining the relations between science, art and absolute sovereignty, and between educational institutions and inter-faith relationship.

At the beginning of the twentieth century thinkers such as Abby Warburg, Erwin Panofsky and Walter Benjamin used the notion of Baroque to come to terms with the crises of modernity. This collection of essays follows in their footsteps. Going beyond the understanding of Baroque as style
or historical structure, we shall look at the seemingly paradoxical configuration of the sciences and arts flourishing under non-democratic and non-liberal rulers, and at religious educational institutions accommodating seventeenth-century scientific and artistic practices and knowledge. Challenging the view of temporal linearity that constitutes modern historiography and its blind spots will open up a historical gaze sensitive to constellations and interactions between seemingly disparate experiences and events.
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Chapter Abstracts

**Edifying the State / Tali Frastai**
This chapter investigates the emergence of a territory-based system of political sovereignty in the context of the Baroque by following the spatial commissions of the Savoyard dukes from the late sixteenth to the late seventeenth centuries. During this period, the dukes commissioned and oversaw an extravagant program of territory-production that included extensive works of both construction and representation on all scale. Turin, capital of Savoy from 1575, is a prominent and early example of the complete and artificial transformation of a city into a capital; the Atlas of Savoy, published in the mid-17th century, offered a comprehensive representation of the dukes’ lands; and the key buildings of the realm boasted the most innovative architecture of the times. I interpret these various commissions – distinct in scale and medium, but nevertheless working together to construct a new symbolic space of domain – as part of a grand project aimed at forming a politically-legitimizing subject through the construction of a communal sense of orientation.

**Allegory as Writing: From Sacred to Profane Unity in the French Court Ballet / Daniel Matiuk**
Toward the end of the 16th century a new art form had emerged in Europe: the court ballet. For almost a century it had occupied a central position within European culture, until finally it had dissipated into the emerging opera and new forms of dance. For the modern spectator (presuming one could hypothetically occupy the position of an early modern spectator) these ballets bear no resemblance to the romantic or even modern dance he or she are accustomed to identify with this genre. What could be the meaning of odd geometrical shapes being formed by groups of dancers on stage? What sort of relation coherently unifies a lion, “Immortality,” and the god Jupiter dancing together in the same ballet? The answer is allegory. Yet the reason these ballets seem unintelligible to us does not reside solely in the fact that the allegorical “message” they conveyed is lost (indeed, in many instances it can be faithfully reconstructed), but more so in our misconception of allegory itself.
This chapter argues that Walter Benjamin’s writings on allegory, through the poetry of Baudelaire and the German tragic drama, offer an illuminating perspective for the study of the court ballet. His articulation of correspondences and allegory as two distinct yet interrelated forms of tapping into or reconstructing meaningful unified experience in memory highlights their ritualistic or religious quality, which in its turn sheds light on allegory’s nature as a form of writing. As a form of writing, allegory could be conceived as a synthetic, rigid, schematic and even lifeless conventional system of signs (in contrast to the fleeting vivacious outburst of correspondences). Yet for Benjamin writing should be seen as the most complete archive of non-sensuous similarity, i.e. not as marking the decay of magnetic correspondences but as embodying their transformation.

This process is traced within the inner history of allegory, from the ritualistic and religiously motivated renaissance revival of hieroglyphics and emblems to the fragmented and relatively more profane allegorical writing of the baroque. This sets the backdrop against which the evolution of the court ballet is presented through two distinct case studies: Balthasar de Beaujoyeulx’s 1581 “Ballet Comique de la Reine”, and Claude François Menestrier’s 1682 “Des Ballets Anciens et Modernes: Selon les Regles du Theatre”. The former serves to illustrate through the hieroglyphic choreographed geometric dances the deep neo-platonic premises that had animated the birth of the court ballet, while the latter sketches the outlines of the fully developed baroque allegory as an infinitely rich form of expression at the service of the allegorist through the atomized text-like quality that governs late baroque choreography. It is argued that these two artistic manifestations are but two faces of allegory’s ability to reconstruct unity and should be understood in terms of the transition from sacred to profane unity in the French court ballet.

Passions and Machines in French Baroque Performing Arts: Corneille’s Andromède / Ronnie Mirkin

Pierre Corneille’s play Andromède, presented before the royal court of France in 1650, is categorized under the specifically French genre of ‘machine tragedy’ (tragédie à machines). Although the play was a great success since its first performance, and was staged many times until the 1690s, it gradually lost its appeal, being considered an impure work of art because it included music and spectacular visual effects within the dramatic text of a heroic tragedy. This was the result of a growing demand, as the 17th century advanced, for strict classical rules and distinct generic divisions for the various forms of drama and theatre that were being written at the time. Andromède was seen as a ‘parenthesis’, an error, within the course of Corneille’s oeuvre, mostly remembered for the great summits of the first period of his dramatic writing before 1645.
Cardinal Mazarin wished to introduce Italian opera into France. With Andromède Corneille transposed the Italian opera into the frame of French tragedy. This was achieved by asking Giacomo Torelli, the scenographer who had previously designed Italian operas in Paris, to create the spectacular visual effects of the performance. Torelli was known for the marvels of the flying machines and the changes of scenes before the eyes of the spectators, wonders never before seen in France. The engravings by François Chauveau of the set designs by Torelli for Andromède are preserved in the Bibliothèque National Française. Very rarely do both printed text and all the set designs of plays survive from such an early time. For my purpose they are material traces that enable to imagine and somehow reconstruct a long ago lost production, which is often overlooked as part of the Cornelian canon.

The seventeenth century’s new consciousness of a mechanistic world view brought machines into the foreground of cultural thought, Descartes being a major promoter of this model. Passions and machines seem dichotomous. While passions belong to interiority and the soul, machines belong to the material nature of the exterior world.

In my paper I wish to establish a link between these seemingly separate domains. It is in the theatre, the site of mediation and representation, that such a link can be found. The three dimensional perspectival dynamic stage that Torelli had created as an acting space for Corneille’s drama will be seen as arena where human passions could be enacted, a landscape where conflicts between human characters become a psychomachia, a battle of the human soul. These engravings are not the working plans of a stage designer. They are peopled with images of actors impersonating humans and gods on the stage floor and in the air. Besides recording the sets and machines, the engravings describe the various characters with their costumes and gestures. In this light one can read the ‘actions’ of the characters in Chauveau’s engravings, integrated into the spectacular stage vistas, as the coming together of passions and machines, working in coherent unity at a moment of total theatre in the history of Baroque performance art. In Andromède the theatre of machines is turned into an optical instrument, focusing inwards. It becomes a metaphor for interiority.

**Baroque Architecture for Jesuits with regard to Depictions of the Laterna /Lucerna Magica and Salomon’s Temple / Angela Mayer-Deutsch.**

This chapter begins with the observation of the striking architectural similarity between the Biblical description of the inner section of Salomon’s Temple and Athansius Kircher’s architecture for the *Laterna/Lucerna Magica* as depicted in his *Ars magna lucis et umbrae* (Amsterdam 1671, 768-769). It leads into the general subject of Baroque Architecture for Jesuits in relation to their spirituality, treated via the examination of several case-studies.
Baroque Frontispieces: Between a Physical Theater Stage and a Transcendental One / Dror Shaier

During the 16th and 17th centuries, natural philosophy underwent a series of significant changes that challenged the very basis upon which it stood. Events like the discovery of America and the invention of the telescope and microscope played a crucial role in this process. Moreover, the increasing influence of Copernican theory, and the decline of the Aristotelian worldview, produced endless disputes in the philosophical world. This unstable atmosphere forced the prominent scientists of that time to create their own self-representations in order to anchor their legitimate place and status among the scientific community. As part of this effort, they used the engraved title pages of their books (frontispieces) as powerful instruments to achieve this goal. Frontispieces functioned as a stage upon which a scene was performed. This paper theater had its own language and rules, as well as a certain degree of autonomy in the strict baroque atmosphere. It became possible for the designer, due to the emblematic/allegorical style, to express his ideas openly under the cover of the inherent ambiguity of the genre.

One of the common methods of self-representation was to create an imaginary meeting scene between some of the prominent figures of the natural philosophy world, and the author himself. Through an examination of the figures in these scenes, and the links they create between different frontispieces, I will suggest a new understanding of these works: not just as a mere collection of individual paper theaters, but components of a higher representation level, one taking place in a transcendental space, lacking the time dimension and other physical limitations. A space that, in a way, reflects much of the period’s nature.

Descartes: Epistemology of Figuration / Sybille Krämer

The tension between the baroque excess of art and the rational “air” of science in the Early Modern Period can be described in spatial terms of surface and depth: the forms of baroque art modeled surface as depth, while scientific work modeled depth as surface. This chapter concerns the scientific side.

The rational ‘translation’ of three dimensional bodies to two-dimensional surfaces preferred the line as the decisive medium of representation. This is especially apparent in the visualizing practice and epistemic philosophy of René Descartes. The line, at once an empirical stroke and schematic signature, belongs to both the sensuous and intelligible world, negotiating the relationship between them. In Descartes, configurations of lines are a privileged tool for the visualization of the
The many graphic figurations found in his texts serve not only as representations, but also as methods for the acquisition of knowledge and the production of evidence. In this chapter I will examine what this means in two ways. First, I will give an account of the line in Descartes' writings on music theory, on mathematics, and on meteorology. Then, I will argue that Descartes' early theory of perception, imagination and intuition is a form of epistemology in which the "mind's eye" is not in fact perceptually blind but rather "sighted," in that it is embodied in the cooperation of the physical eye and the operating hand. Descartes is not only a "strategist of visualization" but also a thinker of the epistemology of the line, an essential orientation mechanism which runs through his (and later Leibniz's) philosophy. In this epistemology, a cartographic impulse comes to the fore, which conceives of thinking and recognition as one path traveling through one cognitive realm.

**Benjamin, Descartes and Scholasticism: A discourse on Method and Detour / Ori Rotlevy**

The Baroque, according to Walter Benjamin, is a period of spiritual contradictions. Knowledge about the antithetical details might be collected, yet the meaning and coherence of the period seems to elude the grasp of theory. The investigator should refrain both from being led by the details to an oscillating, disorienting, move between contradictions, that will not allow an image of the whole, and from aiming towards the whole in advance, and being led by it, while effacing the contradictions in a synthesis, and obliterating the very particular nature of the period. As an alternative to these two approaches, Benjamin describes in the preface to his book on Baroque Trauerspiel a process of mental schooling, of training and exercise, which the mind has to undergo, in order to capture the meaning of the baroque, and to gain a view of a totality, in which its details will make sense. The initial condition of this process is described through a spatial metaphor, that of initially distancing oneself from the desired object; a totality in which each detail will have its place. What is this ascetic schooling? This chapter focuses on the first and most explicit moment of this schooling: the description of the medieval treatise as exercise, its method as Umweg, and the adoption of this method by Benjamin, The philosophical implications of this adoption are illuminated by examining them against the most renown philosophical method of the baroque, that of Descartes.
Hamlet: Tragedy or Sorrow Play / Eli Friedlander

In 1930 Benjamin sends his *Origin of German Trauerspiel* to Carl Schmitt with a letter acknowledging his indebtedness to him for the presentation of sovereignty in the seventeenth century, and in particular to the understanding that the ruler is the holder of dictatorial power whose principal function is to avert the state of emergency in which law itself is suspended. In 1956, more than a decade after Benjamin’s death, and more than twenty-five years after their initial contact, Carl Schmitt publishes a book entitled *Hamlet or Hecuba: The Irruption of Time into Play*, containing an appendix addressing Benjamin’s work, and returning to the issue of the relation of history and play raised in Benjamin’s *Trauerspiel*.

Benjamin would reject what is probably the most famous model of the relation formed between the playfulness of art and the serious domain of history and the political, expressed, for example, in Schiller’s *Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man*. On that Romantic model, playfulness allowed by the work of art provides something of a training ground for our faculties to engage in the seriousness and freedom demanded by political community and the moral life. Yet Benjamin stresses that in the baroque Trauerspiel it is the very vision of history that reintroduces the dimension of the game, not as preparatory for life, but rather as a scheme through which the world is perceived. The rejection of both the romantic and the baroque notion of play is the focus of Schmitt’s book. As his title makes clear, this distinction between the truly tragic and the realm of play is reflected in Shakespeare’s Hamlet by way of the difference between the actors’ representation of Hecuba lamenting over the death of Priam, which Schmitt considers mere play (within a play), and the doubling or even tripling (counting the dumb show) of the “Mousetrap” which, according to him, reveals the real tragic core of Hamlet. Schmitt would argue that only the existence of such a tragic core would guarantee that the redoubling be experienced as an intensification rather than an ironization or mere distancing from reality.

Thus, whereas Schmitt would seem to adopt something of the tragic scheme for his vision of history, thus thinking of Hamlet as a modern tragic figure of the West, Benjamin elaborates the form of the Trauerspiel or sorrow play precisely so as to set it against the idea of the tragic, conceiving of Hamlet as one of the greatest sorrow-plays. This chapter follows up this confrontation of Benjamin and Schmitt, developing some of the characteristic features of the contrast Benjamin forms between tragedy and Trauerspiel in relation to Hamlet, in order to argue that it significantly differs from the tragic, and cannot be recast into the vision of tragic destiny which Schmitt wishes to attribute to it.
“And yet it moves”: Staging Baroque Science in Brecht’s Life of Galileo / Gal Hertz

Bertolt Brecht’s theatrical response to the rise of the Nazism is (the early version of) his play Life of Galileo. Why has he chosen this Baroque scientist as a model of his critique? How can an unheroic figure that succumbed to the authority of the church symbolize resistance and a fight for truth, as Brecht insisted? The article seeks to show how, by staging the life of this seventeenth-century scientist, Brecht aimed to examine the relations between individual and society, knowledge and authority, law and truth, but also suggest a critical perspective on the material and physical aspects of sovereignty of modernism, to which the baroque os positioned as an uncanny double.

All Hell’s a Stage: The Dramatization of the Visio Tnugdali in Jesuit Theatre / Matthias Däumer

Like all – or at least like many things – the Jewish and Christian history of theatrical space starts with the Genesis: the parade of the animals before Adam’s denominating eye can be regarded as one of the Jewish and Christian Urszenen of theatricality. From this scene arise some limitations of the possibility what a theatrical space can or must not represent. One of these issues is the depiction of Hell, Purgatory, or the Hereafter. First of all there is the problem, that the biblical text presents nearly no spatial depiction of the underworld. The second problem is, that the act of speaking about the Hereafter is branded a profanity by Paul. Therefore a clear theatrical depiction of Hell (as a space, not its inhabitants) had been a taboo for a long time in Christian theatre. But paradoxically Paul’s interdiction also became the starting point of a whole medieval genre of non-theatrical literature, that (with more or less good excuses) breaks his rule and starts to draw the map of paradise and Hell as well.

This essay will focus on the depiction of death and hellish penalty in the drama Tundalus Hiberniae Miles Redivivus by Georg Bernhard S.J., performed in 1622 at the Jesuit school of Ingolstadt. The drama will be analyzed according to the literary tradition of the so called vision literature and will ask, under what technical, ideological, and aesthetical conditions – but also under which ghostly re-significations of the stage itself – it had been possible to finally transfer the medieval, non-theatrical depictions of the underworld to the Baroque stage.
The Ghost / Ilit Ferber

Ghostly apparitions, or the “virtual space of spectrality” as Derrida puts it, are usually considered (at least in western culture), to be fictional, or sometimes to be images designating a pathological-unreasonable point of view. These apparitions rupture the “reasonable”, unambiguous division between life and death, or real and unreal, healthy and pathological, which is suddenly exposed. Benjamin finds the Trauerspiel of the seventeenth century so alluring precisely because it tolerates such an inability to discern and differentiate by violating what seems to be the ultimate border. The Trauerspiel indeed presents an astounding number of ghost figures, which appear in many plays of the period (Gryphius’s Cardenio und Celinde in one interesting example), sometimes as the ghosts of the dead coming back to haunt the living, sometimes even as ghosts of living people on the stage.

I propose to explore the philosophical-historical structure lurking behind the ghostly apparitions in baroque theater. I focus on the temporal structure from which the ghost operates; the special relationship its appearance constructs between the living and dead, or between the present and the past; the restlessness and disturbed nature of the ghost; the challenge it poses to a synchronic conception of time; and finally, the strong ethical obligation that the ghostly apparition presents as well as the ethical implications in answering its call.

A Few Thoughts concerning Leibniz’s Odd Thought / Dikla Bytner

The chapter focuses on a short text written by Leibniz in 1675, titled “An Odd Thought Concerning a New Sort of Exhibition”. It posits two questions which it then tries to answer: what is new about Leibniz’s “new sort of exhibition”; and what us odd about Leibniz’s “odd thought”. Following Jacques Derrida’s analysis of the concept of invention and its transformations in the 17th century between Descartes and Leibniz, I suggest considering Leibniz’s “new sort of exhibition” as the invention of the institution of inventions, intended to allow a regular production of novelties, thereby affecting a deadlock between the new and the possible. This attempt to regularize the production of the new is an “odd thought” since it can be read as a fantasy of transforming the ghostly encounter with “the gusher of novelties that flooded 16th and 17th century Europe” into a meaningful “growth of the sciences”, thereby suggesting a slight mutation to the accepted historiographical formula of the relation between science and the new in the 17th century. A “science of the new” rather than “a new science”.
The Legal Project of R. Joseph Karo between West and East / Roni Weinstein

The legal Summa of R. Joseph Karo in late 16th century have served as a focal point in Jewish legal tradition (Halakhah) from their very first moment of publication in print. Their composition is intimately related to the cultural perspective of the Jewish Iberian Diaspora, spreading all along the Mediterranean basin, in northern Europe and the ‘New World’ as well. Thus the motivation for composing the double Summa – the long version of Beit Yosef, and the shortened and more popular Shulchan Aruch – responds to changes in history of law taking place in both Christian Europe and the Ottoman Empire in the Muslim milieu. The growth of centralized states (in the European context) and the constitution of wide Empire of unprecedented territory (in the Muslim context) allocated a new role to legal discourse. The extensive legal writing in the early modern period gave rise to new methodological questions in regard to both theoretical and practical use of juridical literature in Christian, Muslim, and Jewish context as well.
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Partners

The project is co-hosted and co-sponsored by the kind support of the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute. The project also builds upon the strategic-academic partnership between Tel Aviv University and Goethe University Frankfurt. Collaboration between the two institutes took the form of inviting a group of colleagues from Frankfurt to our summer workshop series.
4.6.1 Whitepapers and Round-Table Series: Israeli Academy between Autonomy and Governance

This year we dedicated our effort to collecting our research projects of former years in the form of whitepapers to be distributed among members of our group, as well as to key decision-makers (deans, departments heads, etc.) in the humanities and social sciences, as part of our effort to broadcast our research results, and expand our circle of interlocutors.

Towards the middle of 2014, however, our efforts took a slightly different emphasis, in light of the publication of the governmental committee for the reorganization of academic governance in Israel. In light of the dramatic changes recommended by the committee, in terms of reforming the Israeli academic system, we saw fit to redirect our efforts so as to respond to this development. We decided to do so by pursuing two venues:

1) re-orienting our whitepapers to the format of responses to the committees recommendations, so as to make them more relevant to the here-and-now

2) in light of several critical responses (outside our group) to the governmental committees recommendations, we decided to launch a series of round-tables that would serve as a stage for such debates, and for presenting our whitepapers for discussion.

The round-tables will be hosted and co-sponsored by our project partner, the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute.

The following is a shortened version of the invitation letter we send to our series of round-tables, which serves to clarify the rational of the group in the passing year of activity, and its projected work for the next one.

Higher Education in Israel: Between Autonomy and Governance

(Short version of round-table invitation letter)

The committee for the reorganization of governance in the Israeli higher-education system has recently published its conclusions. This committee was mandated to redesign the organizational structure of those bodies in charge of managing Israeli higher education, so that their interface with the government would express relations that “well-serve the autonomy of the higher-education system, while giving expression to that government’s policy and to national needs and goals” (quoted from the committee’s letter of appointment). In light of this, the committees top priority
was defined as the need to strike “a reasoned and sustainable balance between the two” (quoted from the committee’s summary report).

This expresses a desire to bridge the traditional role of the academy with contemporary goals. On the one hand, the nurturing and development of cultural heritage and the consciousness of concerned citizens, as a basis for civic society; on the other hand, a focus on “information economy”, namely the power of higher-education as a basis for economic growth, and a more egalitarian, successful society.

At the same time, the built-in tensions between academic freedom and market needs and direction; between excellence and access; information autonomy and instrumentalization—have not received significant discussion. The crisis such tensions lead to in the so-called “non-practical” disciplines has also not been seriously debated. Without such debate one cannot truly touch upon questions of educational evaluation; of excellence-driven processes that do not undermine autonomy but rather encourage original thought; and in the importance of the academy to the nurturing of civil society and democracy.

The publication of the committees’ summary report already generated varied responses as well as criticism. Some argue the recommendations would be devastating to academic freedom, leading to a politicization of the academy. Other see them as a necessary step in order to provide for contemporary needs, improving management processes, and increasing efficiency and transparency.

We suggest the questions already raised by this report are not purely technical or administrative questions regarding functions, appointments, authorities, and budgets. Instead they point to two fundamental issues that have received insufficient attention and reflection. The question of the relation between academy and government (the question of autonomy); and the question of the relation between academy and society.

In light of the importance and timeliness of the matter, and the public responses it generated, we would like to invite you to a series of round-table discussions, revolving around the committee’s recommendation, seen through these two key questions.

Prof. Gabriel Motzkin (Director, the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute)
Prof. Rivka Feldhay (Director, the Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University)
4.6.2 Group Member Publications

In addition to our group-level activity, members of the group have pursued some of the lines of investigation developed in the framework of our joint work. Some of these took the form of publications dealing with methodological questions at the center of humanistic studies, while others developed various aspects of the ethical dimension of the humanities, in the context of contemporary developments both in Israel and abroad.


Ori Rotlevy. “Dreaming and Awakening in ‘Parser Passagen’”. Walter Benjamin: minor Readings in German Literature, Prof. Galili Shachar’s Seminar, Department of Literature, Tel Aviv University, 2014.

4.7 Genealogies of the Humanities 1200-1840

**Director:** Prof. Rivka Feldhay

**Group Members:**

Prof. Dr. Dr. Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, Goethe University Frankfurt

Prof. Dr. Andreas Niederberger, University of Duisburg-Essen

Prof. Menachem Fisch, Cohn Institute, Tel Aviv University

Prof. Yossef Schwartz, Cohn Institute, Tel Aviv University

Dr. Andreas Wagner, Goethe University Frankfurt

Dr. Amos Edelheit, Maynooth University

Dr. Hanan Yoran, Ben Gurion University

Dr. Raz Chen-Morris, Bar-Ilan University

Dr. Ayelet Even-Ezra, Tel Aviv University

Tim Rojek, University of Duisburg-Essen

Anselm Spindler, Goethe University Frankfurt
General Description

This project, which has split out of another project, “The Future of the Humanities,” is currently in its first phase. Having assembled the team of researchers and the rationale of the project, our plan is to submit it as a multi-year proposal to one of the significant, European-level research funds. The project is a collaboration of the Minerva Humanities Center and Frankfurt University, and includes scholars from these two universities as well as additional ones. The project is designed to serve as a broad research framework, described below, within which scholars will conduct individually-driven research projects.

Project-Launch Workshop (22-23/6/14)

The seeds for this project framework were sown at a meeting following the conclusion of the 2012 summer workshop “The Future of the Humanities,” which was co-organized by the Minerva Humanities Center, Goethe University Frankfurt, and the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute (which also hosted the workshop). After a period of gustation, in which we most corresponded by email, we launched the project in a two-day intensive workshop at Tel Aviv University, held between 22-23/6/14.

In this workshop we achieved two goals:

1) The joint production of our Project Framework document—a short version of which is provided below under “Project Description.”

2) Introduction of the various members’ individual projects that will take place under this framework. Each group member distributed a primary text that served as a representative for the problematics they wish to engage with in their project. The group jointly read these texts and discussed both each members’ project proposal, as well its relation to the other projects and to the general research framework.

Project Description

A. Rationale

The humanities are a contested field—and politically and ideologically as well as theoretically. While the persistent debates surrounding these disciplines often elicit apologetic responses from their defenders, they also encourage a reflection that plays a crucial role in determining the humanities’ own self-understanding. In our view, such reflection is itself an essential dimension of these scholarly pursuits, and one that merits an investigation through humanistic tools.
An ongoing debate takes place concerning the utility of the humanities. Through explicit or implicit comparisons with scientific knowledge, it is asked whether and how the knowledge produced by the humanities is socially or otherwise useful. Deeper reflection on these questions has led to debates concerning the wider ideological implications of the humanities. On one side we find the answer that the humanities’ basic role is to critically reflect upon society, particularly to expose ideological reifications, in order to dismantle power-relations and to bring about social and cultural changes. On the other side of the ideological spectrum, the humanities are perceived as the main vehicle for articulating and transmitting essential traditional values that underpin the social order.

The notion of humanist education adds another layer to this debate. The humanities are often marked by the view that professional education, geared to teaching specific skills and technical expertise, as insufficient in itself if not accompanied by some form of liberal-humanist education. The latter is perceived as involving a richer process of Bildung that seeks to shape the learner’s morality, personality, and critical abilities. At the same time, the establishment of an educational system requires the institutionalization of specific intellectual programs and its translation into concrete curricula. Questions regarding the aims and forms of humanistic education are thus particularly acute. Should such education strive for the intellectual and aesthetic (thus perhaps a-political) fashioning of unique individuals, or should it be civilly-oriented towards educating responsible citizens? Should such citizens be regarded as bearers of given social and cultural values, or rather as critically-minded intellectuals? Should these disciplines be taught only in universities, or should they transcend the limits of the academic world and provide the backbone of a broader civic and intellectual culture?

In addition to this perspective, there is also the controversy over the epistemological status of the knowledge produced in the humanities. Some claim that the humanities are, like the natural sciences, equally capable of producing reliable knowledge and, accordingly, advocate suitable methodologies of research and forms of presentation. Others highlight the distinctiveness of the objects of the humanities and their connection to humanist knowledge. According to the latter view, given the particularity of their subject-matter, the humanities pertain to an epistemology and methodology different from the truth-orientation of the sciences. Some go so far as to argue the scholarly perspective of the humanities cannot but be inherently normative.

According to the fundamental rationale of our project, the very persistence of the abovementioned questions throughout the centuries, and across transformations in the institutional settings and cultural positionings of the different humanistic fields, suggests that a serious study of the
humanities, past and present, calls for a *genealogical approach*. Current analyses of the evolution of the humanities tend to take the academic reforms of these disciplines starting in the early nineteenth century as their point of departure. The contention of the present project is that although these early nineteenth century developments constitute a crucially important and transformative moment in the history of the humanities, they by no means mark their origin. We therefore propose to examine not only the “pre-history” of the humanities, in terms of the background for these nineteenth-century developments, but also those modes of humanistic thought that were marginalized by that process. The genealogical method we propose will uncover these sources and options, potentially challenging the prevalent interpretation of the humanities promoted by the exclusive focus on their recent institutional history. These considerations dictate the temporal dimensions of our project commencing with the establishment of the major medieval universities and culminating in the reforms of the academic system in the first half of the nineteenth century. Instead of a smooth, continuous narrative of progress, a genealogical approach allows us to concentrate on carefully selected, discreet moments, in which the humanities grappled with problems that up to this day remain characteristic of both their subject-matter and self-understanding. It is an approach that will also allow us to reflect upon our own position which emerges within the long history of the humanities as a major transformation of academic culture in its own right.

**B. Research Framework: Thematic-Temporal Matrix**

This broad research framework will be carried out along two axes: a thematic and a temporal one. Within this matrix, individual projects will be carried out, in a manner that is meant to combine both the autonomy of each project together with a shared framework for cross-fertilization between projects, and the formation of shared insights, by corresponding to a common research agenda.

On the *thematic axis*, we focus on five key *problematics*, which serve as methodological clusters of investigation across the different genealogical stations we examine:

1. The humanities’ awareness of the *contingency* of its objects of knowledge
2. The epistemic and scientific place of *interpretation, allegory and symbols*
3. The *distinctiveness* of man and society as an object of investigation
4. The place of *tradition* in the development of knowledge and as an object of knowledge
5. The social *utility* of the humanities and their position vis-à-vis other social, political, and cultural spheres.
On the *temporal axis*, the project will be divided according to the following historical periodization:

1. Early thirteenth century: the establishment of the universities and the separation of philosophy and theology.
2. Renaissance Humanism, and the “rhetorical” challenge of the scholastic intellectual endeavor.
3. The sixteenth-century school of Salamanca, seen as an attempt to integrate new scholarly standards developed by the humanists into the scholastic framework.
4. The new philosophies of the seventeenth century, and the attempt to transcend the dichotomy between scholastic syllogistic models and humanistic antiquarian sentiments, so as to address the new natural sciences.

**C. Project List**


Ayelet Even-Ezra. *University Masters of the Thirteenth Century on Texts and Metaphors as Objects of Scientific Inquiry and Means of Education*.

Hanan Yoran. *Radical Humanism and the Critique of the Humanities*.


Andreas Niederberger and Anselm Spindler. *Transpositions of the Concept of Law in the 17th and 18th Century and Their Reception in the Works of David Hume and Immanuel Kant*.

Rivka Feldhay. *How did Philosophy become a Humanistic Discipline in the 17th Century?*


Tim Rojek. *The Hegelian Philosophy of Spirit and the ‘Geisteswissenschaften’*.

Andreas Wagner. *The Knowledge of Politics*. 

4.8 Knowledge Migration in/within East Asia, Second Millennium AD

Director: Dr. Asaf Goldschmidt.

Dr. Ori Sela (TAU)

Israel Kanner (Ph.D. candidate, TAU)

Meny Vaknin (MA candidate, Dept. of East Asian Studies, TAU)

Galia Kalderon (MA candidate, Dept. of East Asian Studies, TAU)

Abstract

The major themes our group examines span both space and time in Asian history. These include: Transformation in medicine during the Song Dynasty (960-1279); Transmission of Western knowledge (astronomy and mathematics in particular), via the Jesuits, during the Ming and Qing Dynasties (c. 1600-1800); Transformation of knowledge systems and historiography during the transition to the modern period (c. 1860-1949); The triangle of knowledge transfer – West/Japan/China – during the nineteenth century; The nexus of identity (personal, social, cultural) and knowledge; The historical actors’ perception of knowledge.

Specific case-studies we are pursuing include Xu Shuwei (1080-1154) and the transmission of medical knowledge in the Southern Song; Public graveyards in the 12th century; Xu Guangqi (1562-1633) and the legitimation of Western learning in the late Ming; Qian Daxin (1728-1804) and the ambivalence about Western learning in the High Qing (the philological revolution); Hanaoka Seishō (1760-1835) and medical knowledge in Tokugawa Japan; Qin Bowei (1901-1969) and the transformation of medicine in Republican China; The problematic historiography of Chinese martial arts; The transformation of categories of knowledge at the turn of the twentieth century; The continuation and transformation of the “Xixue Zhongyuan” (“Western learning originated in China”) paradigm.

Rationale and Preliminary Conclusions

At first it seemed unreasonable to expect to find a single thread that runs throughout these very different themes, times, and places. It seemed pretentious to assume that we would be able to bring all these differences together somehow. Nonetheless, having met regularly, and having been engaged in constant dialogue, we feel that we did manage to find such a thread that binds
our subjects together as an axis that holds the various themes together. Finding this axis was the result of an international conference and workshop we organized in May 2012, *From Qing to China*, wherein, apart from the Israeli participants, 16 renowned scholars from Europe, North America, and Asia took part. The discussions in that conference led to a book project titled *From Qing to China: Knowledge Systems in Transformation* (currently under negotiations with Hawai‘i University Press). Our preliminary conclusions for the “Chinese” scene includes the understanding that the interaction of “Old” and “New” was and could be analyzed as a mechanism for various forms of knowledge-migration across time and/or space, including recycling, legitimization, accommodation, rejection, or substitution of knowledge. In addition, the identity and sense of identity of the historical actors also plays a key role, as the categories of old/ancient versus new as employed by these actors.

**Publications**


**Abstract**

This volume examines transformations of knowledge, broadly conceived, from late-nineteenth-century to mid-twentieth-century China. The leading argument, developed in the editorial piece, brings “old” and “new” as heuristic terms back onto center stage. Rather than considering them as binary alternatives, it analyzes their continual interplay and mutual accommodation through a number of specific case studies. This is done within the context of the transformation both of the knowledge systems and of the political, social, and cultural arenas; the contexts within which knowledge was transformed. The main thread that runs through all chapters is the interaction of old and new knowledge systems in the interconnected realms of practices and of ideas. Contemplating on this theme and its relevance to earlier periods we came to the conclusion that the interaction of old and new is indeed applicable to the research of other members of the group as well, and, as this interaction is crucial to the migration of knowledge, at least in East Asia, we can emphasize it as the main axis of the group’s research as a whole. This axis we call “*Xinxue guyuan* [新學古源 “Ancient/ Old origins of New Learning”],” as a paraphrase on the phrase “*Xixue Zhongyuan* [西學中源 “Chinese origins of Western Learning”]” that has been widely used in the past four centuries in China.
4.9 The Transmission of Jewish Encyclopedic Works

Dr. Roni Weinstein (individual project)

Abstract

Dr. Weinstein is working on mapping the main encyclopedic works in a Jewish context from the early Middle Ages until the late seventeenth century, while uncovering their affiliation to both Islamic and Christian encyclopedias. The research includes an investigation of the term Encyclopedia itself, showing its relevancy to various fields in Jewish culture, both scientific, Halakhic, and philosophic. The work follows the change of encyclopedic concepts through the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and its role in the formation of new concepts of knowledge and in its modes of organization.

4.10 Classical Greek, Hellenistic, and Roman Influences on Early Modern Thought

Dr. Ivor Ludlam (individual project)

Revising the Ancient Philosophical Tradition

Project Abstract

Attempting to construct a theory regarding the transmission and reception of concepts from one culture to another, Dr. Ludlam sees his task as providing reliable but difficult case studies which indicate what such a general theory might or might not encompass. It is often assumed that the transmission of ideas is linear. In the case of Greek philosophy, the stages of transmission are all too often taken to be in the sequence: (C6-4) Presocratics, (C5-4) Sophists, Socrates, (C4) Plato, Aristotle, (C4-1) Hellenistic philosophers (Academics, Peripatetics, Epicureans, Stoics), and (A.D.) “eclectics”. The chronological stages are problematic, as is the terminology: some “Presocratics” outlived Socrates, and the denotation, implying a lack of ethical enquiry in their natural studies, is somewhat misleading; sophists became a significant feature of higher learning throughout the ancient period, and not just in the fifth-fourth centuries B.C.; Socrates in Socratic dialogues should be regarded as a character adapted to the requirements of the authors (especially Plato and Xenophon) in their time; Plato is actually accurately placed between the historical Socrates and the historical Aristotle, but his work has been severely misconstrued (on which, see 2A below); Aristotle is normally assumed to have influenced the Hellenistic philosophers, and indeed he may have done so - but through
his published dialogues, now lost to us, and not through the works with which we are familiar; these only came to be known to the general public in the first century B.C.; as for the Hellenistic philosophers, to take just one example, some Stoics, but not all, derived much inspiration from the “Presocratic” Heraclitus and from the dialogues of Plato, but there is hardly any evidence for Aristotelian influence; the later so-called “eclectics” are no different from their predecessors in taking ideas from any source and fitting or moulding them into a new scheme, but it must also be noted that occasionally the eclecticism is only apparent - for example, the Stoic Seneca wrote rhetorical works in which he attempts to persuade an Epicurean friend (Lucilius) to become Stoic, and to do so he frames many of his arguments in Epicurean terms, making him appear to a scholar unversed in rhetoric to be somewhat less than a true Stoic.

In this framework, Ludlam identifies two areas in the philosophical tradition requiring urgent attention: they are both central to our understanding of the way knowledge migrates, and they are both currently greatly misconstrued. Appreciating the traditional types of misconstrual of these two areas will greatly advance our understanding of what is considered tradition, just as a proper understanding of these two areas will advance our understanding of the thinkers themselves, how they were reacting to their influences, and whether different traditions, so far overlooked, may be located indicating a less misconstrued reception of their ideas.

Publications

*Plato's Republic: A Philosophical Drama on Apparent Prudence* (c. 350pp.) (Submitted for publication)

“Plato’s Republic as a Philosophical drama on doing well”, Ivor Ludlam. (forthcoming)


4.11 Knowledge Transformation in Twentieth Century Physics-Technology Interaction

**Dr. Shaul Katzir** (individual project)

**Abstract**

Shaul Katzir (Tel Aviv University) examines transfer and transformation of knowledge in modern science and technology as part of his study of the interaction of physics and technology in the early twentieth century. In a world in which knowledge was usually published and in principle accessible beyond specific disciplinary or local circles, the transformation and adaptation of knowledge still required either human agency or specific motives and often both for a successful transfer of ideas.
and methods from one realm to another. The effort needed for such a transfer is especially clear in the employment of scientific knowledge to practical applications, but is also evident in the turn from one field to another inside physics or technology. People, who moved between these fields (either at different times, or as playing a mediator role between them) often transferred knowledge with which they had experience in one realm to another. Such a move between research fields required reasons. These could be found in a strong incentive to solve the technological problem (as was the case during WWI), in common practice of inventors, engineers and scientists working on technology of moving from one problem to another, or in the judgment of a scientist that his or her results have a practical value (coupled with a technological orientation to use them).

**Publications and Conference Papers**

*From Sonar to Quartz Clock: Technology and Physics in War, Academy and Industry* (MIT Press, manuscript accepted for review).


"Manchester at war: Bohr and Rutherford on problems of science, war and international communication,” Finn Aaserud and Helge Kragh (eds.) *One hundred years of the Bohr atom: Proceedings from a conference - Scientia Danica. Series M · Mathematica et physica*, 1, Copenhagen: Danish Academy of science (forthcoming).


5. Post-Doctoral Fellows

Dr. Asaf Federman

Post-doctoral research fellow at Minerva Center for Humanities Research, Tel Aviv University. Also funded by The Interdisciplinary Center, Hertzliya, and the Israeli Government’s Ministry of Absorption. Asaf’s project focuses on the migration of ideas and practices from Buddhism into psychology in the Twentieth Century, in particular meditation. Asaf completed his PhD in the department of psychology at Warwick, UK, where he studied ideas of self-control in cognitive science and Buddhist philosophy. He completed a Master’s degree in Religious Studies at Bristol, and graduated from Haifa University’s philosophy department. His Hebrew translation of the Pali Dhammapada was published in 2011. He has also published a few articles on issues related to Buddhist history and thought, including an extensive correspondence between Nyanaponika Thera and David Ben Gurion, that had been found in Sri Lanka.

Research

In the academic year 2013-2014 I continued to work on the migration of Buddhist practice and knowledge into Western psychology and psychotherapy. My article on the acceptance of meditation in Britain between 1853 and 1945 was submitted after revisions to the journal Religion. It is now under second review. A book chapter was submitted earlier this year and will appear in press in the next few months. As in the year before, I spent some time in the UK researching relevant archives. I am now continuing to work on further publications, one on the idea of freedom within the new secular mindfulness movement and another on the evolution of the concept of mindfulness from Buddhism to psychotherapy. The research project in its entirety centers on mindfulness as a case study for modern knowledge migration between east and west, and between religion and therapy.

Presentations

“Mindfulness in migration: from Buddhist monasteries to mental health clinics”, The Oxford Mindfulness Centre at the Department of Psychiatry Seminar Series, (invitation pending).


Articles in Refereed Journals

Dr. Raz Binyamini

Raz Binyamini received his Ph.D. from the Department of Musicology at the Tel-Aviv University. His doctoral thesis suggested an interpretation of the aesthetics and practice of mid-16th century Venice, as manifested in the works of Adrian Willaert and Gioseffo Zarlino, in light of the tensions between myth and reality in the political, social and religious Venetian lives and discourses of the times, while uncovering a complex web of connections between visual, textual and musical works of art. His current research focuses on the reciprocal influences between political discourse and musical aesthetics and practice in 16th-century Venice as a locus of implementation, appropriation, elaboration, amalgamation and public distribution of migrating bodies of knowledge from various sources. Special attention is given to the official and national impulses behind this process and to the institutional forums for its cultivation, in the larger context of the Myth of Venice.

Publications

1. Members

1.1 Core Research Group

**Adi Ophir: Director.** Adi Ophir is a philosopher, specializing in political theory and contemporary continental philosophy. Ophir is professor at The Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, a visiting professor at the Cogut Center for the Humanities, Brown University. He serves as director of the Lexicon for Political Theory at The Minerva Humanities Center at Tel Aviv University, and is the founding editor of *Mafte’akh: Lexical Review of Political Theory*. He is the author of, among others, *Divine Violence: Two Essays on God and Disaster* (Hebrew 2013); *The One State Condition* (co-authored with Ariella Azoulay, Stanford University Press 2012), and *The Order of Evils* (Zone Books 2005). Ophir is also the translator of several philosophical texts into Hebrew, most recently, together with Ariella Azoulay, *The Human Condition* by Hannah Arendt (Hakkibutz Hameuchad 2013). He is currently engaged in two research programs. The first is the construction of a discursive theory of concepts that would allow a comparative study of the “conceptual performances” of various authors writing in different genres and discursive fields. The second, in collaboration with Prof. Ishay Rosen-Zvi, historian of Jewish thought in late antiquity, reconstructs a genealogy of the Hebrew concept *goy* (gentile) in late antiquity, analyzing the theo-political implications of the discursive formations in which the concept serves as a constitutive element.

**Hagar Kotef: Managing Director.** Hagar Kotef is a fellow of the Lexicon Project at the Minerva Humanities Center, and a teaching fellow at the Department of Politics and Government, Ben Gurion University. Her main research areas include political philosophy, critical theory, and feminist theory. She works primarily on gender, activism, and political questions of embodiment. Her book, *Movement and the Ordering of Freedom* (forthcoming, Duke University Press 2015) examines the various political meanings of motion and immobility, offering a new reading of liberal philosophy, as well as of contemporary political spaces. Kotef is one of the editors of *Mafte’akh*, and author of the entries *House/Home* and *Movement*. 
1.2 Scholars


**Ruthie Ginsburg** studied art at the Midrasha College of the Arts, and received her PhD at the Program for Culture and Hermeneutics, Bar-Ilan University. Ginsburg is currently teaching visual culture, theory of photography, and gender at several universities, including Tel Aviv University, Ben-Gurion University, and Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design. Her book “*And You Will Serve as Eyes for Us*: Israeli Human Rights Organizations as Seen through the Camera’s Eye” is forthcoming in Resling Press. Her research examines the human-rights discourse through an investigation of visual activism, mainly photography, of human rights organizations. Ginsburg is leading the *Photo-Lexic* research group at the MHC, writing on civil uses of photography through concepts such as Exposure and Resolution. She is author of the *Mafte‘akh* entry *Exposure*.

**Michal Givoni** works in the field of contemporary political theory, studying the intersections of non-governmental politics and moral sensibility. Her work explores the history, ethics and politics of humanitarian action; the ethics of witnessing and testimony; cosmopolitanism; and innovative
technologies of public participation. Givoni completed her PhD at the Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas at Tel Aviv University (2008), and was a Fulbright postdoctoral fellow at UC Berkeley (2011). Her book, Ethical Witnessing: History of a Problem is forthcoming in Hebrew at the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute / Hakibutz Hameuchad publishing house. She is author of the Mafte’akh entry Witnessing/Testimony.

**Ariel Handel** is a postdoctoral fellow at the French Research Center in Jerusalem (CRFJ). His PhD dissertation, written at The Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Sciences and Ideas, deals with the movement regime in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, examining movement restrictions as a distinctive technology of population- and territory management. His research interests are types of mobility in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, mapping and spatial representations, and the political philosophy of geography. His recent publications include The Political Lexicon of the Social Protest (editor-in-chief, Hakibutz Hameuchad 2013), and “Gated/Gating Community: The Settlement Complex in the West Bank”; in Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers (2013). He authored the entries Violence and Frontier in Mafte’akh.

**Yoav Kenny** is a Fulbright post-doctoral fellow at the Rhetoric Department, University of California, Berkeley, and editor-in-chief of Mafte’akh, where he wrote the entry Declaration. He completed his PhD in Tel Aviv University’s School of Philosophy, and his research focuses on the ethical and political significances of non-human animals, especially in post-Heideggerian thought. He is the recipient of the 2013-14 Dan David post-doctoral award, and the 2014-15 Fulbright post-doctoral award.

**Mili Mass** is Senior Lecturer (emeritus) at The Hebrew University’s Paul Baerwald School of Social Work. Her research deals with child welfare from clinical, legal, and political perspectives.

**Anat Matar** is a senior lecturer at the Department of Philosophy, Tel Aviv University. Her latest book is Modernism and the Language of Philosophy (Routledge 2006). Matar has been an Anti-Occupation activist for many years, and is co-founder and chair of the Israeli Committee for Palestinian Prisoners. She has recently co-edited (with Adv. Abeer Baker) Threat: Palestinian Political Prisoners in Israel (Pluto Press, 2011). She is the author of the entry University in Mafte’akh.
Keren Sadan is a lecturer at the MA program for Cinema and Culture at the University of Haifa. She received her PhD from the Philosophy Department at The New School for Social Research. Her interests lie in the ethical and the political, and the connection between theory and praxis. To that end she founded a program in the Tel Aviv–Yafo municipal education system for teaching philosophy in preschools. Her areas of specialization are film and new media studies, ethics, feminist theory, contemporary French feminism, and philosophy and children.

Itay Snir finished his PhD at the School of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University. His dissertation, written under the supervision of Dr. Anat Matar, studied the concept of Common Sense from philosophical and political perspectives. Snir is one of the co-editors of Mafte’aikh, and author of the entries Common Sense and co-author of Equality. Snir received his MA (summa cum laude) from The Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, Tel-Aviv University, and his BA (summa cum laude) from the Philosophy Department and the Multidisciplinary Program in the Arts, also at TAU. He currently teaches philosophy at “Alon” High School in Ramat Hasharon, and works as a teaching assistant at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya.

Roi Wagner holds PhDs in math (1997) and philosophy (2007) from Tel Aviv University, and is currently a Buber Fellow at the Hebrew University. He publishes on History and Philosophy of mathematics and critical theory. In 2009 Wagner published the book S(zp ,zp): Post-Structural Readings of Gödel’s Proof. Wagner is the author of the entry Labor migrants in Mafte’aikh. His research at the Political Lexicon group concerns politics of resistance from the margins.

Noam Yuran specializes in political economy and the philosophy of economics from orthodox and heterodox perspectives, studies media and television from philosophical and political perspectives, and writes about Israeli culture and its relation to the state. Yuran is one of the editors of Mafte’aikh, director of the Political Economy research group, and author of the entries Money and Television. He completed his PhD in the Philosophy Department at Ben-Gurion University. Yuran is author of What Money Wants: an Economy of Desire (Stanford University Press 2014); The Erotic Word: Three Readings in Hanoch Levin’s Work (Haifa University Press 2002, Heb.); and Channel 2 TV: The New Etatism (Resling 2001, Heb.).
1.3 Students

**Yohay Bloom** received his BA in Philosophy from Tel-Aviv University (summa cum laude). He submitted his MA Thesis to Tel-Aviv University, written under the guidance of Prof. Adi Ophir and Dr. Anat Matar, on *Hans Jonas on the Visual Metaphor in Philosophy*. His main areas of study are metaphysics, analytic philosophy, visual metaphors, Hume, Wittgenstein, and Jonas.

**Lin Chalozin-Dovrat** is a Ph.D. candidate in linguistics and the epistemology of linguistics at the Paris-Sorbonne University (Paris IV) and Tel Aviv University. Her PhD dissertation (expected by the end of 2014) explores the relations between temporal and spatial cognition in linguistic theory, and considers the interrelations between theories of temporality in linguistics and other fields, such as physics, psychology, and the social sciences. Her research interests include the history of linguistic ideas, particularly the political aspects of linguistic theory, and the linguistic aspects of political theory. Lin lectures at Tel Aviv University’s French department, and is a co-author (together with Roi Wagner) of the entry *Left* in the *Political Lexicon of the Social Protest*.

**Udi Edelman** is a student at The Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, Tel Aviv University, and serves as co-editor of *Mafte’akh*. He is an independent curator, and serves as curator and director of research and academic connections at the Israeli Center for Digital Art, Holon. His research in the Lexicon project examines the relations between concepts and art.

**Uri Eran** is a graduate student at Indiana University. His main research interests are moral philosophy and Kant’s practical philosophy. Eran is co-editor of *Mafte’akh*, and has taught at the Philosophy Department and the Dov Lautman Unit for Science-Oriented Youth, Tel-Aviv University. He is the author of the entry *Cynicism* in the *Political Lexicon of the Social Protest*.

**Gal Eshsel** is an MA student in the philosophy department at Tel Aviv University. Her research interests include political philosophy and contemporary political theory, critical theory, biopolitics, and the sociology of legitimized knowledge. She is co-editor of *Mafte’akh*, and teaches philosophy at Tel Aviv University.
Revital Madar is currently working on her MA thesis under the direction of Prof. Adi Ophir, dealing with the concept of Revenge in Nietzsche. The motivation to work on that concept evolved from questions regarding the possibility of reversibility and translation, as well as questions regarding difference and repetition. She also takes part in the Living Together research group, directed by Dr. Raef Zreik, where she directed a research group investigating the relations between Sexism and Racism.

Ohad Reiss is an MA student in the philosophy department at Tel Aviv University. His research field is the anthropology of philosophical knowledge. He is a graduate of the multidisciplinary program for outstanding students at Tel-Aviv University, a member of the "Kant and his World" inter-university program. He teaches philosophy at Tel Aviv University and at the Unit for Science-Oriented Youth.
2. Bi-weekly Meetings

Throughout the 2013-2014 academic year the core group of the Lexicon Project acted as a reading group. Topics and texts were selected after a thorough discussion in which several options were considered. The motivation has been twofold: to achieve a better grasp of the “state-of-the-art” discourse in two major domains (one per semester) of contemporary political theory; and to look into issues that are relevant for the research aims and practices of the Political Lexicon project. The first semester and the beginning of the second were dedicated to questions concerning the relations between political theory and practice. The second half of the second semester was dedicated to questions concerning translation, more specifically, to questions concerning the relations between translation, critical political theory, and lexical work. A selection of texts was assigned to each semester by a small ad-hoc committee, and texts were added or subtracted from the list as our discussions developed throughout the semester. Each meeting was guided by a group member and was dedicated to one or two texts from the selected list.

2.1 Political Theory in Praxis: On the relation between political ideas and political actions

In the summer of 2012, the lexicon group held a discussion concerning its work and practices, opening up these issues in ways we have never considered them before. The need to hold such a discussion arose following a demand outside the Lexicon group, at a time the group was working on the Political Lexicon of the Social Protest (2013), a processes that opened the group to wider communities of both readers and writers. We were then confronted with the demand to adjust the group’s practice to its declared politics of knowledge. We have quickly realized that similar demands and similar discussions have been common in the Feminist and Anarchist traditions in civil politics. These traditions have various origins, which, during the twentieth century, were met by the insights of the Pragmatists following the linguistic turn: namely that if every linguistic message cannot be disconnected from its linguistic act, then it is plausible that there is a deep connection between political praxis and political meaning as well. In other words, it is not only on moral grounds but on a practical ground as well that what one does in politics is how one does it.

Looking for texts on this topic, another set of questions presented itself, concerning the difficulty to theorize this relation between political praxis and ideas. Where does this relation exist? In what kind
of theoretical literature does it exist? When does it appear and when does it disappear in political theory or in political action itself? In order to examine these questions, we had read texts dealing with this relation directly, including texts that do not articulate a “grand theory,” while asking where is such a theory missing, and what is the meaning of its absence from certain political domains (liberal democracy, for example) and from various disciplines (political science, for example).

The following are a few examples of questions or perspectives the group dealt with, and their corresponding texts:

1. What is the relation between political structures and religious cults and rituals? More broadly, how do specific forms of cultures and conceptual frameworks shape political institutions and milieus? What kind of democracy is possible given religious political and institutional structures (with the discourse concerning Islam being paradigmatic in this context)? Texts include D. Graeber, “Provisional autonomous zones, or the ghost state in Madagascar”; L. Sadiki, *The Search for Arab Democracy: Discourses and Counter-Discourse*.

2. How does the institutional structure of NGOs, and various other modes of non-governmental intervention in the political sphere, dictate a certain kind of political action, if not political conceptions and agenda. And vice-versa: how do particular political frames differentially shape the particularities of non-governmental forms of intervention, institutions, and their formation. Texts include Adi Ophir, “Moral Technologies: Managing disaster and abandoning life”; Holloway Parks, “Dissident Citizenship”.

3. Critique of liberal democracy and representation. How does the liberal institutional structure potentially interfere with the realization of the political goals it is supposed to serve?

4. Do certain some political contents derive directly from the structure of political practices? Can practice and meaning be disentangled? As paradigmatic examples we examined “flat” political structures, including anarchist and feminist practices. Texts included Jo Freeman, “The Tyranny of Structurelessness”; VW Pickard, “Assessing the Radical Democracy of Indymedia: Discursive, Structural and Institutional Constructions”; U. Gordon, *Anarchism and Political Theory*. 
1st Meeting, 23.10.13

Directed by Lin Chalozin-Dovrat


We opened our first semester’s readings with this classic of Feminist thought and Social Movements Studies, a celebrated exemplar of our selected theme, “Political Theory in Praxis.” When Jo Freeman originally wrote this text in 1970 it was intended for a conference summoned by the Southern Female Rights Union. Hence the article tackles a specific malaise in the feminist movement during the 1960 and 1970: the inadequacy between the pretention of feminist groups to act in a non-hierarchical manner as “structureless” organizations, and the reality of power-relations among its group members. Freeman’s vocation as a feminist activist along with the article’s original context of production and reception led us at first to perceive the text as a case-study for a “micro-theory” of action, entrenched in a specific sociological and political set of problems, rather than as a broader effort to theorize the relation between political ideas and actions in general. However, as the discussion unfolded it was suggested that precisely because the article is such a fine specimen of its historical, political and intellectual context, it may also exemplify a whole trend of political hermeneutics which still thrives in various contemporary discourses, both scholarly as well as more popular ones. Taken more broadly, “The Tyranny of Structurelessness” proposes a structuralist ontology of civil-political groups. Whether it is formal, informal or both, such a group always has a structure, claims Freeman, and the tension between the overt discourse about that structure and its reality of power-relation is precisely what political critique should theorize. This suggestion, focusing on the theorist’s role in exposing the contradictions between avowed ideals and goals and the underlying structure of political reality, represents the structuralist tradition of explanation in a nutshell, and as such, provided us with a first model of Political Theory in praxis.

2nd Meeting, 6.11.13

Directed by Roi Wagner and Noam Yuran

We followed a line of thinking the relation between theory and practice in the context of the Russian revolution and the Arab Spring. We contrasted Lenin’s claim that a trade union, due to its very institutional practice and constraints, cannot lead a revolution, with Emma Goldman’s claim that an avant-garde, due to its institutional practice and constraints, cannot create a communist-democratic reality. We discussed the extent to which these relations between political practice and political vision are tenable. Next, following Mathijs van de Sande, we discussed the claim that the Arab Spring should be judged in terms of the practice it effected rather than through its supposed results, and that its fulfillment lies in its being a laboratory for a social experiment in learning democracy.

3rd Meeting, 4.12.13
Directed by Uri Landsberg


4th Meeting, 18.12.13
Directed by Revital Madar


In *Politics of Piety* Saba Mahmood criticizes Western Feminist theories, claiming they have overlooked practices of religious Muslim women, which differ from those of Western women. Mahmood suggests a new perception of the performative act, according to which the performative acts of religious Muslim women in Egypt operate differently in relation to social and religious norms. These women practice norms not in order to reveal their fragility through their practice, but rather in order to internalize those norm. Thus the performative act of these women can be a tool which strengths their piety even when the act is not following an internal state of mind, but rather is a passage that internalizes it. Mahmood’s critique is directed mostly at Judith Butler’s theory, claiming that the latter’s concept of agency is unsuitable for the those women Mahmood is examining, seeing as their
interaction with norms does not generate a resisting agent as described by Butler. Mahmood demands us to be more careful when applying theories to practices, since the danger of enforcing a theory on a practice, besides being unsuitable, can also make us overlook unfamiliar forms of resistance. Discussion in this meeting revolved around Mahmood’s interpretation of Butler, as well as her main claim: the demand to look at forms of resistance which are alien to the Western world and categories of thought. Through Mahmood we questioned the possibility of these acts being forms of resistance, rather than forms of oppression and consent to patriarchal oppression. We were also demanded to think the need of theories to relate to more particular situations than to seemingly universal patterns.

5th Meeting, 15.1.14

Directed by Ariel Handel


As part of the investigation of the relations between political ideas and actions, we read two complementary texts. The first, Seeing like a State by James C. Scott, develops the various strategies used by the state to govern through detailed organization of knowledge regarding the ruled. How many are they? Where do they live? What are they living from?—knowledge-practices designed to achieve the fantasy of the perfect plan. Scott, therefore, describes the political technologies of statistics, mapping and standardization, and their roles in spatial planning and population management. Those utopist plans are doomed to failure, says Scott, as they must rely on an inherent flattening of the actual situation into ready-made categories which conceal their excessive features that cannot be described by such statistics and maps. In so doing, the political language assumed by modernist governmentality forces itself upon reality, thereby dictating a limited set of possible actions. This is what de Certeau calls “strategy”: “a calculus of force relationships when a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from an environment”; a place where it can “capitalize on its advantages, prepare its expansions, and secure independence with respect to circumstances.” In other words, to force its own worldview through analytical and scientific measures, regardless of the actual richness of the reality it applies itself to.

What de Certeau adds to the equation are tactics: “clever tricks, knowing how to get away with things,
the hunter’s cunning, maneuvers, polymorphic simulations, joyful discoveries…’ While strategies are powerful tools, they are never exhaustive and comprehensive. The reduction of language is followed by a contra-move taken by its users. The richness of reality might go underground, but it never disappears. That means that political ideas and languages can never be fully fulfilled, as there are always subversive tactics which undermine them in everyday life.

**6th Meeting, 5.2.14**

**Directed by** Roi Wagner


In this meeting we took the time to look back at the previous sessions and reframe our discussion. We asked, in the context of what we had read, how the political practice described in those texts interacts with political vision and political results. As a frame of reference we used McLuhan’s thesis of reducing the contents of enunciations to their mediatic form, and asked to what extent this holds in the relation between political practice and political vision/results.

**7th Meeting, 19.2.14**

**Directed by** Itay Snir


We have read and discussed Horkheimer’s text in order to sharpen our understanding of the question concerning the relations between theory and practice, by returning to one of the constitutive texts of the Neo-Marxist tradition. We analyzed Horkheimer’s argument that a critical theory has to take into account the historical and political context in which it is formed, and to aim at changing social reality, rather than simply understanding it (a development of Marx’s 11th “Thesis on Feuerbach”). We were able to clarify the question which occupied us, and which should be distinguished from Horkheimer’s question: namely what kind of knowledge is necessary for political activism, and thus what is the theoretician’s role in political struggle.
8th Meeting, 5.3.14

Directed by Ruthie Ginsburg


In this text Butler discusses the tension between the political and the material in the “Space of Appearance,” while aiming to underline the materiality of the political. Her claim is that a political struggle is a struggle over materiality. In the context of the central topic of our meetings, I offered to see the political as part of political theory, and materiality as part of every political act. For Butler, materiality is part of the conditions of every political act. Her examples include the 2011 demonstrations in Arab countries (the Arab Spring), the USA and Europe. She notes part of the protests, the political act, the undermining of the legitimacy of the ruling power, took place by occupying the Space of Appearance. It sometimes entails endangering the protesters themselves.

The second type of materiality Butler refers to is that of the body. The body in the Space of Appearance appears together with other bodies. According to Butler, numerous perspectives are created in the appearance with others. The body of the individual is not responsible to all these perspectives, and she/he does not control them. This enables Butler to develop her main argument regarding political struggle as a struggle over the distribution of the physical needs of various bodies. Butler sees the focus on the materiality of the body as part of the heterogeneity of the Space of Appearance—unlike the classic notion of the public sphere, where the body and its physical needs are supplied in the private space. In the 2011 protests such bodies were brought to the public space, as the protesters slept, ate etc. in public as part of the demonstrations.

Although it seems Butler is arguing with Arendt in this text, we understood it as a critic of Agamben's notion of *Homo Sacer*, and the gesture of abstraction it involves, namely the abstraction of the body to a political figure.

9th Meeting, 19.3.14

Directed by Gal Eshel


Tupinambá is part of a Marxist-psychoanalytic tradition, and as such is concerned with questions regarding semblance. Examining the mass protests in Rio de Janeiro, he claims that the bourgeoisie find themselves out on the streets, protesting, in order to maintain the last privileges that distinguish
them from the proletariat. Yet upon going out on the street they encounter the existential struggle and protest of the proletariat, realizing that, in order for the struggle to succeed, they all must unite. Since the initial motivation was to distinguish themselves from the lower classes, the struggle fails. Tupinambá further confronts us with disturbing questions, some well-known and are here to stay, and some rather new. What does it mean and what are the potential consequences of political practices after the representation crises? What does it mean to construct a political practice based not on an ideal, but on a relation to semblance? What does it mean, within this new orientation, to direct the masses, if the politics of semblance makes no claim to a special access to what the masses really want deep down? How can a Party trust the masses while at the same time not fearing to put back into circulation those ideas of discipline, power and organization which are associated, by the masses themselves, with totalitarianism and fascism? And finally, how are we to move beyond the Stalinist distrust of semblance without leaving behind critical concern with our own, possible imposture?

2.2 The Borders of Language: Lexicon, Location and the (Im)possibility of Translation

How and in what sense is translation political? Wherein lies the political dimension of translation and linguistic unification? Wherein lies the political dimension (if at all) of writing in one language rather than in another? What are the boundaries and conditions of possibility of translating political concepts—a translation which takes them out of a particular context and history (of a language, of a nation and people, of a place and its inhabitants)? What is the price such a translation demands, and what are the gains it offers? These questions concern transitions between official languages, but they also form a substrate for understanding the various forms in which one symbolic order shapes others (is forced upon them, obliges and binds them, excludes them). Such questions were considered by many scholars from various disciplines, including linguistics, philosophy of language and anthropology. We tried to consider them from two main perspectives which sometimes converge into one. First, the lexical perspective: the question of language as the material—or at least one of the materials—of concepts; the relation between words and concepts, including the relation between place, society, culture, history and conceptualization; the possibility of a visual translation of concepts, etc. Second, the critical-political perspective: linguistic colonialism, translation, and linguistic unification; the pretense of conceptual universalism as a knowledge/power dispositif; diglossia or linguistic inequality (the unequal relation between two or more native languages which share the same political territory, and its effect on the interaction between the languages.)
The question concerning the possibility of translation offers one possible perspective on the question of the politics of knowledge. It allowed us to deal in a systematic way with some of the issues which have been occupying us in our lexical work and reflection. We planned the semester around two clusters (eventually, since we extended our work on the relation between political ideas and political practices, we dedicated less time than planned to the first cluster). First, a cluster of theoretical texts concerning “translation”, its (im)possibility and its implications. Second, concrete work on and through the new project of The Dictionary of Untranslatables, edited by Barbara Cassin and others. Apart from getting acquainted with this project, which is extremely relevant to our Political Lexicon, we began to think about the Hebrew language in relation to this project, and about the differences between our work and the kind of lexical and philological work performed in this and other, similar projects.

1st Meeting, 2.4.14

Directed by Ohad Reiss


In the opening session of the second semester we began our discussion with the Cassin’s Untranslatables. Emily Apter’s texts demonstrate how untranslatable words and concepts cause misunderstandings in certain specific academic discourses. The discussion focused on the difference between Cassin and Apter’s work, and between their and the lexical work that takes place in our own lexical group. I argued that our work differs from both these authors since, while they strive to present the whole variety of meanings and usages that a single word (or a chain of related words) might have in different contexts, we aim to introduce the reader to the specific usage of a concept in a specific language game.

2nd Meeting, 23.4.14

[7-8.5.14: The 11th Lexical Conference]

3rd Meeting: 21.5.14

Directed by Hagar Kotef and Ariel Handel

Texts: Hagar Kotef, "Ba’it" (Home/house/household), Mafte’akh 1 [in Hebrew]; Ariel Handel, “The perimeters of my house are all that is left for me of Palestine that I can call my own, and even this is not secure’: Homes, Houses and Housing Theory in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip," in Haim Yacobi and Shlomit Benyamin (eds.), The Housing Regime in Israel (Van Leer Institute, forthcoming, Heb.); Amal Jamal, “Place, Home and Being: The Dialectics of the Real and the Imagined in the Conception of Palestinian Domesticity,” in Ariella Azoulay (ed.), Homeless Home (Museum on the Seam, Jerusalem, Heb.).

In this meeting we read three essays in order to think about the relation between concepts, language and locations. The essays all revolved around the same concept, “home”, and at least two, those of Kotef and Handel, can be read as lexical in nature. By thinking of these three papers together, the meeting reflected upon some key questions that posed by the nature of lexical work:

- Are we, in the lexical group and in Mafte’akh, committed to thinking in Hebrew? And what would that mean? Are we committed to thinking about this particular place (Israel/Palestine)? Or are concepts by nature universal and thus transcend localities and languages? The comparison between the three essays allowed us to show that these two commitments are not necessarily entangled: namely that there could be a commitment to the particularity of a certain language that is nonetheless more universal in its political, epistemological, and philosophical concerns and vice-versa.
- Are we defining “words” or “concepts” in our lexical work? And what does the difference between the two consist of? For example, the Hebrew word “Ba’it” is not readily translatable to English, as it simultaneously suggests the physical site (“house”), the social order that is organized within it (“household”), and the affective dimension of attachment to it (“home”). It also marks a space containing (holding) within it a variety of elements, both literally and metaphorically: for example that of those who are sick (the Hebrew word for hospital is literally the ba’it of the sick), or sanctity (the Temple is the ba’it of holiness). It is also the domus of the domestic sphere, and it entails (or is contained within) the oikonomia of the oikos. Hence, an act of conceptualization that begins from Hebrew derives a demarcation that would not have been available for an English-speaker, for example. But is this a trait of languages or of lexical
thought? And can the two even be separated?
- On a related note, are we defining signs (concepts, words) or “things”? And can the latter be thought without the symbolic apparatuses of different markers?

Clarifying these questions, we argued, would change the array of connections and associations in the conceptual networks we seek to mark. The conversation that followed relied on the particularity of this concept as a basis from which a reflexive accounts of the entire Lexical Project can be made.

4th Meeting, 11.6.14

Directed by Lin Chalozin-Dovrat


Schechter’s article examines two translations into Hebrew of Spinoza’s Ethics, the first one completed by Jakob Klatzkin in 1924, and the second by Yirmiyahu Yovel in 2003. As stated by Schechter himself, his commentary does not intend to follow the traditional form of a comparative study of translations. Instead, the article delves into the political dimension of the attitudes presented by Yovel and Klatzkin toward the task of translating Spinoza from Latin into Hebrew. This exceptional approach to translation, and particularly to the translation of a major philosophical work, was especially interesting for us in our quest for a political theory of translation. In fact, Modern Hebrew presents special traits in this theoretical framework. Playing an important part in the political and cultural strategies of Zionism, the history of Modern Hebrew is hardly dissociable from that of the national project.

Yovel’s approach to the task of translating Spinoza into Hebrew, maintains Schechter, is inseparable from the political functions of Modern Hebrew in the national project. In fact, according to Schechter, this national ideology of language seeks to purify Modern Hebrew, along with its speakers, from their past. This past includes not only the figure of the diasporic, practicing, religious Jew, but also the rich, innumerable historical layers of the Hebrew language itself. Our discussion focused on the implicit ontology of Hebrew suggested by Schechter’s analysis, portrayed as a trans-historical vibrant textual space, whose semantic connections cut across ages, discourses and texts. This image of the constant intercommunication between different Hebrew texts and historical layers echoes the textual traditions of Judaism. During this last session on translation we considered the ways in which this image of linguistic environment can enable us to rethink our special situation in Modern Hebrew, and its consequences on the ways we do political theory in Israel today.
3. Publications and Activities

3.1 Scientific Publications by the Lexicon Group

Mafte’akh Vol. 7
Published Winter 2014, the 7th issue of Mafte’akh: Lexical Review of Political Thought was dedicated to the work of the Photo-Lexic research group, a sub-group of the Political Lexicon research group. The director of Photo-Lexic, Dr. Ariella Azoulay, was guest-editor of the issue, the longest to date, which included numerous photographs and illustrations, many of which have never been presented in an academic context. The issue includes 12 lexical entries written by academics and practitioners from various institutions in Israel and abroad: Archive, Digital Image, Violent Index, Exposure, Capturing, Archivist, Photomonologue, Horizontal Photography, Aerial Photograph (historical source), Aerial Photograph (community), Deciphering Aerial Photographs, Animal photography.

Mafte’akh Vol. 8
The 8th issue of Mafte’akh: Lexical Review of Political Thought was published in August 2014. It includes 6 lexical entries written by researchers and graduate students from various fields and disciplines (geography, communication, gender studies, theater, political science, and Jewish thought) as well as a first Hebrew translation of Giorgio Agamben’s text “What is a People?” (1997), and a textual and visual piece by young Israeli artist Yael Frank. The issue includes the entries Border, Television, Not-funny, Mizrahiut, Safe Space, Game, Roleplaying, People.

Mafte’akh: Political Concept – A Selection (Edited Volume)
This edited volume is the first book of selected essays from the online journal Mafte’akh. Based on the eight issues published so far, we chose fifteen entries to be republished in book format, published in-house. Assembled together, these essays form an experiment in both political thought and lexical work. Like the journal, the book seeks to contribute to the renewal of existing political lexicons by critically examining common concepts, inventing new concepts, and re-presenting seemingly non-political concepts into the political vocabulary. We do so without accepting in advance disciplinary boundaries or a demarcation of the field (whether of vision, thought, or politics) through existing schools of thought. This is not merely a linguistic work but a political work par excellence. It seeks to reinsert critical thought into the foundations of contemporary political reality; to reframe, re-
understand, and thereby reshape the political present by critically analyzing the history of concepts; to capture quintessential elements of our political present by examining our uses of various concepts. (Re)defining political concepts in Hebrew requires the author to be attuned to the different dimensions of political life that still lack their own language (or that language serves to mask, distort, render meaningless). It thus opens new horizons and new visions for political futures.

3.2 Group Members’ Publications and Activities

**Adi Ophir**


**Conferences**

Co-organizing two conferences on political concepts with *The Political Lexicon Initiative* at Brown University, November 2013, and at The New School for Social Research, April 2014.

**Merav Amir**


“Normal”, *Maftea’kh: Lexical Journal for Political Thought* 8 (Summer 2014) [with Hagar Kotef, in Hebrew].

**Conference Papers**


“Don’t Shoot! We are Citizens! You’ll Meet Us at Home! The Activism of Anarchists Against the Wall in the West Bank and the New Security Logic”. Paper presented at The Institute for the Study of Conflict Transformation and Social Justice, Queen’s University Belfast, 2014.


Workshops Organized

Initiated and organized a lexical workshop in Queen’s University Belfast. The conference was in the format of the Minerva Lexicon conferences, and included 18 participants from the Minerva Center, Queen’s University, Durham University, Brow University and Goldsmith College. Hosted by the School of Geography, Archaeology and Palaeoecology on 16-18 May, 2014.

Yohay Bloom


Lin Chalozin-Dovrat


Udi Edelman


Curatorial work

Co-Curator of HeLa, Ha’Yarkon 19 Gallery, 2014.


Editor

Series Editor for Chosen: The Israeli Center for Digital Art Reader 1 (2014).

**Uri Eran**


**Conference Papers**


**Dani Filc**


**Forthcoming**

“The role of civil society in health care reforms: an arena for hegemonic struggles”. Accepted for publication in Social Science and Medicine.

“Palestinian Prisoners’ Hunger Strikes in Israeli Prisons: Beyond the Dual Loyalty Dilemma in Medical Practice and Patient Care”. Accepted for publication in Public Health Ethics (with Davidovich N., Ziv H.).

“Blurring the Boundaries between Public and Private Healthcare Services as an Alternative Explanation for the Emergence of Black Medicine: The Israeli Case”, accepted for publication in Health Economics, Policy and Law (with Cohen N.).

“We are the (chosen) people, you are not: the case of Shas party”. In Populism and Religion, Columbia University Press, edited by Roy O., McDonnel D. and Marzouki N.. Forthcoming 2014.
Ruthie Ginsburg


Forthcoming


Conferences

“Collaborative Advocacy: What effects does the visual documentation have on social relations?”. Paper presented at the “Social Practice of Human Rights” Conference, Dayton University, Ohio, October 2013.


Michal Givoni


Forthcoming

The Ethics of Witnessing: A History of a Problem. The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute and Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing House. [In Hebrew]


Submitted for publication

“Humanitarian Dilemmas, Concern for Others, and Care of the Self”. In The Dilemmas of Humanitarian Aid in the Twentieth Century, edited Johannes Paulmann. Oxford University Press.
Ariel Handel


**Forthcoming**

“What Are We Talking About When We Talk About Geographies of Occupation?”. In *The shadows of the Wall: Israelis and Palestinians between Separation and Occupation*, edited by Cedric Parizot and Stephanie Latte Abdallah. Ashgate.


**Conference Papers**

“‘Our Grapevines Life is Hard’: Terroir and Territory Making in the West Bank”. Paper presented in *The settlements in the West Bank: New Perspectives* conference, Tel Aviv University, June 2014.


**Organized Conferences**

The settlements in the West Bank: New Perspectives. Tel Aviv University, June 2014.

---

Yoav Kenny


**Forthcoming**

“*Messiah Now!* Giorgio Agamben and the Messianic Time of the Political”. In *CHOSEN*, edited by G. Eilat & A. Szyłak. Tel Aviv and Gdansk: The Israeli Center for Digital Art and Wyspa Institute of Art, 2014

**Conference Papers**

“Revitalizing the Political: Aristotle’s Political Animals and Non-Anthropocentric Political Thought”. Paper presented at the Departmental seminar, Philosophy Department, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, January 2014.


**Hagar Kotef**


**Forthcoming**


“Normal”. Maftea’kh: Lexical Journal for Political Thought vol. 9 (Summer 2014.) [in Hebrew]

**Under review**

“Little Chinese Feet Encased in Iron Shoes: Freedom, Movement, Gender, and Empire in Western Political Thought.” Under review in *Political Theory*.


**Conference Papers**


Invited Lectures and Seminars

“Opening Remarks”. Knowledge in This Era International Conference, Minerva Humanities Center and Safra Center for Ethics, Tel Aviv University, January 2014.


Reviatal Madar

Forthcoming


“Revenge,” submitted to *Mafte’akh*

Invited Talks


Conference Papers


“Revenge”. The 10th Lexical Conference of Political Thought, Tel Aviv University, June 2013.

Conferences Organized

“The Underrepresentation of Women from Minority Groups in the Israeli Academy”, Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University, December 2013.

Mili Mass


Forthcoming

“The Child in His Family—A Necessary Perspective to Broaden the Adoption by LBGT”. In *The LGBT Book*. The Hebrew University [With Zvi Triger].
Anat Matar


**Forthcoming**


**In Preparation**

“‘Black against Our Whiteness’: Blanchot on the Outside and the Privilege of Writing”. (Will be submitted to *Radical Philosophy* by August 2014)

Ohad Reiss

*Research Areas*: sociology of philosophical knowledge; practices of knowledge production, the internal structure of the discipline, the relation between different philosophical factions and its influence on philosophical knowledge itself etc.

Keren Sadan

**Conference Papers**


“The Labor of Arab Labor”. The 30th Annual Conference of the Association for Israel Studies, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Sede-Boqer Campus, Israel, June 2014
Itay Snir


PhD Dissertation: “Common Sense as a Political and Philosophical Problem” (Tel Aviv University).

Roi Wagner


“On (not) choosing between mobility and visibility: Crossing sexual and national borders in Israel/Palestine”, Borderlands 12(2) (2013), 109-135


Forthcoming

“The Occupation Image.” Journal of Film and Video [with Boaz Hagin].

“Regimes of Visibility and Mobility in Israel-Palestine, and How to Walk through Them.” In Anthology of Israeli Articles in Homo-Lesbian Studies and Queer Theory, edited by Aeyal Gross, Amalia Ziv and Raz Yosef. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad Publishing. [In Hebrew]

Submitted

“Chitrabhanu’s 21 Questions in Sanskrit and Malayalam”

“Wronski’s foundations”

“Transcendentalizing the State”

Conference Papers

“Making and breaking mathematical ideas through transcription”. German Israeli Frontiers of Humanities Symposium (Tzova), 2013.
Noam Yuran


“Politics, Morality and Moralism: a Look on Television from Perspective of the Reality Genre”, a research paper for The Israel Democracy Institute [in Hebrew]

“Television”, *Mafte’akh* 8 [in Hebrew]


“The Stuff Commodities Are Made of”, for Elisheva Levy’s exhibition “Villa”, Raw-Art Gallery, Tel Aviv, 2014 (reprinted in Ha’aretz, and Erev-Rav independent art magazine)

**Keynote Lectures**


**Conferences organized**

“Fiktzya 5: The End of Television”. The fifth annual conference in television studies in Israel, Tel Aviv University, January 2014.

**Conference Participation**

“Luxury”. The 11th Lexical Conference in Critical Political Thought, Tel Aviv University, May 2014

### 3.3 Academic Activities held by the Lexicon Group

**The 11th Lexical Conference of Political Thought, Tel Aviv University, May 2014**

The presentations in the conference aimed, like those presented in previous conferences, to contribute to an alternative political lexicon, drawing upon twentieth-century trends of thought within Continental Philosophy or inspired by it. At the heart of the lexicon stands the need for a thorough critical discussion of the basic concepts of contemporary political discourse, a discourse based on a national-liberal conception or a neoliberal conception of the nation state.

Presentations in this conference did not focus on specific thinkers, systems, periods or texts, but rather on concepts suggested by the participants. As usual, the conference drew new, suggestive and often challenging connections between concepts (e.g., *Prostitution* and *Luxury*, *Not-Funny* and *Legal Fluidity*). In addition to its usual personal invitation for artists to speak conceptually about their work (*Not-Funny*...
and State Artist), this year’s conference held another session devoted to art (Israeli Dance and Artwork Community). Another session directly continued our very successful conference “Knowledge in this Era”, through the concepts School and Skill.


**Lexical Practices: Critical Reflections (Tel Aviv, August 7th, 2014)**

In this special, one-day intensive seminar we celebrated the publication of *Maftea’kh: A Selection of Political Concepts*. Together with more than 40 young and senior scholars who have been contributing to the group’s work, we tried to critically examine the lexical practice we have developed over the past five years. We sought to place and examine our conceptual work within a wider context: the context of the tradition of critical thought and theory, in Israel and abroad, and the context of other forms of progressive intellectual involvement within a colonial reality and under conditions of struggle and oppression.

We asked whether the conceptual writing and lexical editing of our conferences and publications are able to promote and fertilize thought that is theoretically and scholarly well-anchored, while at the same time critical and reflexive in its approach, both towards its research object—the concept, and its context, in this case—and towards the scholar’s position and the situation in which their research takes place. Can such writing be not only critical but also constructive? Can it contribute to changing the political discourse? Is there a reason to bother to renew a political-theoretical lexicon in Hebrew, with all the effort such an enterprise entails, to import and civilize foreign terms, while also examining contemporary Hebrew in relation to its historical layers? Finally, is this an appropriate form of intellectual engagement, responsibility or involvement in the current political conditions in Israel?
4. Adjunct Research Groups

4.1 Political and Philosophical Theory of Space

**Director:** Dr. Ariel Handel

**Members:** Noa Appel, Ronnen Ben Arie, Rivi Gillis, Ariel Handel, Efrat Hildesheim, Chen Misgav, Moriel Ram, Jonathan Rokem, Ori Rotlevy, Oren Shlomo.

The aim of this research group is to investigate and develop spatial concepts as well as concepts related to spatial thought, from original and various angles. The group is composed of 10 permanent members—mostly doctoral and post-doctoral students—who come from several fields: geography, architecture, political theory, philosophy and art.

**4.1.2 Reading group**

The meetings take place at Tel Aviv University, in the form of a four-hour "mini-workshop," three times each semester. This year’s reading was devoted to the concept of utopia, under the title “Other Spaces.” We read texts by Frederic Jameson, Michel Foucault, David Harvey, Ash Amin and Ben Anderson. These texts dealt with utopias in general, spatial utopias, planning and utopia, and the utopian potential of certain spatial concepts. Utopia is one of the most slandered concepts in contemporary thought, certainly after WWII and the social engineering projects that followed, mainly in communist states. We have learned to be very suspicious towards any kind of grand plan, and tend to focus more on social critique rather than possible solutions. That is why those relatively few works which do try to think of utopia are usually clear and sharp when discussing the problems they wish to counter, yet come to be quite airy when suggesting a positive horizon. The idea was to take our experience as critical researchers, who are still dealing with concrete materials, in order to find a way to think rigorously about utopia, or in other words, to define the eutopia ("good place") of outopia ("no-place").

**4.1.3 Academic activities of group members**

**Jonathan Rokem** (scholar)

Urban Planner and Researcher. 2013-2014 Erasmus Mundus Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Department of Human Geography, Lund University, Sweden. Jonathan is completing his PhD (expected 2014) at the department of Politics & Government at Ben Gurion University of the Negev, and holds a Master’s degree from the Cities Program at the London School of Economics and Political Science. His research interests and publications focus on spatial and social critical analysis of urban
segregation, comparative urbanism, housing policy and urban planning. Jonathan also works as an urban planning consultant specializing in community engagement with NGOs and the Private and Public sectors. Formerly he served as project manager for the Advocacy Participation of NGOs in Planning (www.tcpa.org.uk/pages/apango.html), an EU funded project at Town and Country Planning, London UK.

**Organized Conference and Events**


*Learning from Jerusalem*. International research seminar, Jerusalem, May 2014.

**Oren Shlomo**

PhD candidate, Department of Politics and Government, Ben Gurion University. Areas of research include urban and political theory, and the way these two bodies of knowledge relate to each other theoretically and empirically. Current research deals with Israeli rule in Palestinian Jerusalem, focusing on the relation between governmental practices of population and space management in relation to conceptualization of empirical/effective sovereignty.

**Publications**


“Sovereignty, Urbanity and Planning: The Case of East Jerusalem”. In: *Cities of Tomorrow: Planning Justice and Sustainability Today?*, edited by Tovi Spenser and Oren Shlomo. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hamuchad, 2014 (in Hebrew)

**Workshop Papers**

“Sovereignty and Governing the Conflictual Urban space: The case of Re organization of informal public transportation in east Jerusalem”. Royal Geographical Society with IBG Annual International Conference, Imperial College London, August 28-30, 2013
Chen Misgav
PhD candidate, Tel Aviv University; PEC LAB-Planning for the Environment with Communities; Department of Geography and Human Environment.
My research fields are driven by my interest in the relation between space, activism, and other forms of political civil actions, gender and sexuality. In particular, my current focus is on the ways in which spatial activism within local urban spaces is constructed through bodies, identities and memory and in relation to questions of gender and sexuality. My former M.Sc. research focused on planning theory and practice in relation to LGBT people and communities.

Forthcoming
“Radical Activism and Autonomous Contestation ‘from within’: The LGBT Community Center in Tel Aviv” In Companion for the Geography of Sex and Sexuality, edited by Gavin Brown Kath Browne, London: Asgate.

Published


“Dirty dancing: The (non)fluid geographies of a queer night club in Tel Aviv”. Social & Cultural Geography, 2014 (with L. Johnston).

“Memory and place in Participatory Planning”. Journal of Planning Theory and Practice 15 (September 2014) (with Tovi Fenster).


Editor
Guest editor of Special Issue on Gender and Geography of Hagar: Studies in Culture, Polity and Identities. 11 (2013). 188 pages (with Orna Blumen and Tovi Fenster)

Book Reviews


Submitted for review
“With the Current, Against the Wind: Constructing Spatial Activism and Autonomous Spaces in Tel-Aviv LGBT Community Center”. Submitted to ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geography.

“Memories for Planning: The Spatial Past of a Place in Planning processes with Communities”. Submitted to Megamot (with Tovi Fenster, in Hebrew).


“The Protest within the Protest ? Political Spaces of Feminism and Ethnicities in the 2011 Israeli Protest Movement”. Revised and resubmitted to Gender, Place and Culture: Journal for Feminist Geography (with Tovi Fenster).

“Between Complicity and Subversion: Spatial Politics and Activism in the Municipal LGBT Center”. Submitted to The Public Sphere.

Conference Papers
“The spatial past of a place in a planning project with communities: Community, Planning and Memory”. The Annual Conference of the Israel Association for Environmental Planning, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, February 2014 (with Tovi Fenster).


“‘With the Current, Against the Wind’: The Spatial Activism and Radical Activism of Trans in the Center Group”. Another Sex (Sex Acher) conference for LGBT studies and Queer theory, Tel-Aviv University and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, June 2014. The paper presented was awarded the Moran Zafir prize of Transgender and Queer research and presented as part of a special session.

Noa Appel
Noa Appel holds an MA in architecture from the Ecole d’architecture de la ville et des territoires, Paris. She is a lecturer at the Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design, Jerusalem.

Ronen Ben Arie
PhD candidate at the Division of Government and Political Theory, School of Political Sciences, University of Haifa, and research fellow at the Minerva Humanities Center. Ronnen’s dissertation explores the concepts of resistance in the political thought of Deleuze and Foucault, as a basis for thinking of possibilities for change in the social and political order. At the Minerva Humanities Center Ronnen directs the “Spaces of Living Together” research group, which explores modes and practices of control and resistance in heterogeneous urban spaces in Israel/Palestine. Research areas include the spatiality of power, resistance and change in contemporary political theory and continental philosophy, shared and mixed urban spaces, the politics and materiality of everyday life, and the political, ethical and professional manifestations and implications of alternative planning. I explore these issues focusing on the concepts of citizenship and nationality, through the cases of heterogeneous urban spaces in Israel-Palestine and planning in the context of the unrecognized Bedouin villages in the Negev.

Conference Papers

**Efrat Hildesheim**

Ph.D. Student, School of Architecture, Faculty of the Arts, Tel Aviv University. Landscape Architect, artist and independent researcher. Hildesheim holds a bachelor degree (Magna Cum Laude) in landscape architecture from the Technion Institute of Technology in Haifa, Israel. After several years of practice as a landscape architect, she earned a post graduate diploma in Fine Arts from the Bezalel Academy of Art and Design in Jerusalem, and an interdisciplinary Master of Environmental Studies and Arts from the School of Environmental Studies and the Faculty of Arts at Tel Aviv University. Her areas of research are landscape theory and critical theory. The epicenter of her present research is the reciprocity of landscapes, roads and borders. Hildesheim focuses on conceptual art, land art, and landscape architecture in Israel. She explores the concept of the garden in its wider, abstract and metaphysical aspects and appearances through hermeneutics and critical thought as well as in her artistic praxis, placing installations in galleries and museums as well as interventions in public spaces.

**Conference Papers**


**Publications**


**Moriel Ram**

PhD candidate, Department of Politics and Government, Ben Gurion University.

**Conference Papers**

“Standing on the edge of the Union: Locating Europe in the Cyprus conflict.” The Second Annual Conference of Young Israeli Researchers in European Studies, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, 2013.

**Rivi Gillis**
PhD Candidate, Tel Aviv University, Labor Studies Department, Faculty of Social Science. Research areas: Sociology and theory of society in Israel; postcolonial and feminist theories; whiteness studies; the ethnic identity of Israeli settlers; aspects of religion, gender and race in the Israeli law of surrogacy; social history of Israeli training of Africans in the 1960s-1970s.

**Publications**

**Ori Rotlevy**
PhD candidate, Philosophy Department, Tel Aviv University. Research areas include epistemology, theories of space, philosophy of history, the history of modern and continental philosophy with an emphasis on Immanuel Kant and Walter Benjamin. My research in philosophy focuses on the significance of spatial concepts and figures of speech to the description of thought. Centering on the semantic web surrounding the concept of Orientation in Kant and Benjamin, I show how this concept serves as a threshold between the philosophy of the subject and its overcoming.

**Conference Presentations and Invited Lectures**


“Dreaming and Awakening in ‘Pariser Passagen’”. Walter Benjamin: minor Readings in German Literature, Prof. Galili Shachar’s Seminar, Department of Literature, Tel Aviv University, 2014.
Minerva Humanities Center (Tel Aviv University), June 29-30, 2014

Organizers

Marco Allegra (MA, Near and Middle Eastern Studies, SOAS London; PhD, Political Science, University of Torino) is Research Fellow at the Centro de Investigação e Estudos de Sociologia (CIES), Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (IUL). His main research interests are urban studies and political geography, Middle East politics and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. His articles have appeared in journals such as Citizenship Studies, Mediterranean Politics, The Geography Compass, Urban Studies, and Environment and Planning A. https://iscte.academia.edu/MarcoAllegra

Ariel Handel is a postdoctoral fellow at the French Research Center in Jerusalem (CRFJ) and a research fellow at the Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University. His research interests are human movement in the occupied Palestinian territories, mapping and spatial representations, and the political philosophy of geography. He is the head of the “Space and Power: A Political Lexicon” research group at the Minerva Humanities Center. His publications include The Political Lexicon of the Social Protests (co-ed, 2012), and Geographies of Occupation (forthcoming). His work has been published in journals such as Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, and Theory and Criticism. http://telaviv.academia.edu/ArielHandel

Erez Maggor is a PhD candidate at the Department of Sociology at New York University (NYU). His main research interests are political economy, state theory, and historical and comparative sociology. http://nyu.academia.edu/ErezMaggor

Abstract
Jewish settlements are one of the most controversial issues in the context of the Israel-Palestine. Still, academic production and media attention on the topic focuses almost entirely on the radical, national-religious components of the settlers’ population; on the connection between the settlement enterprise and the religious-ethno-national territorial imperative of the “conquest of the land”; on the status of settlements within the framework of international law and on their role as “obstacles to peace”. 
The first scholarly rationale for organizing this workshop is to explore less conventional approaches and angles that go beyond the immediate politico-diplomatic dynamics and impact of Israel’s settlement policy, in order to understand how the transformation of the socio-political and human landscape determined by the expansion of settlements created new—albeit not necessarily fair—patterns of relations amongst the resident population of Israel/Palestine. At the same time, a more holistic approach to the settlement issue can open up spaces for comparative analysis and theory building beyond the specific reality of Israel/Palestine.

A second, more political and pragmatic rationale informs the organization of this event. In the last fifteen years, the exhaustion of the conventional conflict-resolution approach based on the formula of the so-called “two state solution” has become increasingly clear. This has certainly not diminished the salience of Israel’s settlement policy. On the contrary, this issue has instead become even more important in the context of the rise of new actors and the development of new approaches to the problem of Israeli-Palestinian relations (to take two significant examples: the emergence of the idea of the so-called “one state solution” and the progressive, if uncertain, re-orientation of EU policy with regard to trade and cooperation with Israel). We maintain that, in this context, careful, critical and innovative research on Israel’s settlement policy is desperately needed.

Finally, we think that it is especially important to have this discussion in Israel. Although it might be easier to hold the workshop in Europe or the US, for us, organizing this event in Tel-Aviv—where we will be able to generate debate and expose the local students and audience to the subject—has a deeper political meaning.

**Themes**

The workshop explored the way Israel’s settlement policy constituted a driver for the transformation of the socio-political and human landscape of Israeli-Palestinian relations. More specifically, it focused on four thematic axes:

1. *The spatiality of settlements*. While the existing scholarship overwhelmingly focuses on the diplomatic, legal and humanitarian impact of the establishment of the settlements, we try to understand how the transformation of the landscape it entails created a new set of boundaries (gated communities, separate roads, security fences and checkpoints, jurisdictional and administrative lines) as well as interfaces (physical proximity, neighborhood and economic relations, patterns of commuting, employment centers, etc.) that simultaneously segregate and connect the various territorial and human components of the metropolitan fabric.
2. The political economy of settlements. The prevailing discourse sees settlement policy as part of a political "plan", executed by the Israeli state and the settlers' movement following an ethno-national territorial imperative of the "conquest of the land". Our focus seeks to adopt a more contextualized approach, which allows understanding the expansion of the settlements not as an exceptional phenomenon contradictory to other trends in Israeli society, but as a historical process shaped and influenced by broader and long-term changes in Israel's political-economy, such as privatization, deindustrialization and government retrenchment.

3. The identity of settlers. While so far the majority of academic research on the subject dealt with the (political) culture and identity of the ideological settlers' movement, we are interested in shifting the focus to other groups of Israelis living beyond the Green Line, and other sociopolitical and economic dynamics, including but not limited to personal and collective histories of various class and ethnic backgrounds, dynamics of place attachment, and inter and intra-communal relations.

4. Settlements in comparative perspective. Much of the discourse about Israel/Palestine stresses the unique history of the region and the exceptional features of the conflict that developed there. At the same time, and despite the diffusion of the concept of "settlers society," comparative research that explicitly focuses on the development of settlements remains scarce. The workshop thus aims to place the development of settlement policy in a broader comparative perspective, especially, though not exclusively, along the three thematic dimensions outlined above.

Program

Online program: [http://settlementsworkshop.wordpress.com/programme/](http://settlementsworkshop.wordpress.com/programme/)

The workshop took place during two days, and included an introductory session and five panels (each structured around three-four papers based on on-going or recent research), followed by a concluding roundtable. The workshop brought together different perspectives on the subject, as well as junior and senior scholars—the latter predominantly in the role of discussants—and is meant to be the first episode in a future series of events, aimed at establishing a continuous discussion among scholars working on these issues, and at developing collaborative projects.

The workshop includes 19 presentations in five thematic sessions, with total participation of 24 scholars (five discussants and 19 speakers) from five different countries (including four from the US and four from the EU):
Introduction

- Marco Allegra, University of Lisbon: *The Settlements in the West Bank (1967-2014): New Perspectives*

Session 1. Discussant: Ian Lustick, University of Pennsylvania

- David Newman, Ben Gurion University: *Settlement as Suburbanization: The Banality of Colonization*
- Erez Maggor, New York University: *State, Market and the Israeli Settlement: the Ministry of Housing and the Shift from Messianic Outposts to Urban Settlements in the 1980s*
- Mtanes Shihade, The Hebrew University: *The Welfare State of Settlers*
- Lee Cahaner, Oranim Academic College: *Ultra-Orthodox Settlements in Judea and Samaria*

Session 2. Discussant: Hadas Weiss, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies

- Hannah Mayne, University of Florida: *Personal Narratives of Female Settlers: Uncovering Alternative Routes and Networks*
- Callie Maidhof, UC Berkeley: *Legal Regimes of Difference and the Green Line*
- Shimi Friedman, Open University: *Hills, Farms, and the Local Council: A Heterogenic Society in Conflict at Southern Hebron Settlements*

Session 3. Discussant: Sandy Kedar, University of Haifa

- Johannes Becke, University of Oxford: *Taking Tiger Mountain by Strategy: Typological Theory and the Case for a Transnational Perspective on Israeli Expansionism*
- Shay Hazkani, New York University: *Settler March: Social Movements, States, and their Synergies in Settling Poznan and the West Bank*
- Ronen Ben-Arie, Haifa University: *The Civil Foundation of the Settlements in the West Bank: Past, Present and Future*

Session 4. Discussant: Dani Filc, Ben-Gurion University

- Dana Rubin, Open University UK and SOAS: *Haredi Settlers: Religion and Neoliberalism on the West Bank Frontier*
- Rivi Gillis, Tel Aviv University: *Religion, Class and Ethnicity in the Israeli Settlement Project*
- Sivan Hirsch-Hoefler, IDC and Haifa University: ‘Organized We Stand, Divided We Fall’: The Effect of Organizational Membership and Collective Identity on Radical Collective Action
Session 5. Discussant: Ronen Shamir, Tel Aviv University

- Ariel Handel, CRFJ: ‘Our Grapevines’ Life is Hard’: Terror and Territory-Making in the West Bank
- Haim Yacobi, Bezalel Academy, and Wendy Pullan, University of Cambridge: The geopolitics of Neighborhood: Jerusalem’s colonial space revisited
- Erez Tzfadia, Sapir College: The Grey Space of Israel’s Settlement in the West Bank

Workshop Output and Dissemination

We see the scholarly output of the workshop in two main areas:

1. Future publications. While the organization of the workshop is still at an early stage with respect to future publication activities, it is already clear to us that its themes are attracting considerable interest, and we are determined to pursue an ambitious publication plan in this respect. We are currently exploring the possibility of publishing a selection of papers from the workshop as a special issue in two different scholarly journals (English and Hebrew), as it is paramount for us to reach both the local academic environment and the wider audience of critical geographers worldwide. We have already received a declaration of interest from the editors of Theory and Criticism, Israel’s leading journal of critical theory (http://theory-and-criticism.vanleer.org.il/en/AboutJLS.aspx). We also aim at publishing a wider selection of papers in an edited volume. A book proposal will be submitted to a leading international publisher during 2014.

2. Networking and collaborative projects. The workshop sought to bring together a number of different scholars at different stages of their career and based in different countries. It is our intention to build on the network we are creating to develop further collaborative projects:

- The workshop website (http://settlementsworkshop.wordpress.com/), represents a pilot project that will allow us to later develop an open platform, designed to foster exchanges between scholars working on these themes, providing extensive web resources to a wider audience.

- The workshop will serve as forum to discuss future collective projects, including (but not limited to) the drafting of a proposal for an international research project on Israel’s settlement policy, to be submitted for funds in 2015.

- We aim to turn the workshop into an annual event, and to hold the next one in the West Bank, with the support of a local academic institution.
4.2 Political Economy Research Group

Director: Dr. Noam Yuran, Minerva Humanities Center

Scholars

Roy Kreitner: Faculty of Law, Tel Aviv University
Yuval Yonay: Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Haifa University
Michael Zakim: Department of History, Tel Aviv University
Anat Rosenberg: Radzyner School of Law, The Interdisciplinary Center Herzliya
Noam Maggor: Thomas Arnold Post-Doctoral Fellow in Historical Studies, Tel Aviv University
Rami Kaplan: Postdoctoral Fellow, School of Business and Economics, Frei Universit"at Berlin
Ricki Shiv: Department of History, Haifa University
Abigail Faust: Independent scholar

Students

Shaul Hayou: PhD candidate, The Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Sciences and Ideas
Oleg Komlik: PhD candidate, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ben Gurion University
Tahel Frosh: PhD student, Department of Literature, Ben Gurion University
Oz Gore: PhD candidate, Manchester Business School
Amnon Knoll: PhD candidate, School of Philosophy, Tel Aviv University

Visiting Members

Irene Tucker: Humanities Center, University of California, Irvine

Group activity

The Political Economy Research Group is an interdisciplinary group dedicated to a critical study of economics and economy. The group consists of scholars of sociology, history, psychology, philosophy, literature and law, and is guided by the idea that a cross-disciplinary perspective is essential for the understanding of contemporary economic reality and its genealogy. Our work is informed by three motivations: keeping up to date with current critical writing on economy; supporting and enriching ongoing projects of the group members; and our research topics in political economy. Among the members’ projects discussed this year were Anat Rosenberg’s study on the genealogy of consumer
economy from the perspective of law and literature; Michael Zakim’s book on the history of the business clerk; and Roy’s Kreitner’s research of the political history of the dollar. The main study themes we chose this year were the critical research of finance and classical political economy to early twentieth-century economic thought.

Classical and Early Twentieth-Century Economic Thought

Our interest in early modern economic thought was guided by the idea that the study of the history of economic thought is also a way to reopen philosophical-economic questions. The 1940s mark the beginning of the crystallization of orthodox economics—a process described among others by group member Yuval Yonay in his book *The Struggle Over the Soul of Economics*. This process gave shape to economics as a scientific discipline. At the same time, the obverse of this “scientification” of economics was the narrowing of the philosophical polemic that accompanied modern economic thought since its very inception. Throughout the crystallization of orthodox economics, questions that were once posed as philosophical were substituted by allegedly-technical ones. For classical and early neo-classical economics, a question such as “what is private property?”, even when posed in the context of an economic argument, was inseparable from the question “what is a human being?” or “what is society?” In contrast, in orthodox economics private property (or for that matter money, exchange, or commodities) appear as technical terms that require no interrogation.

Returning to classical and early twentieth-century economic thought we had two targets in mind. First, an understanding of the process of crystallization of orthodox economics. The exploration of the early background for this process served to present the technical form that economic discourse eventually took not simply as devoid of philosophical underpinnings, but as one specific philosophical choice, namely the choice of an individualist, utilitarian framework, that can retroactively appear as merely technical precisely because of its unequivocal victory. From a philosophical perspective, however, such a victory is itself scandalous, keeping in mind that philosophical polemics are not meant to be unequivocally decided. This presentation of the process of crystallization of orthodox economics underlines the ideological layer of contemporary economic thought, and the manner its progress is itself part of the practical expansion of market capitalist economy. Our second, parallel aim in returning to nineteenth and early twentieth-century economic thought was to reopen several philosophical questions that were closed during the crystallization of orthodoxy in economics. Yuval Yonay’s book, *The Struggle over the Soul of Economics*, provided us with a view on a critical phase in the crystallization of orthodox economics: the fall of the Institutional Framework from
its central position in American economics, up until as late as the 1940s, and the rise of the Neo-Classical Framework to an unprecedented status of complete dominance over the discipline. The book reconstructs several aspects of the debates that accompanied the fall of the former framework: debates over the method of economics, over the status of theory vs. empirical research, over the economic subject-matter, over the scope of economy, and more. Highly relevant to our interest was the recurring type of argumentation which sought justification for the new economic methodology by comparison with other branches of knowledge, mostly physics. The fact that this type of argumentation recurred in different form on both sides of the debate, raised the question whether this debate was already founded on a retreat from the idea of economics as a science of humankind, and thus entailed a narrowing down of the philosophical aspect of economic discourse and the emergence of its ideal as a technical science.

Our reading of classical economic thought consisted of Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* (which we read alongside Bernard Madeville’s *Fable of the Bees*) and John Stuart Mill’s *Principles of Political Economy*. In addition we read two texts from the later stages of the German historical school in economics, which we approached as one of the trajectories of thought whose banishment was part of the crystallization of economic orthodoxy: Werner Sombart’s *Luxury and Capitalism* and Max Weber’s *Economy and Society*.

In addressing classical economic thought we were looking both for the seeds of orthodox economic philosophy and for possibilities that go beyond it. We were interested in a dynamic view of the texts we engaged with, reading them as efforts to tame and contain elements that disrupted the formation of the economic perspective that were eventually removed from it. It is clear, for example, that Mill and Smith see economic relations as explicitly political. That is why Mill can span an elaborate hypothetical comparison between a form of communism and a system of private property (concluding that, although communism may appear to be a better system, it is unfair to compare it to the system of private property in its current, wretched state).

However, in our search of the way classical economic thought tames and contains disrupting elements, we were led to a category which upon first sight appears more endogenous to economic life rather than being explicitly political. One of the recurring themes that caught our eyes was the disturbing position that luxury, in various conceptualizations of the term, held for economic thought. Viewed in retrospect, classical political economy can be characterized by a drive to tame a threat that luxury consumption held for economic thought. This drive becomes evident in view of a certain shift from Mandeville to Adam Smith—the former’s influence on the latter being widely acknowledged. Mandeville’s fable describes how the vices (fraud, lust, vanity and more) in which his imaginary
hive is steeped were actually the secret engine of its economic thriving: how “private vices” became “public benefits”. It is often remarked that this fable, in a somewhat more subtle version, lies behind Adam Smith’s idea of the invisible hand and his affirmation of laissez faire economy. To quote one of the closest parallels to the fable, from the very beginning of Smith’s The Wealth of Nations: “It is not from the benevolence of the butcher the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity, but to their self-love”. However, in reading both texts together, what interested us was not such possible influence but rather what slipped away in the shift from Mandeville to Smith. Some of this is apparent on first reading: the vices in Mandeville’s fabled hive are much more intense than Smith’s invocation of “self love”. In discovering how vices actually propelled their economy, the hive dwellers found out that “the root of evil, avarice” was “slave to prodigality”; that luxury and pride employed millions of the poor; that envy and vanity “were ministers of industry”; and that fickleness “their darling folly” was “the very wheel that turn’d the trade”. However, upon closer inspection the difference between Smith and Mandeville is not just a difference in intensity but a more meaningful one. The vices that Mandeville acknowledges (envy, pride, fickleness) are in fact different from self-love because they are of an inherently social nature. Perhaps it is not the mere intensity of these vices that requires their taming in Smith’s more moderate version, but the fact that they point to an economy propelled not by egoism, but by hostile, competitive, social urges. In other words, what is avoided by Smith’s rewriting of Mandeville’s fable is the possibility of an economy where goods are inherently entangled with social relations.

We found a certain affirmation for this conjecture in turning to Sombart’s Luxury and Capitalism. This half-forgotten book raises a provocative speculation about the historical origins of capitalism, through a broad narrative, stretching back to the eleventh century. The origins of capitalism, claims Sombart, lie in the secularization of love during the late middle-ages. This secularization brought about a tension between free, sensual love and the institution of marriage, which led to the rise of a semi-formal class of illicit women, namely courtesans, concubines, etc. The rise of this class generated a demand for luxury goods, which required a greater investment of labor, and provided the initial driving force to capitalist production. To quote the concluding statement of the book: “Luxury, then, itself a legitimate child of illicit love, gave birth to capitalism”.

What struck us as deserving a further exploration is a certain theoretical balance sheet surrounding the concept of luxury. On the one hand, the rejection of envy, pride and luxury in Smith’s rewriting of Mandeville’s fable can be seen as an early seed of the egoistic but rational homo economicus central to the individualist methodology of orthodox economics. On the other hand, the category of luxury, which troubles the classical economic mind, allows Sombart to achieve what escapes orthodox economics, namely a historical conception of capitalism. Sombart provides a detailed account of
the rise of luxury production from the fifteenth century onward, in an attempt to empirically prove its significance to economic growth. In retrospect, however, one can also detect a conceptual advantage in this category as a key to historicizing economy. Luxury can provide such a key precisely because it disrupts the individualist-utilitarian framework of economics, presenting an economy that is deeply social, that is, an economy where the goods themselves are inherently social. Moreover, luxury, in Sombart’s conceptualization, is related to obscene gender relations, and in that sense provides an interesting possibility for a historical perspective of capitalism: a history propelled by the transformations of an obscene social kernel and its embodiments in goods. (For more on Sombart, see Noam Yuran’s discussion report below).

We found an additional perspective on such a possibility in Walter Benjamin’s *Arcade Project* and “The Paris of the Second Empire in Baudelaire”. We noted the importance Benjamin ascribes to luxury in his account of nineteenth century European capitalism. We read the fragmented text of the *Arcades* as an account of the confrontation with luxury as an experience of shock. Benjamin proved to be an excellent supplement to our reading in Sombart. Two associations appeared as deserving further research. The first is a more theoretical one: Benjamin’s writings make clear why luxury can serve as key to a historical view of capitalism, as he refers to luxury as goods that are not merely objects, but in way also include something of the subject. In Benjamin, luxury implies a certain subjective attitude, which nonetheless is not wholly transparent to the subjects themselves. Thus Benjamin writes of the Paris department store as a space where people are confronted with an alien image of themselves: “The customers perceive themselves as a mass; they are confronted with an assortment of goods”; “The flâneur is a man uprooted. He is at home neither in his class nor in his homeland, but only in the crowd […] The department store is the last promenade for the flâneur. There his fantasies were materialized”; “The crowd is the veil through which the familiar city beckons to the flâneur as phantasmagoria—now a landscape, now a room. Both become elements of the department store, which makes use of flânerie itself to sell goods”. To put this in more general terms: luxury can prove a fruitful category for historicizing capitalism, because by entailing a subjective attitude, it can also be seen as partaking in shaping subjects. What appears to be a promising line of investigation, which echoes some of the group members’ interests (especially Anat Rosenberg, Michael Zakim and Noam Yuran), is a reading of Benjamin as a materialist account of luxury, aided by Sombart’s broad historical speculation.

The second promising association we found between Benjamin and Sombart is of a more historical nature: the emphasis both put on the obscene underside of capitalist economy. While Sombart traces this obscene underside in the origin of luxury-production and its relation to illicit love, Benjamin explores it through his fascination with the prostitute as an emblematic figure of the commercial spaces of nineteenth-century Paris. Reading both texts together can contribute to a unique view on capitalism, which presents its basic economic categories—goods, money, exchange—as gendered.
Finance and Financialization

Our discussions of finance were a concluding chapter to our previous year's work (see the 2012-2013 report). We read two texts that offer diametrically opposed views on finance: Giovanni Arrighi’s *The Long Twentieth Century*, and Donald MacKenzie’s *An Engine, Not a Camera*. While the former sees financialization as inherent to capitalist systems, a recurring phase in the development of capitalist centers from profiting from production to financial profits, the latter sees finance as a specific historical phenomenon effected by the performative aspect of economic knowledge. Finance economy, according to MacKenzie, emerges as distinct reality as a result of the application of economic models developed for understanding finance. We found both approaches to be lacking. While Giovanni’s thesis lack the historical specificity that MacKenzie addresses, the latter fails to account for the question what are finance's unique characteristics that allow for its modeling in terms that distinguish it from other economic subfields.

Discussions of Group Members’ Work

Apart from our discussion of Yuval Yonay book, we held a discussion of Anat Rosenberg's work-in-progress on consumerism. We discussed a paper presented later this year in a workshop dedicated to the advent of consumerism in nineteenth-century England from an integrated legal and literary perspective. Discussing the relation between the two perspectives in the paper, in light of our study agenda this year, we arrived at the general formulation that literature articulates a traumatic kernel that troubles the legal discourse in its attempt to regulate the rising use of credit by married women (for more, see below).

Reading List

Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Time*


Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*

Werner Sombart, *Luxury and Capitalism*

Max Weber, *Economy and Society*

Walter Bejamin, *The Arcades Project*

Walter Benjamin, “Paris of the Second Empire in Baudelaire”

Yuval Yonay, *The Struggle over the Soul of Economics*

Anat Rosenberg, “Anchor the Consumption”

John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*
Summary of Discussions

Irene Tucker on John Stuart Mill, *Principles of Political Economy*

The political economy reading group's turn to Mill's *Principles of Political Economy* offered an opportunity to examine its own terms of self-definition. While the *Principles* is a relatively early work in Mill's remarkably expansive—and remarkably varied—oeuvre, a case can certainly be made that political rather than economic relations are most fundamental to his vision of human relations within modernity. What, then, does Mill understand the political role of economic relations to be, we asked. For Mill, the relations of producing, buying and consuming are in contingent, rather than necessary relations to one another. Given this irregularity of relations, economic action has the potential to focus as a kind of self-expression. But where Mill's seventeenth-century predecessor John Locke had understood the "expressiveness" of labor to turn upon both the usefulness of the property produced to others and upon its fungibility, Mill saw the particularity of economic activity to function as a means of protecting the fragile individuality of economic actors.

Noam Yuran on Werner Sombart, *Luxury and Capitalism*

While all group members were fascinated by this provocative attempt we were in dispute of how to approach it, some members preferred to read the book primarily as a historical record, attesting to anxieties raised by the spread of capitalism and the emergence of consumerism. They saw it as articulating such anxieties in a misogynistic terminology, that invokes the effeminizing effects of consumerism and modern economy (Michael Zakim's manuscript about the history of the business clerk addresses similar fears in a different context, namely nineteenth-century American capitalism, haunted by the threat that clerical work posed to masculinity). The book undoubtedly lends itself to such a reading (suffices to note a subchapter titled "The Triumph of Women"). Notwithstanding the validity of such a reading, others in the group suggested that it also deserves the effort to extract from it a possible historical explanation. As a historical account of the emergence of capitalism, Sombart's thesis has some unique advantages in comparison with other more familiar explanations:

Sombart links capitalism to a special type of commodity rather than seeing it merely as a system of production of commodities. This has the possible advantage of providing a more robust historical view of capitalism—a view that sees it embedded somehow in the goods produced in capitalist economies. In this view, capitalism is not just the method in which goods are produced, but is embedded in the goods themselves and the way we are surrounded by them in everyday life. In other words, Sombart
allows us to conceptualize capitalism not just as a system of production but also as a system of consumption. For that purpose, by choosing luxury as a key, Sombart’s book suggests understanding goods as involved with the shaping of subjectivity, serving as a horizon of expectations and attitudes of subjects. Furthermore, as Sombart situates the luxury good in a relation between the sexes, his book may help us point to the way capitalist goods are involved with shaping gender relations, gender identities etc.

**Anat Rosenberg, “Anchoring Consumption”**

Anat Rosenberg’s article, “Anchoring Consumption,” historicizes the emergence of a calculative attitude toward domestic consumption in nineteenth-century English legal discourse. It relies on George Gissing’s 1895 novel, *Eve’s Ransom*, to interpret legal developments visible in both high-court precedents and the social history of working-class consumer credit provided by the drapery trade. Historically, the calculative outlook on domestic consumption marked a break from older conceptualizations. The article traces the break in what was known as “the doctrine of necessaries,” which regulated the consumer credit of married women and, by implication, domestic consumption. The article shows how a status-based assessment of the luxuriousness of commodities gradually gave way to an assessment based on the rationality of budget management within daily household routines. An important difference between the two conceptualizations is that the new one signaled a refusal to discriminate between commodities. With its focus on budgeted daily life, it had little to say about choices within the budget. Retrospectively, the shift appears to have been responsive to pressures of capitalist expansion: one could read this history as yet another instance of the legal support of late-modern capitalism, particularly its indiscriminating consumerist culture. The article argues, however, that the shift was backward-looking. The guiding sentiment was a disciplinary attempt to contain, even delimit, the consumption of two groups whose threat loomed large: the working classes, and women. Culturally enabling the opposite—an indiscriminating consumerism—was almost a historical accident.

In our discussion we considered a variety of questions, such as the relation of this history to the creation of a credit consumer economy in general, and to the rise of impersonal sales, particularly in department stores; the history of the “fall of status” as an explanation or a result of the rise of a calculative mentality in law; and the relation of histories discussed by the group, such as Sombart’s and Veblen’s, to the reading developed in the article.
**Shaul Hayoun on Yuval Yonay, The Struggle over the Soul of Economics**

Yonay’s book presents the two main economic traditions in the inter-war period: the Institutionalist and the Neoclassical schools. More importantly, the book proposes a different perspective in analyzing these two poles. Yonay’s argument goes against the traditional dichotomous positioning of Institutionalist and Neoclassical economists prior to, and mostly after the First World War. Using concepts from the Sociology of Science, Yonay shows how, counter to common belief, Institutionalism has been much more than a marginal critical trend, and actually has been used productively in economic thought of leading economists. The book illustrates the struggle between the two schools in various fronts: the discussion over the question of “what is science”; Economics positioning amongst other sciences; the role of models in the explanation of reality; and the issue of efficiency and relevance in economic management. Yonay’s argument is not only one of specific historic economic thought, but also of advance in science, and specifically in social science. His insights may therefore be relevant to our days as well as to the first half of the twentieth century.

**Noam Maggor on Giovanni Arrighi, The Long Twentieth Century**

The book is most notable for its influential reading of Fernand Braudel as a general framework for understanding the history of capitalism over the past five hundred years. Using a broad temporal perspective (longue durée) and a creative reinterpretation of the Marxist formula M-C-M, Arrighi identifies a recurring historical pattern in which the rise of financial capital marks pivotal moments of economic transition. As financial capital is redeployed into new fields, it triggers massive cycles of restructuring. Each cycle produces new spatial patterns and recasts the relationship between market actors and political institutions. Arrighi’s analysis suggests that “financialization” is not a recent phenomenon but in fact an integral part of the history of capitalism from its inception. Whereas participants in the seminar were excited about the historically-grounded theoretical approach, they found the implementation of this framework, particularly the chapter on the rise of modern capitalism in the United States, to be disappointing and too steeped in outdated paradigms.

**Oz Gore on Donald MacKenzie, An Engine, Not a Camera**

We turned to MacKenzie as one of the leading figures in the study of finance through the application of the analytical tools developed in science and technology studies. The book, which describes the effects of economic theories developed at the Chicago University on the activity of traders, is a prime
example of one of the central theories in this branch of knowledge, namely the performativity of economics. Our discussion concerned MacKenzie’s argument and his type of validation, as well as the question of performativity at large. What interested us was the measure of “openness” of such arguments: the question whether any economic model can be performatively effective or rather there are ontological or epistemological criteria for models that can have such effects. If the latter case is true, some argued, then it might point to a certain weakness of the performativity framework. We also discussed the relation between economic theories, moral justifications and political frameworks in light of the performativity theory.

Bios and Research Activities: Scholars

Noam Yuran (Director)
(Please see bio under Lexicon Group Scholars)

Michael Zakim

Publications


“Capitalism as Progress;” Odyssey, no. 22 (January 2014), in Hebrew.

Additional academic Activity

Joined the editorial board of *Men's Critical Fashion*.

Presentations at the Hebrew University, University of Chicago, Michigan University, and Stockholm University.

Roy Kreitner

Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs at the Faculty of Law at Tel Aviv University. He teaches in the fields of private law, legal history, law and political thought, and the legal and economic foundations of capitalism. He is the author of *Calculating Promises: The Emergence of Modern American Contract Doctrine* (Stanford University Press, 2007). In 2009-2010 he was a fellow at the Radcliffe Institute at Harvard University and an ACLS Fellow, and in 2010-11 he was a visiting researcher at the Institute for Global Law and Policy at Harvard Law School. He is currently working on a book on the history of money in the U.S. from the Civil War until World War I, titled *The Political Career of the Dollar*.

Publications


Work in progress

“Markets, Morals, and Contracts”: an article on current contract theory and its attempts to work out a morality of markets.

*The Political Career of the Dollar*: a book on the history of money in the U.S. from the Civil War until World War I.

Organized Conferences

Fifth Annual Berg Conference: The Arts in Legal History, Tel Aviv University (June 2014) (with Anat Rosenberg and Chris Tomlins).
Anat Rosenberg
Assistant professor at the Radzyner School of Law, the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya.
Anat’s research interests focus on liberal thought in late modernity and liberalism critique, cultural representations of modern market society, the history of consumer culture in late modernity, contract law and perceptions of the contracting individual, the promise of marriage, and the historical interrelations of law and literature as genres. She is currently working on a cultural legal history of consumer credit.

Publications

Conferences Organized
Fifth Annual Berg Conference: The Arts in Legal History, Tel Aviv University (June 2014) (with Roy Kreitner and Chris Tomlins).

Yuval Yonay
Senior lecturer in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Haifa. He is the author of The Struggle over the Soul of Economics (Princeton University Press, 1988).

Publications


Irene Tucker
Professor of English at the University of California, Irvine. She specializes in the theory and criticism of Victorian literature and culture.

Publications


“Parting Ways with Judith Butler’s Secular Identitarianism: A Brief Genealogy of Jewish Republicanism,” (under review, Representations)

Conference Papers

Response to Ravit Reichman, "Property: Sacred and Mundane," The Arts in Legal History conference, The Berg Institute for Law and History, Buchman Faculty of Law, Tel Aviv University, June 22-23.

“A Brief Genealogy of Jewish Republicanism,” Tel Aviv University English Dept. Faculty Seminar, March 20, 2014.

Noam Maggor
Historian of the United States in the 19th century, with a particular emphasis on the rise of capitalism. His book manuscript, Brahmin Capitalism: Bankers, Populists, and the Making of the Modern American Economy (under contract with Harvard University Press), is a finance-driven and urban-centered account of the transformation of American capitalism at the end of the nineteenth century. Maggor is currently the Thomas Arthur Arnold Fellow in the School of Historical Studies at Tel Aviv University. He was previously a Senior Lecturer in the Department of History at Vanderbilt University. He received his PhD from Harvard University in 2010 and his BA from Columbia University in 2003.

Review essays

Rami Kaplan
Dahlem Research School and Israel Science Foundation postdoctoral fellow at the School of Business and Economics in Freie Universität Berlin. He is working on a book length manuscript entitled The History of Corporate Responsibility: 1900-2010 for Columbia University Press.

Work in Progress
“Who has been regulating whom: An Inquiry into the mid-20th-century institutionalization project of ‘corporate responsibility’ in the United States.” In review process in Socio-Economic Review.

Bios and Research Activities: Students

Oz Gore
PhD candidate in management in Manchester University. During the previous year he participated in two workshops in Bruno Latour’s project “An Inquiry into Modes of Existence: An Anthropology of the Moderns”, which focused on an attempt to redefine the concepts of economy and of accounting, using theoretical tools of actor network theory and process philosophy.

Publications

Workshops
Participated in two workshops in Bruno Latour’s project “An Inquiry into Modes of Existence: An Anthropology of the Moderns”.

Oleg Komlik
PhD Candidate in Economic Sociology in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology and a Lecturer in the School of Behavioral Sciences at the College of Management Academic Studies. In his doctoral dissertation Oleg focuses on the socio-political foundations of the Israeli banking system and analyzes the institutional relationship between Israeli banks and the state agencies throughout the years. He is the founder and editor of the global online academic community of Economic Sociology and Political Economy which brings together more than 19,000 researchers, students and practitioners from 90 countries, aiming to disseminate the insights of Socio-Political research of the economy to the public and academics.
Conferences and Workshops


The 11th SCANCOR International PhD Workshop on Institutional Theory, Hebrew University, January 5-9, 2014.

Invited participant to the workshop “Work Motivation and Work Culture”, Transilvania University of Brasov, Romania, June 27, 2013.

“Between Work and Family: Look at the Changing Reality”, the 45th Annual Meeting of the Israeli Sociological Society, Organizing Committee Member, Tel Aviv University, February 2-3, 2014


Shaul Hayoun

PhD candidate at the Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, where he had also completed his MA in 2012 (summa cum laude). At the background of his academic research is a professional career of 15 years in capital markets, as a securities lawyer. His research is aimed at introducing a structural semiotic perspective to financial accounting theory. He is evaluating the feasibility and potential of treating contemporary financial accounting, under IFRS and US GAAP, as a semiotic system as envisioned by Ferdinand de Saussure and his main followers (including Roland Barthes and Louis Hjelmslev). His broader research interests include, on the one hand, critical accounting theory, financial regulation and social studies of finance, and, on the other hand, philosophy of language, semiotics and structuralism. He is specifically engaged in pursuing a productive interrelation between these two distinct spheres.

Conferences

Ricki Shiv
Completed a BA in economics and accounting and an MA in business management at Tel Aviv University. She has completed an MA at the Cohn Institute of the History and Philosophy of Sciences and Ideas at Tel Aviv University. She has completed her PhD at the Department of Sociology in Haifa University, where she has written about the discourse of social rights and distributive justice in Israel. She teaches at the History Department in Haifa University, and specializes in the history of economic thought and the political economy of Israel.

Publications

Amnon Knoll
PhD candidate in the School of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University, and holds an MA (summa cum laude) in philosophy from Tel Aviv University. His research interests are political philosophy, deliberative and radical democracy, discourse ethics and argumentation and public controversies.

Conferences

“Experts discourse, public knowledge and political legitimacy: the social protest and deliberative democracy”. The 14th annual conference of the Israeli Society for History & Philosophy of Science (ISHPS), Jerusalem. 2013

Tahel Frosh
Poet, psychotherapist, activist and a PhD student in the Department of Literature at Ben Gurion University. She has completed her MA in the Department of Psychology at Haifa University, and in her thesis she developed a model explaining the dynamics of greed on psychological, sociological and philosophical terms. Her poetry book Avarice was published in the Bialik Institute Press.

Abigail Faust
Alumni of the Interdisciplinary Program for Outstanding Students at Tel-Aviv University. She completed her MA studies at Meitar Center for Advanced Legal Studies and is currently practicing commercial litigation at a leading law firm. Her fields of interest are legal theory (notably theory of private law), political philosophy and the history of capitalism.
4.3 Photo-Lexic Research Group

Director: Dr. Ruthie Ginsburg


Aim and Rationale
The Photo-Lexic research group examines concepts related to photography and seeks to think through them about photography as a political practice. The group is composed of members who come from different fields, including visual culture studies, political theory, gender studies, art history, history, and philosophy, some of whom work as professional photographers and curators. The different backgrounds of the members contribute to the development of concepts pertaining to photography and visual culture from various angles.

Group Meetings
The Group meetings during the 2013-14 academic year took place at Tel Aviv University. These long sessions, which last five hours, have two main parts. The first is a presentation and discussion that revolves around a selected text. In the second part, the group meets an expert who presents his or her work that and its connection to photography.

In relation to the our collective research on the political and philosophical theory of space, the first semester was devoted to reading texts on the topic of utopia. The intention of the reading was to understand the topic of utopia in the context of a political project that is developed based on civil imagination, much like photography (Ariella Azoulay, Civil Imagination [New York: Verso, 2012]). The texts that were presented and discussed included Foucault, “Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias” (1984); Jameson, “The Politics of Utopia” (2004); Baudrillard, America (1986); and Anderson, “Transcending Without Transcendence” (2006). At the beginning of the second semester, the Photo-Lexic group together with the Political and Philosophical Theory of Space group held a joint meeting, in which we elaborated on the connection between utopia, history, and creative representation, such as in art. We did this through Hayden White’s text “The Modernist Event” and the exhibition Histories, curated by Political Lexicon group member Udi Edelman at the Israeli Center for Digital Art, Holon. Edelman and artist Yael Frank presented their work and connected it to our conversation on history, art, and utopia.
In the second semester the group focused on reading Vilém Flusser’s *Towards a Philosophy of Photography*. The aim of the reading was to collect new concepts related to photography for the next *Mafte’akh/Photo-Lexic* issue. In the second half of our meetings, we met experts such as Advocate Michael Sfard, who specializes in human rights litigation, who explained the role of photography in court, specifically in the context of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. A representative from the IDF (Israeli Defence Force) archive presented her how she works with photographs, describing the logic of selection, categorization, and registration in the IDF archive. A high-ranked officer from the IDF drone squadron also talked about his work. He described the development of drone technology and its use in the Israeli military forces by demonstrating its visual performance. Another guest was manager of the NGO Videre, who presented the organization’s work. Videre, a Human Rights organization that works in violent and remote regions at Africa, collects evidence of human rights violations through hidden cameras. In order to protect their sources, the organization operates in the public sphere differently than “regular” human rights organizations. Finally, a representative of the Israeli police explained the work of solving criminal assaults through the help of photographs.

**Special Event: Launch of Mafte’akh Photo-Lexic Issue**

The Photo-Lexic group launched a special issue of *Mafte’akh* (vol. 7) devoted to photographic concepts. The event took place at the café-bookshop *Tolaat Sfarim* in Tel Aviv, and was attended by over 40 people. Contributing members who presented their work included Hagit Keysar, Moran Shoub, Chava Brownfield-Stein, Aïm Deüelle Lüski, and Ruthie Ginsburg.
Academic Activities of Group Members

Ruthie Ginsburg: Director
(Please see bio in list of Lexicon Group members above)

Scholars

Ya’arah Gil-Glazer
Research areas: Socially engaged photography, art and other expressions of visual culture in the 20th and 21st centuries; photographs as cultural-historical documents; image-text relations; socially engaged art education.

Publications
“Photo-monologue”. Mafté’akh 7 (Winter 2014).


Conference Papers


Other Activities
Judging committee of the “Local Testimony #10—The Annual Israeli Photojournalism Exhibition.”
Chava Brownfield-Stein
Research Areas: Gender studies, visual culture, cultural studies, photography theory, political thought.

Conferences


Publications
“Capture”. Mafte’akh 7 (Winter 2014).

Artists and curators

Moran Shoub
Areas of research: Art, Photography, Curatorial Work, Sound Art, Art Criticism.

Publications
“Aerial Photography (Aerial decoding)”. Mafte’akh 7 (Winter 2014).

Curatorial Work


Exhibitions
Participated as a photographer at the “Moby Dick exhibition” (curator: Dalit Matityahu). Tel-Aviv Museum of Art, May-August 2013.

Participated as a researcher-writer-performer at the “Contact Point Project” (director: Renana Raz). Israel Museum, Jerusalem, July 2013.
**Ayelet Carmi**
Research areas: American Studies, Gender, Photography Theory, Reception Theory, Art History, Visual Culture.

**Publications**

**Conference Papers**


**Miki Kratsman**
Research areas: Photography, photojournalism, visual pedagogy, art.

**Publications**

**Gilad Reich**
Research areas: Art, curator, gender, photography, critical theory, visual activism, neo-liberalism politics, culture studies.

**Curatorial Work**

**Residency**
Art center Para-Site, Hong Kong, 2014.
Invited talks and Conference Papers

Invited lecture at the Times museum Guangzhou, China, 2014.

“Imagine Work!”. Invited guest in a session at the Spin Center, Brussels, September 21, 2013.


Students

Hagit Keysar

Research areas include ideas and practices of an open-source community, one which invents tools and methods for imagining and connecting invisible dots between science, technology and political participation.

Publications

“Aerial Photography (Community)”. Mafte’akh 7 (Winter 2014).

Conference Papers


Citizen Cyberscience Summit, UCL and Royal geographic Society UK, February 2014.

The annual conference of the political science Israeli association, Ben-Gurion University at the Negev, 2014.

Learning from Jerusalem international workshop, French Research Center Jerusalem, May 2014.

Open Hardware Summit, Rome, Italy, September 2014.
1. Rationale

Last year witnessed a significant expansion of the work of this department, both horizontally and vertically. Horizontally in the sense of starting another two major projects: The Religious-Secular project, a joint project with other three universities from around the world, and the Cohn-Minerva project on Globalization and the Crisis of the Humanities. The vertical expansion refers to the fact that those new sub-groups that developed out of discussions in the core group now stand on their own. Apart from that, during the last year we maintained the three-tier format of our activities. The first tier is the core reading and discussion group, comprised of graduate and post-graduate scholars that meet on a bi-weekly basis to read and discuss various texts on citizenship, identity, and modes of living together. The theme of the past year was nationalism. In addition, members are encouraged to initiate their own projects and workshops, and in fact, as mentioned above we had, two new sub-groups emerge this past year. The second tier of activity aims to bring researchers from other universities to partake in concentrated and focused workshops that provide a platform for gathering together scholars from different academic institutions in Israel, and to exchange ideas, thoughts and projects. The third tier aims to make intellectual interventions in contemporary public debates that occupy Israeli society in general. In this regard we initiated several conferences, speaker series, and lectures. In addition, we placed more attention on the importance of documentation, and as a result have documented most of our events by video, and are currently in the process of transferring them into print as well.

2. Core Research Group

2.1 Core Group Members

Raef Zreik is the director of the Living Together project at the Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University. He is a graduate of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (LLB 1988; LLM magna cum laude 1997), Columbia Law School (LLM 2001), and the Harvard Law School (SJD 2007), where he wrote a dissertation on Kant’s concept of right. Zreik served as visiting professor at Georgetown Law School, taught as adjunct at the Universities of Haifa and Tel Aviv’s law schools, and was a researcher at the

**Muhammad Abu Samra** is a Post-Doctoral fellow at the Minerva Humanities Center as part of the joint project on Globalization and the Crisis of the Humanities. He completed his PhD in the Department of Middle Eastern History at the University of Haifa, with a dissertation titled "Attitudes to the Qur’an in Contemporary Arab Islamic Thought: Modernists and Liberals". He is currently teaching at the David Yellin College, and served as visiting lecturer at Queen’s University, Kingston, Ontario, and at Knox College in Galesburg, Illinois. Among his publications are "Islamic Modernism and the Invention of the Written Qur’an Tradition", in *Zmanim: A Historical Quarterly* (2013); "Liberal Critics: ‘Ulama’ and the Debate on Islam in the Contemporary Arab World", in *Facing Modernity: Rethinking ‘Ulama’ in the Arab Middle East* (edited by Meir Hatina, E.J. Brill, 2009). At the Minerva Humanities Center he studies the attitudes of modern Arab Muslim thinkers to the Islamic tradition and its authority and role in studying and interpreting the Qur’an.

**Ronen Ben-Arie** is a PhD candidate at the Division of Government and Political Theory, School of Political Sciences, University of Haifa, and a research fellow at the Minerva Humanities Center. Ben-Arie’s dissertation explores the concepts of resistance in the political thought of Gilles Deleuze and Michel Foucault, as a basis for thinking of possibilities for change of social and political order. At the Minerva Humanities Center Ben-Arie directs the Spaces of Living Together research group (see below), which explores modes and practices of control and resistance in heterogeneous urban spaces in Israel/Palestine. Ben-Arie is also a member of the research group on the Political and Philosophical Theory of Space, part of the Lexicon for Political Theory group at the Minerva Center. His Areas of research include spatialities of power, resistance and change in contemporary political theory and continental philosophy; shared and mixed urban spaces; the politics and materiality of everyday life; and the political, ethical and professional manifestations and implications of alternative planning.
He explores these issues with a focus on concepts of citizenship and nationality, through the cases of heterogeneous urban spaces in Israel-Palestine and civic planning in the context of the unrecognized Bedouin villages in the Negev.

**Moria Ben Barak** is a PhD candidate at the Department of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University. Her dissertation title is "Eco-Pessimism: Schopenhauer as Environmental Philosopher". She has completed her BA in philosophy (cum laude) and management and her MA in philosophy (magna cum laude) at Tel Aviv University. She was a research assistant at the Minerva Humanities Center and a teaching assistant at the Philosophy Department at Tel Aviv University, as well as a journalist in the fields of culture, literature and health. She is currently conducting research at the Humboldt University, Berlin.

**Azar Dakwar** is the co-director of the Shared Public Space project at Sikkuy: The Association for the Advancement of Civic Equality, and is currently studying towards an MA in philosophy at Tel Aviv University. He holds a BA in cognitive sciences and life sciences (Hons.) from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In 2012, he was awarded an MA in public policy with a thesis in political sociology from the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin. His thesis explored the mutual exclusivity of liberal citizenship and identity politics as collective action strategies among ethno-cultural minorities in hegemonic societies. For the past six years, Dakwar has worked as a research assistant and teaching fellow with various academics and universities and interned for the European Union. He takes interest in the nexus of political theory, political sociology and sovereignty.

**Keren Dotan** is a doctoral candidate at NYU, writing her dissertation in Israel. She is a former lawyer (LLB), with BA degrees in economics and psychology (summa cum laude) and an MA in literature (summa cum laude), all from Tel Aviv University. She worked as an editor in Haaretz newspaper and in the literary quarterly Mitaam. Her dissertation engages with Jewish Mizrahi writers in the beginning of the twentieth century, and she is primarily interested in questions of modernity, Mizrahi identity, and the critique of secularism.

**Abed Kanaaneh** is a PhD candidate at the school of Historical Studies at Tel Aviv University. He holds both a BA and an MA in Political Science from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His dissertation title is “Hezbollah in Lebanon: Al-Muqawama (Resistance) as a Contra-Hegemonic Project”. Kanaaneh’s MA thesis title was “Al-Muqawama (Resistance): Metamorphosis of an Idea into Culture”.
Uri Landesberg studied philosophy and history at Tel Aviv University and Paris. He is currently completing his MA in philosophy. Landesberg specializes in phenomenology, post-Hegelian thought, and philosophical anthropology, with a strong emphasis on contemporary social, ethical and psychoanalytic thinking and education. He has participated in workshops in Weimar, Jerusalem, and Tel Aviv on the history of concepts and modern European culture. Landesberg is also a member of the Lexicon for Political Theory at the Minerva Humanities Center.

Asher Levy is a PhD candidate at the Department of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University. He completed his BA and MA in philosophy at Tel Aviv University (Hons.). The title of his dissertation is “The Excessive Oppression in School and the Ways to Prevent it: A Philosophical Discourse”. Levy is exploring the influences of great philosophers from different periods on the formation of the education system as an oppressive system, and is interested in finding alternative educational venues for liberating it. As deputy-director of the Israeli Community Centers Association, he initiated and managed an alternative education network which offered students, marginalized by the system, tangible opportunity for success. Levy is also a scholar of cinematic theory, founder of the Israeli Cinematheque, and a sports commentator. Today he serves as the chairperson of the Israeli Association for Adults Education.

Gal Levy holds a BA in economics and political science, an MA in political science from Tel Aviv University, and a PhD in political science from the University of London (LSE). Levy is a senior teaching faculty at the Open University, where he studies the relationships between education, ethnicity, religion and citizenship. He published on ethnic politics and education, the education reform and the Palestinian society, and ethnic and class voting and on citizenship after the 2011 social protests. His chapter on “Contested Citizenship of the Arab Spring and Beyond” is forthcoming in 2014 in The Routledge Handbook of Global Citizenship Studies (edited by E.F. Isin and P. Nyers). His current research deals with alternative education in the Palestinian society in Israel (Israel Science Foundation grant no. 217/09), acts of citizenship in the Arab and Jewish societies, and urban citizenship since 2011.

Guy Lurie recently received his PhD in history from Georgetown University, which he attended with the aid of the Foreign Fulbright Doctorate Fellowship. Before going to Georgetown he completed his law degree (LLB) at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and served as the coordinator of a governmental commission headed by a former Chief Justice of Israel’s Supreme Court, Justice Meir Shamgar. Lurie’s doctoral dissertation focused on citizenship in later medieval France (c. 1370–1480), and examined conceptions and practices of citizenship not only in the realm as a whole, but also in
the towns of Champagne, in Brittany and in Dauphiné. Lurie serves in the research staff of the Israel Democracy Institute. His publications include articles in peer-reviewed journals and policy papers published by the Israel Democracy Institute.

**Revital Madar** is an MA student in the Department of Philosophy at Tel-Aviv University. She is currently working on her thesis under the direction of Prof. Adi Ophir. Madar is writing on the concept of revenge in the thought of Nietzsche, as a key metaphysical concept. The motivation to work on that concept evolved from questions regarding the possibility of reversibility and translation, as well as of interest in questions regarding difference and repetition. She is also a part of the research group the Lexicon for Political Theory at the Minerva Humanities Center, and directs a subgroup Mutual Performance of Sexism and Racism (see below). Her areas of research are modern and contemporary philosophy (Nietzsche, Derrida, Deleuze and Bataille), political thought, feminist and postcolonial thought, questions of translation, repetition and difference, and fashion with relation to questions of identity, body and repetition.

**Yoav Meyrav** is a doctoral candidate at the School of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University, where he also teaches. The title of his dissertation is “Themistius’ Paraphrase of Aristotle’s Metaphysics Lambda in the Medieval Arabic and Hebrew Traditions”. His primary field of interest is the transition of Greek philosophy to the Arabic and Hebrew worlds. He is also interested in the relationship between metaphysics, ethics, and politics, in philosophy of religion, and in secularism.

**Nitzan Rothem** is a post-doctoral fellow in the Martin Buber Society of Fellows in the Humanities and Social Sciences at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She examines the mutual commitment between the individual and society in late-modernity. She finds a current shift in the patterns of commitment, and suggests that there is a moral and conceptual movement from solidarity to responsibility and from self-sacrifice to emotional containment. Rothem is a researcher of the relations between the military and society. She discusses the cultural attitudes to military suicide, and of soldiers returning from captivity in Israel and the United States.

**Shaul Setter** received his PhD from the Department of Comparative Literature at UC Berkeley. He currently teaches literature at Tel Aviv University and Sapir College and theory at Bezalel Academy of Art and Design. He studies the relationships between textual and artistic projects and political thought and practice, between the Middle East and Europe. His current work examines anti-colonial textual-political projects in Israel/Palestine in the 1960s and 70s.
Tomer Shadmy is a direct track PhD candidate at the Zvi Meitar Center for Advanced Legal Studies at Tel Aviv University, a doctoral Fellow at the Global Trust research project, and a scholar at The Israel Democracy Institute. In 2013, Tomer received the Dan David prize Scholarship, and in 2012 she received the Law, Transnational Space and Human Rights Research Grant. Tomer received her LLB (magna cum laude, with hons.) from Tel Aviv University in 2005. During 2009-2010 she was a visiting researcher at Sciences Po (Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Paris).

Sigal Shahav is writing a dissertation under the supervision of Supreme Court justice Prof. Daphne Barak-Erez and Prof. Shai Lavi on “The Social and Constitutional Implications of Adjudicating Terrorists Suspects: A Comparison of General Criminal Law Procedure and Specific Terrorist Law”. Shahav received her LL.B. and LL.M. (cum laude) from the Buchmann Faculty of Law, Tel-Aviv University. Her fields of interests are criminal law, criminal procedure, human rights and social change, law and society, and law and politics. Shahav joined the PhD program after many years as a practitioner in the field, practicing criminal law and representing delinquent youth through legal aid, and as a legal advisor for the Association for Civil Rights in Israel and the National Council for Child Welfare. In these positions she represented suspects and prisoners, lobbied the Knesset, and wrote, discussed, and worked on the following subjects: promoting prisoners’ rights, advocating against police violence, imploring for improved legal procedures in the Israel Defense Force, supporting the duty of legal representation in criminal proceedings, blocking police privatization, critiquing the Communication Data Law, adjudicating Terrorists Suspects, and using video conference in criminal proceedings.

Chen Strass is a PhD candidate at the Department of Hebrew Literature at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, where she also teaches. She holds a BA in Hebrew literature and behavioral sciences (cum laude) and MA in Hebrew literature (magna cum laude). Strass is writing her dissertation on representations of space and vision in the prose of Israeli authors Yehoshua Kenaz and Yeshayahu Koren. Her interests include poetics and politics of space and representations of vision and power in modern literature. Her MA thesis dealt with the literature of the Kibbutz and the third Aliyah (the third wave of immigration to the land of Israel). She is the coordinator of the “Living Together” group at the Minerva Humanities Center and a literary critic in Haaretz newspaper.

Eran Tzin is a post-doctoral fellow at the Department of Sociology, Political Science and Communication in the Open University. As a post-doctoral fellow, Tzin is researching the demand for the “right to the city” following the summer 2011 social protest. His doctorate, which was supervised by Prof. Oren Yiftachel and Prof. Uri Ram, dealt with the production of space in the globalizing city of Tel Aviv-Jaffa. By profession, Tzin is a lawyer. In concomitant with his PhD studies, Tzin worked as a
director of the law-clinic for Social and Environmental Change at the College for Law and Business. Amer Dahamshe is a post-doctoral fellow at The Minerva Humanities Center at Tel-Aviv University. He is a graduate of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (BA, MA, and PhD). His research fields are the discourse of Palestinian-Arab geographical names, representation of the Hebrew and the Arabic in the public road signs, and the discourse of the identity of the place as reflected in oral art, historical memoirs, literature and the linguistic landscape. Dahamshe has published several articles in his topic, and his first book will be published under the supervision of the Heksherim Institute for Jewish and Hebrew Literature and Culture, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. Amer's research project in his post Doctorate is titled The Untold Story: Comparison of Hebrew and Arabic Names of Natural Features. In his research he will address the Hebrew names of natural features in the Galilee and the Arabic names that were used for the same places by comparing between sources, topics and characteristics of the names in the two languages. By using structural analysis and the approach of critical toponymy, he aims to introduce the history of the spatial environment and its organization, the transformations that occurred in producing space, and its identity that resulted from historical-political changes.

2.2 Biweekly Group Meetings

During the 2013-4 academic year, the group, whose members come from the fields of law, political science, philosophy, sociology, literature, history, education and culture studies explored questions regarding the affinities between nationalism, colonialism, society, identity and political belonging.

2.2.1 First Semester: Nationalism and Nation-Making

The first semester was dedicated to a reading of basic theoretical writings dealing with nationalism, nation-making and national identity. Our aim was to explore the sources of the historical and sociological concept of nationalism and investigate the central attitudes toward nationalism in the western discourse. Among other things, we discussed and criticized the common distinction between “liberal-democratic” nationalism and “ethnic” nationalism, and its implication for the categorization of national identity and politics. Special focus was directed at questions regarding the materialist aspect of nationalism and its relation to modernity and industrialism. We discussed the advantages of the Marxist approach toward nationalism but also tried to problematize the Marxist axioms, and think of ways to connect the materialist approach to modes of living together that we addressed in the previous year. We completed the first semester with a theoretical shift to a different approach toward nationalism, which traces the origins of nationality in the pre-modern period, and discussed the tension between the Marxist approach to nationalism and this latter one.
Reading List


Summary of Selected Meetings

November 27th, 2014


In this meeting we discussed Ernest Gellners’ canonical text *Nations and Nationalism*, an important milestone in the study of nationalism, alongside the writings of Gellner’s colleagues from the modernist school, Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities*, and Eric Hobsbawm’s *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. We addressed the fundamental axioms of the modernist school in the study of nationalism. Our discussion focused on the relationship between nationality, modernity and industrialism, and the project of homogenization of the national society and identity through industrialism and education. A critique of Gellners’ thesis was raised regarding the level of homogeneity embedded in nationalist society and its economic structure. We discussed Gellner’s overlooking of secondary markets and marginal locations and structures in nationalist society itself, despite its intensive efforts of homogenization.

Another issue that was broadly discussed, following Gellner’s main argument, was the relations between the nation and the nation-state, and the consciousness of the necessity of a nation state as a vehicle for connecting the nation to a future nation-state. Following Gellner and Charles Taylor,
we elaborated on the status of the citizen in the capitalist-nationalist array of commodities, and suggested reading it as a shift from pre-modernity to modernity, from particular belonging to citizenship, and from use value to exchange value. Following this categorization we also suggested a different approach, which address nationalism from the perspective of eastern and other countries that became nationalist through the process of de-colonization. Through Gellner’s text we also continued our discussion of the topics of dignity and respect, which the group addressed thoroughly in the previous year.

December 19th, 2014

Speaker: Keren Dotan.

Adrian Hastings’ book traces nationalism back to pre-modernity, much earlier than the modern explanations to nationalism we encountered so far. While Marxist thinkers, such as Hobsbawm, Gellner, Anderson, and others that we read earlier in the semester dated the beginning of the national idea to the 18th century, with the rise of capitalism in Europe, Hastings traces its roots already in the 11th century. This allows Hastings to replace the Marxist explanation of nationalism with a theological one. Thus, for instance, he offers that it was the bible which provided Europe with national ideals, including, but not limited to, the idea of “the chosen people”. Furthermore, he claims that translating the bible to vernacular languages, thereby thus transforming these vernacular dialects into written languages, contributed significantly to the national awareness of European peoples. Overall, Hastings’ approach dramatically changed the discussion within the group, and allowed us to reflect back on the limitation of the texts we read so far, and account for the implications of a pre-modern explanation to nationalism: how does it open the theory on nationalism to contexts outside Europe?

2.2.2 Second Semester: Nationalism, Colonialism and Religion

The second semester was dedicated to a reading of various texts dealing with nationalism from the perspective of colonialism, post-colonialism and religion. We chose to broaden our discussion and deviate from the conservative western-modernist discourse on nationality, to address the tense relationship between nationalism and religion, the political and the theological, West and East.

Reading list


**Summary of Selected Meetings**

**April 9th, 2014**

**Guest speaker:** Prof. Gil Anidjar

Gil Anidjar, professor at the Departments of Religion and Middle Eastern, South Asian, and African Studies (MESAAS) at Columbia University, participated in this special meeting of the Living Together and Globalization and the Crisis of Humanities groups. He discussed his groundbreaking book *The Jew, the Arab: A History of the Enemy* (Stanford University Press, 2003), and his new book *Blood: A Critique of Christianity* (Columbia University Press, 2014). Among the topics raised in this meeting were the European constitution of the categories of the Jew and Arab, the relationship between secularism and colonialism, and the possible transformation of the critique of secularism to a critique of Christianity.

**May 28th, 2014**

**Texts:**


Toward the end of the semester we discussed the writings of scholars and leaders from the Muslim world, which present different approaches and ideologies of the relations between nationalism and religion and between the political-governmental and the theological. We discussed those contradictory attitudes and elaborated on the opposition between the political theology suggested by Khomeini and the call for Arabic (nationalist-secular) unity of Al-Husri. In this context, we addressed the distinction between politics and solidarity which rise from Al-Husri’s text, and his argument that the two unities (Arabic and Muslim) are not mutually exclusive. Saunders’s essay, “The Ummah as Nation” stimulated questions regarding the role religion plays in nationalism in contemporary Islam, and the mutual attributes of Arab nationalism and Zionism—a topic we intend to develop next year.

2.3 Group Members’ Publications and Research Activities

Raef Zreik


Muhammad Abu Samra

Conference Papers

Ronen Ben-Arie


Conferences and Seminars


Amer Dahamshe


**Conference Papers**


“Regional Continuity and Discontinuity in the Municipal Space: Languages and Names in the Welcome Signs of Arab Villages.” Paper presented at the conference “Place Naming: Glorification and Exclusion of People, Time and Place”, the Minerva Humanities Center and the Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, May 14, 2014.

**Organized Conferences**

“Place Naming: Glorification and Exclusion of People, Time and Place”, the Minerva Humanities Center and the Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, Tel Aviv University, May 14, 2014.

**Abed Kanaaneh**

"Israel between Muqawamah (Resistance) and Jihad: A Confrontation between Two Ideologies." *Qadaya Israeliieh* 52 (2014): 29-37 (In Arabic).

**Asher levy**

*Cinematic Answers to Philosophical Questions*. Manuscript in preparation for submission to McMillan Press.

Preparation of international conference as part of the activity of “Buber’s year”, marking 50 years to his passing, sponsored by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities and Frankfurt University (2015).

“Who is interested in dropping out and not dropping out?”. Panel in the “Tafsan” (psychoanalytic institute for youth) Conference, Tel Aviv-Jaffa Academic College, Tel Aviv, June 26, 2014.
Gal Levy


"Shas, the Ethnic Demon and Mizrahi Politics". In The Israeli Elections 2013, edited by M. Shamir, the Israel Democracy Institute (In Hebrew); English translation being refereed.


Book Reviews


Conferences and Seminars


"Is There a Place for Peace Education? Some Thoughts on Political Education." Paper presented at the Association of Historical Dialogue and Research (AHDR), Cyprus, March 29-30, 2014 (Keynote Speaker).
Revital Madar


Conferences and Seminars


“Revenge.” Paper presented at the 10th Lexical Conference of Political Thought, Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, June 2013.


Organized Conferences

“The Underrepresentation of Women from Minority Groups in the Israeli Academy”, Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University, December 2013.

Nitzan Rothem


Shaul Setter


Conferences and Workshops

“Writing You Poems, So You Won’t Understand A Word.” Paper presented at the “Dialogical Textures” Workshop, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, May 2014.


“Poetic Projects, Literary Revolutions: Contemporary Israeli Poetry.” Invited paper at the University of Toronto, Toronto, March 2014.


Chen Strass


Conferences Papers


“Nationality and Representation of Space in Israeli Literature.” Paper presented at the Doctoral Students’ Workshop on Nationality, conducted by the Theodor Herzl Distinguished Chair in Masaryk University, Brno-Telc, Czech Republic, July 15, 2014.


Eran Tzin


Conferences and Seminars

3. Additional Sub-Groups and Projects

3.1 Religion, Secularism, and Political Belonging

Directors: Raef Zreik and Adi Ophir

Group Members:

Raef Zreik (Minerva Humanities Center)
Adi Ophir (Minerva Humanities Center)
Shaul Setter (Minerva Humanities Center and the Department of Literature, Tel Aviv University and the Department of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Sapir College)
Ori Goldberg (Tel Aviv University)
Christoph Schmidt (Department of German Literature and the Department of Cultural Studies, Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Michael Karayani (Faculty of Law, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Ishay Rosen-Zvi (Department of Hebrew Culture Studies, Tel Aviv University)
Khaled Fourani (Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Tel Aviv University)
Hamutal Tsamir (Department of Hebrew Literature, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
Ruth Kara-Ivanov Kaniel (Shalom Hartman Institute)

3.1.1 Overview

The “Religion, Secularism, and Political Belonging” group of the Minerva Humanities Center is part of an international research project held under the supervision of CHCI (Consortium for Humanities Centers and Institutes) and funded by the Mellon Foundation. It is led by four Humanities Centers located in North America (University of Arizona), Europe (Utrecht University), China (the Chinese University of Hong Kong), and the Middle East (Tel Aviv University). It proposes a thirty-six-month pilot program that will investigate how religious and secular formations organize the practices of political belonging across the globe. The initiative takes a comparative approach to its topic and employs the distinct interdisciplinary strengths of its participating centers by involving scholars from across the
fields of literature, history, religious studies, philosophy, law and politics, anthropology, and critical race and gender studies.

During the 2013-4 academic year, the "Religion, Secularism, and Political Belonging" research group at the Minerva Humanities Center has been meeting on a monthly basis. In the first meetings we read and discussed a few major texts in post-secular thought: the Ratzinger-Habermas 2005 debate “The Dialectics of Secularization: On Reason and Religion”; Charles Taylor and Cornell West’s contributions to “The Power of Religion in the Public Sphere” essay collection; and John Milbank’s treatise “Postmodern Critical Augustianism”.

3.1.2 Topics of Study

**Khaled Fourani** from the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Tel Aviv University presented a paper titled “Is There a Post-Secular?”, where he argues that the post-secular paradigm relies on forgetting aspects of the secular’s malleable conceptual history and thus risks perpetuating entrapments it aspires to resolve. By introducing a notion of finitude within secular thinking, Fourani aspires to reconstruct the “traditions of the secular.”

**Christoph Schmidt** from the Department of German Literature and the Department of Cultural Studies at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem presented a paper reflecting on Pope Benedict XVI Regensburg Speech. Schmidt proposed a theoretical framework for what he considers as our post-political-theology moment, where the critical tradition, in its post-secular punctuation, and the Catholic doctrine, both face the challenge of revisiting the modern canon.

**Hamutal Tsamir** from the Department of Hebrew Literature at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev discussed the introduction to her book in writing, where she calls for a post-secular critique of the relationship between nationalism and gender in Modern Hebrew poetry. Stressing the central place of sacrifice in the formation of societies as well as in the constitution of modern nation states, she asks about the place of women, the divine, and patriarchy in the evolution of the Modern Hebrew literary tradition.
Michael Karayani from the Faculty of Law at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, presented his decade-long research on adoption laws in Israel, arguing that they convey the blueprints of the Israeli regime: Ethnic Jewish hegemony on the one hand, and a separation between different religious groups on the other hand.

Ori Goldberg will present his work on theological thinking and practice in Shi‘ite Iran in our next meeting.

3.1.3 Jewish-Democratic/Muslim-Democratic: Religion and State in the Contemporary Middle East (Public Event)

In addition to the monthly meetings of the core group, we organized a public event which took place at Tel Aviv University on June 17, under the title Jewish-Democratic / Muslim-Democratic: Religion and State in Contemporary Middle East. In light of the current, highly volatile political debate on Israel as a Jewish-Democratic state, this event challenged the coordinates of the discussion, placing the question of the Jewish-Democratic in a comparative framework—although not together with Western liberal (and Christian) states, to which Israel is too easily, and somewhat mistakenly often compared, but with other states in the Middle East that perhaps face some of the same challenges in rethinking the place of religion in the public sphere.

Anat Lapidot-Firila (The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute) spoke about the neo-Kamalist regime in contemporary Turkey. Mohanad Mustafa (Center for Academic Studies, Or Yehuda) discussed the challenges Tunisia has been facing after the 2010 revolution; Ishay Rosen-Zvi (Tel Aviv University) discussed the antinomies of citizenship in Israel; and Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev) spoke about the Jews as the problematic center of Western nationalism and secularism—being both the rule and the exception to it.
4. **Adjunct Research Groups**

Members of the “Living together” group are encouraged to initiate their own projects and workshops. This year we had two sub-groups working alongside the activity of the core group, headed by members of the group.

4.1 **Spaces of Living Together: Practices of Control and Resistance in Heterogeneous Spaces in Israel-Palestine**

**Director:** Ronnen Ben-Arie

4.1.1 **Group Members**

**Moran Aviv** completed a BA in developmental counseling and community theater at the University of Haifa. These days she is completing an MA in urban planning at the Technion Institute of Technology. Her research is designed to help identify the level of disparities between neighborhoods through the definition of ‘Spatial profiles’. Spatial profiles are constructed through categorizing the distribution of goods and services within the local authority, based on the theory of Capital assets. These profiles form the basis of a tool that can help formulating policy recommendations for effective spatial distribution of urban resources; relative to environmental, cultural and social assets. Aviv is also working as an urban planner at "Sikkuy"—a joint organization of Jewish and Arab citizens, working to implement full equality on all levels between the Arab Palestinian and Jewish citizens of Israel.

**Ronen Ben Arie** (see above under the Living Together core group)

**Rivi Gillis** is a PhD candidate at the Department of Labor Studies, Faculty of Social Science at Tel Aviv University. Her areas of research include sociology and theory of society in Israel; postcolonial and feminist theories; whiteness studies; the ethnic identity of the settlers; aspects of religion, gender and race in the Israeli law of surrogacy; social history of Israeli training of Africans in the 1960s-1970s.

**Adeeb Daoud Naccache** is an architect and town planner since 1982, and specialist in architectural conservation. He fulfilled number of public positions: City architect and engineer of the Planning & Building Commission, the Municipality of Nazareth, professional consultant of the Knesset in building and planning in the Arab community in Israel, and a member of several national
and international organizations. Naccache is currently an MSc student at the Architecture Department at the Technion. His thesis subject is Levantine modernism. His Fields of interest are public space, alternative modernism, and history of architecture.

**Rolly Rosen** is a PhD student in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Haifa University. She holds a BA in economics and psychology and an MA in philosophy from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and has recently completed her studies for an MA in anthropology at the Haifa University. Her PhD thesis deals with efforts to promote "shared society projects" in Israel, specifically looking into the ways the ideas of shared societies 'travel' across places and projects in the age of globalization; the strategies used by the projects, in Israel and abroad, and the ways they interact with policies of the nation state; and the ways these inter-community project influence conceptions of identity and belonging among the activists. Her interests lie in such concepts as nationalism and the nation state, ethnicity, urban citizenship and civil society. Rosen is also the editor of the book *Haifa: Between Reality and a Vision for a Shared City* (2012). The book was published as part of her work as the Coordinator of the Shatil fund’s “Haifa Shared City Project”, a program that aims to study and improve the inter-community relations in Haifa. *Shatil* is the New Israel Fund’s Capacity Building Center for Social Change, and it plays a leading role in Israel’s civil society.

**Eran Tzin** (see above under the Living Together core group)

**4.1.2 Project Description and Rationale**

The aim of the research group is to explore possibilities of political change and openings of new spaces of citizenship that emerge from heterogeneously populated spaces in Israel-Palestine. By investigating practices of control, resistance, indifference and cooperation, which operate simultaneously within such spaces, we wish to go beyond the overriding concepts of national and ethnic separation that dominate the production of space in Israel-Palestine, and its common understandings. The monthly meetings of the research group take place in Haifa, in a form of a three-hours meeting. Every meeting consists of two parts: the first part is dedicated to a discussion of texts literature, while in the second part group members present their research projects. This year’s meetings were dedicated to literature concerning contemporary understanding and conceptualizations of urban space as a shared space of living together.
4.1.3 Group Meetings and Reading List

December 11th, 2013
The meeting was dedicated for acquaintance of group members and setting joint research goals for the group.

January 15th, 2014
The meeting focused on concepts of cosmopolitism and urban space in a planetary world, through reading and discussing the following essays:
In the second part Ronnen Ben-Arie presented his research on Nazareth.

February 12th, 2014
The discussion focused on concepts of society and violence and on possibilities for social change:
In the second part Rolly Rosen presented her research on Haifa.

March 12th, 2014
The meeting was dedicated to the concept of 'urbicide', through discussion of these papers:
In the second part Eran Tzin presented his research on Tel Aviv.

April 2nd, 2014
In this meeting we continued the discussion on concept of 'urbicide', while the second part of the meeting examined its implications to the concrete urban space of downtown Haifa.
May 7th, 2014

This meeting was dedicated to an outdoor tour in the downtown of Haifa. The tour was jointly guided by three members of the group who focus in their research on this specific urban space: Adeeb Daoud Naccache, Rolly Rosen and Ronnen Ben Arie. During the tour we explored the relevance of the theoretical concepts we were discussing to the concrete reality of this urban space.

June 11th, 2014

This meeting was dedicated to the concept of ‘settler colonialism’ and its relevance to shared urban space. These essays were discussed:


In the second part Rivi Gillis presented her research on settlers in the occupied territories.

4.1.4 Group Members’ Publications and Academic Activities

Ronen Ben-Arie
(see above under the Living Together core group)

Rivi Gillis

Adeeb Daoud Naccache

Eran Tzin
(see above under the Living Together core group)
4.2 The Mutual Performance of Sexism and Racism

Director: Revital Madar

Group Members: Lital Abazon, Yossi David, Maayan Goldman, Yael Messer, Raz Saker Barzilay.

4.2.1 Rationale and Overview

The group focuses on the Gordian knot between sexism and racism, as two forms of oppression that affect women which take a position of otherness due to their ethnic and/or national orientation. This double oppression, known as intersectionality, allows us to look on moments and situations in which a double oppression is in action. While studies of intersectionality focus on denoting moments in which a double depression is operating, and on the sociological costs and political implications of intersectionality, we wish to examine—through a careful reading of theoretical material on sexism and racism alongside reading testimonies of women—the similarities as well as differences between sexism and racism, in order to ask whether their mutual performance affects political concepts as we came to know them. Moreover, we wish to pay special attention to intersectionality in the Israeli context, for here we may observe two different kinds of racism: Exterior racism, i.e. racism which is directed towards those which are not Israeli civilians such as refugees, immigrants and Palestinians; and internal racism, which is directed towards Israeli civilians such as Ethiopians, Russian speakers and Mizrahis, and Palestinians. In relation to the research Living Together group, whose focus is questions regarding political participation through concepts such as citizenship, love, and friendship, our discussion wish to question common political concepts, and ask do this concepts go through a transformation or a change when read into the mutual performance of sexism and racism.

4.2.2 Group Members

Lital Abazon is an MA student in the Department of Literature at Tel Aviv University. She is a teaching assistant at the Integrated Excellence Program of Humanities and the Arts in Tel Aviv University. Her areas of research are comparative literature, Israeli literature, literature and gender, the family novel, mothers and daughters in literature, Middle Eastern literature and autobiographical literature.

Yossi David is a PhD student in the Department of Communication at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He holds a BA in communication and sociology and an MA in political communication. David’s MA thesis dealt with the interrelations between the social protests of summer 2011 with media
consumption, involvement in protest and the climate of public opinion. His areas of research are queer
tory, dynamics of public opinion, the evolution of protests and methodology.

**Maayan Goldman** is an MA student in the Women and Gender Program in Tel Aviv University. She
holds a BA in gender studies and literature. Her MA thesis tries to create a theoretical figuration of an
alternative, political, female subjectivity that is not constructed through motherhood nor identifies
with coherent national, ethnical or religious experiences.

**Revital Madar** (see above under the Living together group)

**Yael Messer** is an independent curator. She holds a postgraduate diploma in curating from
Goldsmith College, London, and participated at De Appel Curatorial Program, Amsterdam. Messer has
been collaborating with museums, institutions and independent art spaces internationally, including
Stedelijk Museum, Van Abbe Museum and SKOR (Netherlands), The Digital Art Lab (Israel) and
Matadero Art Space (Spain). Messer was the research curator for the 13th Istanbul Biennial. Her areas of
research are visual culture, art and politics, public domain and social practice.

**Raz Saker Barzilay** is an MA student in the Department of Political Science at Tel Aviv University.
She is currently writing her thesis, in which she investigates appearances of symbolic violence at the
occupied territories. Her research interests are also the legal and gender aspects of the Palestinian-
Jewish conflict. Saker Barzilay works as a research and teaching assistant at the Department of Political
Science at Tel Aviv University, and is an editorial member of the *Public Sphere* journal.

### 4.2.3 Summary of Selected Meetings

**October 24th, 2013**

Yehouda Shenhav and Yossi Yonah. “What is Racism?”, Introduction to *Racism in Israel*, edited by Y.

Based on these texts, each member presented in the first meeting the questions which occupy her
in relation to sexism and racism. Further discussion related to the history of the concept of racism,
as presented by Shenhav and Yonah, as well as to the discursive need of this concept, even though
it does not hold ontological ground. As for Guillaumin’s text, the discussion related mostly to her
attempt to establish clear and closed definitions, in a way which does not let the concept of racism be
bound to the geographical and cultural ground on which it operates.
November 14th, 2013


Both Thompson and Guillaumin attempt to position themselves in relation to previous theories of sexism. In that sense, both aim at establishing a pure theoretical ground. Guillaumin’s emphasis is on theories which women wrote, as theories written by the oppressed. Her claim is that the oppressed should be the ones writing theory, although she is objecting to the concept of theory in general, and thus leaves us with no conceptual frame for ‘theories’ that are written by women. This also raises the question of theories regarding groups of minorities in general and not only women as an oppressed group. The discussion revolved around the style of both Guillaumin and Thompson, for the attempt to purify the concept brought with it a militant style, which we saw as strange to feminist theory. It was very obvious in the writing of Thompson, and made us think the claim of Guillaumin that the theories are detached from the minority groups upon which they are based—a detachment that harms the success of the struggle. This claim made us ask whether the text of Thompson is a manifesto rather than a theoretical text, and what can we take from it if we read it as one.

December 22nd, 2013


Spivak’s article raised the question of the right to speak about the female subaltern. Does this right exists? Does anyone have the right to speak about the subaltern in general and the female subaltern in particular? Is Spivak’s critique of Foucault and Delleuze relate mostly to their universal perception of the subject, or does it also involve their status as white men? Could theory be detached from the subject who speaks it? The last question brought into discussion the question of the death of the author. This concept is at the heart of Spivak’s critique, and demands us to think whether in a post-colonial and class society we can dream of this concept in the a-political manner in which it is presented by Roland Barthes.

Reading Fanon alongside Spivak revealed the tension that exists between a heterological and homological analysis of oppressed societies. In which case is the effacement graver? Can one of these models prevent that effacement, and can this tension annul the effacement while discussing the male or female subaltern?

December 27th, 2013

Raghda Elnabilisy presented her report, “Who Profits from Racism and Sexism in Civil Society?” She discussed her concept of racism and sexism, as well as her methodology. The report is based of four groups of women: Palestinians, Mizrahis, Ethiopians, and Russian speakers. Based on their testimonies, Elnabilisy revealed the way in which women of minority groups in Israel are oppressed even in the civil society, i.e. in organizations that fight racism and fight for human rights in Israel. Her report exposed the different manners in which each group is suffering from sexism and racism as well as the similarities between them. Discussion related to the understanding of each racist practice as experienced by women from different groups, and to concepts used to describe the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We asked which concepts work to conceal the oppression of Palestinians in Israel and outside of it, and which describe the situation as seen by the oppressed.

4.2.4 Group Members’ Publications and Academic Activities (2013-2014)

**Lital Abazon**


**Yossi David**


**Revital Madar**

*(See above under the Living together core group)*

**Yael Messer**

**Exhibitions**


5. Public Symposia, Conferences, and Workshops

5.1 “Are Modern Societies Racist? Racism and Xenophobia in Israel and Europe Today”

International Conference (November 20-21, 2013)

This conference was a joint project between the Minerva center and Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung in Israel. The preparation for the project included many joint meetings and discussions of the members of the two centers. In part, this international conference aimed to contribute to the public debate on racism both in Israel and Europe. The conference focused on different themes, some more historical while others more conceptual and analytical. We concluded the conference with a round-table that dealt in the current situation in Israel. The following is the abstract of the conferences submitted to participants:

The current waves of economic crises and social upheavals around the globe brought to the surface both old and new forms of racism and xenophobia: Islamophobic agenda has become l’ordre du jour of the rising radical right in many European countries; and racist vocabulary and syntax has been punctuating Israeli ultra-right-wing rhetoric vis-à-vis the Palestinian citizens of Israel as well as immigrant workers and refugees. Racist or xenophobic ideology tends to be attributed to marginal social forces, yet its presence in mainstream discourse cannot be overlooked: in proposed legislation, in structural conditions of inequality, and in populist discourse maintained by ever-growing portions of society. In this conference, we wish to engage with contemporary modalities of racist and xenophobic discourses and practices in the interrelated albeit distinct contexts of Israel and Europe. We wish to examine, among other things, the different ways in which neo-liberal economic policies affect the rise of new forms of racism; the relationship between hostility directed at foreigners or strangers; and hostility directed towards longtime dwellers and natives; the transfiguration and transmission of past anti-Semitic tropes into current Islamophobic ones; and the struggle over the victim’s position and its political cache.

Speakers, Discussants and Chairs (by order of appearance)

Yossef Schwartz (Tel Aviv University)
Yehuda Bauer (Key Speaker, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Moshe Zimmermann (the Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Yehouda Shenhav (Tel Aviv University)
Amal Jamal (Tel Aviv University)
Shaul Setter (Tel Aviv University)
The Living Together Group

Magdalena Marsovszky (Fulda University of Applied Sciences)
Amos Morris-Reich (Haifa University)
Juliane Karakayali (Protestant University of Applied Sciences in Berlin)
Shai Lavi (Tel Aviv University)
Raef Zreik (Tel Aviv University)
Manuela Consonni (Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Yitzhak Saporta (Tel Aviv University)
Gerassimos Kouzelis (University of Athens)
Anne Mehrer (“Miteinander” – Association Against Right-Wing Extremism in Saxony Anhalt)
Naomi Chazan (Dean, the School of Government and Society, the Academic College of Tel Aviv-Yafo)
Shira Ohayon (Mediterranean Andalusian Orchestra, Ashkelon)
Rotem Ilan (Head of Israeli Children Project at ACRI)
Ala Hlehel (Writer and Chief Editor, Qadita Net)
Yossi Sucary (Writer and Lecturer, Bezalel Academy of Art and Design)
David Kretzmer (the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Sapir College)

5.2 From Settlers to Natives? Lecture Series (March, 2014)

Speakers (by order of appearance)

Dirk Moses (Department of History and Civilization, European University Institute, Florence, Italy)
Oren Yiftachel (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev)
Gadi Algazi (Tel Aviv University)
Honaida Ghanim
Raef Zreik (Tel Aviv University)
Orly Lubin (Tel Aviv University)

The lecture series “From Settlers to Natives?” is based on one question, perhaps self-evident in first glance, which we addressed to six prominent scholars from different disciplines (history, law and philosophy, geography, sociology and comparative literature). The question we posed, “when do settlers become natives?”, following a text by Prof. Mahmood Mamdani from Columbia University, turned out to be more complicated than we expected, and resulted in adding an ‘if’ to the ‘when’. The varied responses to this question were presented in a set of three seminars. Each included a lecture followed by a response and discussion, and all focused on the subjects of settlers and natives, home and homeland, colonialism and de-colonization.
The series was created following the conference we held in the previous year, “Natives and Exiles in Israel/Palestine” (June 11, 2013). The lecture series and the conference both aimed to conceptualize in a new manner the meaning and significance of the Jewish and Palestinian collective existence in Israel/Palestine, and to develop a better understanding, theoretical as well as practical, of the relations between homeland, exile and return, settlers and natives, and the relevance of the “settler colonialism” paradigm to the Israeli-Palestinian case.

**Dirk Moses, “From Settlers to Natives? A View from Australia” (March 12, 2014),**
The discussion on these urgent topics in the Israeli-Palestinian context began with Prof. Dirk Moses, who addressed these issues from the perspective of the Australian-Aboriginal case. Moses is a Professor of Global and Colonial History at the Department of History and Civilization at the European University Institute in Florence, specializing in global, transnational, international, and colonial history and in genocide and ethnic cleansing, among else. Moses presented the topic of settler societies and the various modalities of its colonial relationship. The lecture opened with a discussion on the paradoxes of the settlers-natives situation in Australia and its complexity. It continued with an overview of the historical background of the Australian-Aboriginal case, necessary, as noted, for considering the central question of the lecture series: how do settlers become natives, or at least, how do they try to become ones? Or, to pose the question differently, how do settler-societies de-colonized, and whether this is even possible. In the third part of the lecture, dealing with colonial modalities, several issues were discussed, among them the relationships between indigenes and settler national identity, observing the tendency to bridge, and not erase, the settler-native binary (complete assimilating of aborigines and indigenization of settlers), and to distinguish peoples on the one hand, and the shared nation on the other. Moses’ lecture was followed by a response by **Prof. Oren Yiftachel** from the Department of Geography at Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.

**Gadi Algazi, “From Settlers to Natives? A Local Perspective” (March 19, 2014)**
Gadi Algazi from the Department of History at Tel Aviv University presented the characteristics of settler colonialism in Israel/Palestine. Algazi addressed the similarities and differences between the Israeli-Palestinian case as a project that is not yet completed and other societies of settlers and natives, and suggested a new theoretical frame for understanding the Israeli-Palestinian situation. His arguments led to a reflection on how can we think about life beyond the colonial horizon, and what would might a potential de-colonization of Israel/Palestine look like. Algazi’s lecture was followed by a response by **Dr. Honaida Ghanim**.
Raef Zreik, “From Settlers to Natives? Ethical and Political Reflections” (Match 26th, 2014)

The final lecture was delivered by Dr. Raef Zreik from the Minerva Humanities Center. In his presentation Zreik poses the question whether settlers and natives, colonizers and colonized are subject exactly to the same ethical constrains while acting politically, or might there be some “ethical discount” for the colonized given the imbalance of power relations? On a more basic level, the talk addressed the nature of the relation between the political and the ethical.

Zreik’s lecture was followed by a response by Dr. Orly Lubin from the Department of Literature at Tel Aviv University.

5.2.1 Settler Colonialism: Round Table Discussion (March 14, 2014)


In addition to the three seminars we also conducted a workshop in the form of a round-table discussion. In this discussion we attempted to elaborate on the themes of the lecture-series more freely and dialogically, and to open the debate for additional perspectives, theoretical as well as practical, of scholars from different areas of expertise and researchers from the Minerva Humanities Center and the Living Together group.

Among the themes we discussed were the application of the settler-colonialism paradigm to the Israeli-Palestinian situation, and the meaning of the categories of natives, settlers and indigenes. One of the questions which occupied the discussants was the intersection between liberal democracy and the settler colonialism theoretical models, as well as between these and actual modes of governance. We addressed the connections between settler and immigration societies and the liberal democratic state, and the relationship between the territorial and the economic in the project of settler colonialism.

The discussion helped us clarify issues presented by Dirk Moses in his lecture, as well as the main axioms of the settler-colonialism paradigm. Our discussion sharpened the need for going beyond the theoretical categorization and binary structure of natives and settlers. In this context, we reflected on the necessity for an additional model which could help us understand not only colonialism but also de-colonization in Israel/Palestine, together with phenomena which deviate from the structure of natives-settlers (e.g. refugees).
Conference: “Place Naming: Glorification and Exclusion of People, Time and Place” (May 14, 2014 Tel Aviv University)

Organized by Amer Dahamshe

Speakers (by order of appearance):

Meron Benvenisti (Key Speaker)
Yossi Katz (Bar Ilan University)
Amer Dahamshe (Tel Aviv University)
Esther Adamit (Independent Scholar)
Liora Bigon (the Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
Efrat Yaacov (the Hebrew University of Jerusalem)

Opening remarks: Yossef Schwartz (Cohn Institute)
Concluding remarks: Raef Zreik (Minerva Humanities Center)

Abstract
The Study of geographical naming has seen a significant breakthrough in the last two decades. No more searching for the linguistic sources of place names as an independent subject for discussion, and no more taxonomic work that views names as a reflection of human, topographical or zoological reality. In post-modern and post-colonial approaches, geographical naming is perceived as a text that harbors ideological significance associated with local power relations. The concepts prevailing in research nowadays are "the production of space," in the words of Lefebvre, constructing certain categories and blurring other categories and social-political dynamics.

The lectures in this symposium included a range of places, times, people and identities. The subjects of the lectures covered the Israeli domestic sphere, the space of Europe, and up to the African continent. The lectures explored, by analyzing geographical naming, the history of places and the changes that occurred in their political and cultural definition, from prior to the 20th century and until the present. At the center of the lectures stood historical-political issues associated with the effect of the political changes in 1948 in Palestinian names, and at the same time shed light on the mechanisms of Hebrew-Jewish naming, replacing the names that have become the bygone "other." In so doing the lectures shed light on the Arab-Israeli naming of private and municipal spaces.
Globalization and the Conflict of the Humanities: A Middle Eastern Perspective

A joint project of the Minerva Humanities Center and the Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas, Tel Aviv University.

Directors: Raef Zreik, Minerva Humanities Center; Yosef Schwartz, Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas.

1. Rationale

A major aim of this project is to rethink the ways in which certain identities (religious, national, regional) are formed, transformed, and juxtaposed, mobilized, used and abused, and through that to question rigid binaries and conceptual dichotomies. The project will take advantage of its location in the Middle East and study old and new forms of consciousness and their role in the shaping of collective memory and communal (and inter-communal) identities.

We believe our research project to be unique and original in several respects. On the one hand, we plan to question some hegemonic concepts by adopting marginal points of view on core issues, placing the marginal and marginalized at the center. Thus, we shall approach the study of Israeli society, culture, and politics from the point view of the Palestinians in Israel; at the same time, we shall study the history and cultures of the Middle East from the perspective of the Jewish communities in the region. This double move will question monolithic conceptions and subject them to interrogation. This would force us to rethink categories such as nativity, exile, diaspora and homelessness, unity, sovereignty, as well as religious and intellectual exchange and translation, and to introduce new categories like hospitality, fraternity, and solidarity.

On the other hand, the project aims to combine contemporary perspectives with historical ones, and by doing that to show the ways in which the present is shaped by the past, but also the past is shaped by the present. By foregrounding this double movement of time we hope to bring to consciousness and to question patterns of identity-formation in different groups. By moving in between geographical spaces, and travelling back and forth in time, and by narrowing the
gap between theory and practice, we hope to overcome the rigidity of old concepts, entrenched stereotypes and prejudices so as to make way for new ideas, to develop new research agendas, and to suggest new teaching curriculums.

One major theme will be to study and question the division of certain disciplines within the academia. Israeli academia was built in its very basic infrastructure on strong European conceptual frameworks. “Judaic studies” was recreated as strong discipline constituting complex relation with the variety of “oriental studies” on the one hand and with “general”, i.e. European studies on the other. This created a general situation in which the rich intellectual and human resources existing in Israeli academia are segregated into closed disciplinary structures, strongly isolated of each other. The segregated school system in Israel creates the same separation all the way from preschool to high school institutions, institutionally divided according to ethnic, religious and cultural divisions. One goal of this project would be to develop variety of strategies in order to create the basis for a different academic curriculum for the humanities in Israel that may be effective in bringing about social change, especially through creating new school programs. The more contemporary aspect of the project will focus on the ways the existence of Palestinians in Israel “disturbs” the self image of Israel, and the ways the Jews in the middle east might “disturb” its Arab and Islamic image. We think that this mutual “disturbance” can be a very fertile ground for research and challenge.

Structure

At the first stage of the project the Minerva and the Cohn Institute managed to raise funds that will allow Palestinian doctorate and post doctorate students-who are interested in the above themes- to receive grants that can allow them to pursue their research within the humanities within Tel Aviv University. The presences of these researchers on campus, while bringing their unique point of view on Israel, Zionism, modernity has already proved itself to be crucial and productive and created a new spaces of dialogue and interaction. Yet this project is not comprised of Palestinian researchers only: it is a mixed group of Jews and Palestinians. Therefore we invited relevant TAU researchers, graduate students and staff members alike, to join the group meetings.
2. Group Members

Amer Dahamshe
(Please see bio and publications under “Living Together” group members)

Muhammad Abu Samra
(Please see bio and publications under “Living Together” group members)

Abed Kanaaneh
(Please see bio and publications under “Living Together” group members)

Zahiye Kundos
PhD student at the school of cultural studies at Tel Aviv University. Interested in understanding the complicated issues that have been practiced by modern Muslim identities around the world. Her current research investigates the relations between religion and secularism in autobiographical writing in Egypt between the two world wars.

Noah Gerber
Studies intellectual and cultural contacts between European Jews and their 'brethren' from Islamic Lands in the modern period. I published a monograph on this subject, using Yemenite Jewry as a case study, in order to consider Jewish Orientalism side by side with a specific native response to this phenomena. While part of this research group I have expanded my scope to include the Baghdadi Jewish Diaspora, the Muhhrabi Jewish diaspora, the discovery of the Cairo Genizah, the study of the Judeo-Persian orbit, as well the fate of the Aleppo Codex in the hands of the Jewish state. I gave a talk on the Damascus Blood Libel (1840) as a sort of 'Zero Hour' in the history of Jewish Orientalism and have recently competed an essay on this topic which includes a re-orienting, if you will, of the narrative of this event.

Ahmad Ighbariah
The Cohn Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Ideas\The Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies. Main areas of interest are logic ,philosophy and Islamic theology) Kalam .(His doctoral thesis ,The Development of the Theory of Categories in Islamic Philosophy "was written in the Department of Philosophy at Haifa University .He also has a master's degree from The Department of Arabic and Islamic Studies at Tel Aviv University ,(2002) where he wrote about" Ibn Taymiyah’s Criticism of the Theory of logical definition ."Apart from classical Islamic philosophy Dr .Ighbarieh also interested in modern Arab thought ,especially in the second half of the twentieth century ,and in Arabic literature ,especially in the Palestinian context after the 1948
Publications

"Grammatical Features in Ibn al-Muqaffa’s Categories, JSAl, Accepted for Publication.


"Form, Content, and Character of the Late Arabic Organon”, Orients (in preparation).


Introduction to "Contexts": A Collection of Short Stories, by Ahmad Husein, Kull Shay, Haifa, 2013, pp. 7-14.

Conference Papers


Academic and Professional Awards

2012-2014 Mauf Fellowship.


Uri Shachar

Post-doctoral fellow at the Center for the Study of Conversion and Inter-Religious Encounters in Ben-Gurion University. In 2012-2013 he was a fellow at the Katz Center for Advanced Judaic Studies in the University of Pennsylvania. He received his PhD from the University of Chicago with a dissertation on cultural encounters between Christians, Muslims, and Jews in the Crusading Near-East. Dr. Shachar studies ways in which religious communities in Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean negotiated their competing yet complementing notions of pious belligerence and sacred space. Starting Fall 2014 he will assume the position of assistant professor of history at Ben Gurion University.
Publications


“Inspecting the Pious Body: Christological Morphology in the Ritual Crucifixion Allegation,” Journal of Medieval History [Forthcoming].

“Pollution and Purity in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Rhetoric from the Crusading Near East,” Katz Center Collection of Essays, eds. Elisheva Baumgarten, Ruth Mazo Karras, Katelyn Mesler, University of Pennsylvania Press [Accepted for publication].

Conference Papers


Ori Goldberg

Received his PhD from Tel Aviv University’s Graduate School of Historical Studies. His dissertation was published by Routledge (2012) under the title, Shi’i Theology in Iran: The Challenge of Religious Experience. Ori is the author Thinking Shi’a, a Hebrew collection of lectures published by Modan Press as part of its prestigious "Broadcast University" series. During his studies, Ori won various awards and scholarships, among them the Fox International Fellowship at Yale University.

Publications

Understanding Shiite Leadership: The Art of the Middle Ground in Iran and Lebanon (with Shaul Mishal), Cambridge University Press
3. Group Meetings

February 2nd, 2014
First introductory session of the extended group: presentation of the rationale and member projects.

March 19th, 2014
Noah Garber presented the paper “The Orientalist Interpretation of the ‘Damascus Affair’.”

April 4th, 2014

April 30th, 2014
Presentation by Uri Goldberg: “An Islamic theological-political reading, through the theoretical frameworks of De-Certau and Al-Ghazalli, of how religious readings can alter received views of politics and history.”

3.1 Additional Activities
Apart from those meetings, during the 2013-2014 academic year, the general seminar of the Minerva Humanities Center was dedicated to the topics of the Middle Eastern group.

The list of meetings included:

Introductory discussion, led by Raef Zreik and Yossi Schwartz (October 29th 2013)

Individual project presentation: Dr. Amer Dahamshe (October 12th 2013)

Dr. Muhammad Abu Samra (January 14th 2014)

Abed Kanaaneh (March 4th 2014)

Zahiye Kundos (April 29th 2014)

Areej Sabbagh-Khoury (May 20th 2014)

3.2 Conferences
“Place Naming: Glorification and Exclusion of People, Time and Place”, organized by group member Amer Dahamshe, Tel Aviv University, May 2014.

In July 2014 Prof. Yossi Schwartz, Dr. Muhammad Abu Samra and Dr. Noah Gerber (one of the external members of the group) participated in an international workshop organized by the J.W. Goethe University in Frankfurt/Main, Germany, and presented three papers on topics related to European and Jewish European Orientalism.
Knowledge in this Era: Joint Minerva Humanities Center Project

Academic director: Dr. Hagar Kotef

Knowledge in this Era is a joint project of all three research groups at the Minerva center. It emerged from the ongoing work of the Minerva center, including both its research activities, as well as the public-intellectual involvement and commitment of the Center as a whole, and of senior and junior scholars within it. This project aims to open new ways for reflecting on the various aspects of and transformation in the status of the academy, knowledge and scholarship in this era.

Lately, we in Israel have witnessed a series of steps, seemingly unrelated to each other, which amount to a crisis of local academia: far-reaching budget cuts; the establishment of Ariel University in the West Bank—a move jeopardizing the authority of the Council for Higher Education; calls to boycott Israeli academia, versus official Israeli responses that reject the legitimacy of such calls; and government interventions in academic affairs, including attempts to close down entire departments and dismiss faculty. These moves concur, on the one hand, with global processes reshaping the modern university, and on the other hand, with the extensive changes the Israeli society is currently undergoing—changes that pose similar threats to other sites of knowledge-production and circulation, such as the Knesset’s research center, the courts, the press and the school system.

In the first stages of the project, we have created a committee which consisted of members of all the three Minerva Humanities Center groups. The committee had two main objectives. First, to compose a white-paper describing the current predicaments of the Academia-Capital-Government relations; and second, to offer a plan for an academic event that will combine “traditional” academic activities, such as presentations and panel discussions, with other forms of interactions and discussions that will bring together students and teachers, academics and non-academics. The aim was to raise the question concerning knowledge and knowledge-production in Israel today in ways which will both manifest the various social and political aspects of the issue and will allow creative modes of inquiry into it. The various aspects of such questions are usually considered separately and hence the discussions of these issues tend to be biased in framing the problem, instead of trying to figure out the interconnections between these aspects, and to understand how these various, seemingly unrelated aspects are entangled in a complex economic-political-intellectual web.

During these preliminary discussions we formed a cooperation with several other organizations, including the Heinrich Boell Stiftung in Israel, and the department of science-relations in the

---

1 Israeli minister of science Ya’akov Peri, for example, referred to the American Studies Association (ASA) decision to boycott Israel as an illegitimate “mixing of politics with science” that damages “universal science. . . which always knows how to connect between persons from various peoples, nations and political views” (Haaretz, 16.12.2013).
The cooperation of the four abovementioned institutions took the shape of an international conference, bringing together leading scholars and intellectuals from various disciplines and from places, in order to initiate a comprehensive thinking process. Through this cooperation, we were able to consider these issues from a broader, more global perspectives, looking simultaneously at Israel, Germany, and other localities such as France and the United States. We were able to examine the connections, similarities and differences between these locales, the connections between their scholarly communities and traditions, in the past and in the present, and to reflect on the European and global contexts in which they are embedded. The international conference Knowledge in this Era took place between January 5-6, 2014 at Tel Aviv University.

1.1 Rationale
The conference rationale is best described in the Call for Papers that was sent as an invitation to prominent scholars from Israel, Germany and other places:

**The States of Knowledge in this Era**

Historical perspectives, contemporary challenges, and the future of higher education

=================================

Call for Papers
Tel Aviv University, 5-6 January 2014

We would like to invite you to take part in the convention on The states of knowledge in this era. The convention will serve as the inaugurating event of a long-term project, in which we plan to investigate the sense of crisis in Israel which currently permeates the academia, especially in regard to its relationship with governmental institutions, civil society, and the market.
The conference will focus on the Israeli case while placing it within both the global context of our time and a wide historical context. We will examine the material, institutional, ideological and political conditions of knowledge production, looking into matters such as: issues of public funding alongside the privatization and commercialization of public universities; modes of employment and of obtaining funding for research; the institutional relations between universities and governments; the making and breaking of disciplinary boundaries; the process of selecting and establishing fields of research and methodologies. We will also look into the extent to which the academia itself partakes in creating the sense of crisis, or the crisis itself, and the possible relations between the changes in the state and status of the academia and the changes in the state and status of other knowledge apparatuses such as museums, journalism, think tanks, the pharmaceutical industry, NGOs, etc.

The conference will seek to open a series of questions, in an attempt to tackle these issues. For example, we will ask whether the current moment might be characterized as an intersection of several processes, which come together to create an ongoing erosion in the autonomy of knowledge-production systems. If this is the case, how was the delicate equilibrium of the past, which allowed for some measure of autonomy in knowledge production (or perhaps only a perception of autonomy), designed and achieved? Can the current situation be interpreted as a disturbance of this equilibrium? Or perhaps is only the illusion shattered? And if so, why now and does this also apply to other countries? Moreover, on what grounds is the claim for autonomy in spaces of knowledge production justified? Does this claim derive from knowledge itself, or is it external to knowledge—that is, political, social, or universal? Which apparatuses or ideologies created the protected sphere known as academic autonomy in the past, and may be able to maintain it in the present? And how are these apparatuses and ideologies related to the realm of political power and governance, recognized as such? Moreover: are these questions—focusing on the autonomy of knowledge-production systems and on the threat to the very possibility of a university not entirely subjected to market imperatives—sufficient in order to consider all the factors that come into play in establishing the complex array of relations between knowledge and its social and political dimensions?

The conference will be composed of three main interfaces:

1. The *institutional* relationship between the university and the state, in its historical, philosophical, and legal contexts.

2. The *socio-economic* relations between the academia, the market, and civil society—a fundamentally material inquiry that looks into the economic and social conditions within which knowledge production takes place, on both the local and the global scales.

3. The relationship between knowledge and different facets of the political—a critical inquiry into the political dimensions of knowledge; into the mechanisms and processes by means of which the boundaries of knowledge (as “objective,” “non-political,” or “relevant”) are demarcated,
disciplinary fields take shape and the relationships between content, value systems, ideologies and methodologies are woven; and into the scientific infrastructure of the political.

We would like to invite you to participate in this collective inquiry, organized by the Minerva Humanities Center and the Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics at Tel Aviv University, in collaboration with the Heinrich Boell Stiftung in Israel, and the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Israel.

Best regards,

The organizing committee:

Prof. Rivka Feldhay, Minerva Humanities Center, TAU
Dr. Jutta Illichmann, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Israel
Gabrielle Hermani, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany in Israel
Dr. Hagar Kotef, Minerva Humanities Center, TAU
Prof. Shai Lavi, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, TAU
Prof. Adi Ophir, Minerva Humanities Center, TAU
Dr. Marianne Zepp, Heinrich Boell Stiftung in Israel
Dr. Raef Zreik, Minerva Humanities Center, TAU
Dikla Bytner, Minerva Humanities Center, TAU

***************

The rationale expressed in the above Call for Papers has been translated into an immensely rich, productive, and at times provocative conference, consisting of a series of panels (three 20-minute talks followed by discussion) and round-tables (4 to 5 10-minute talks followed by a longer, open discussion with the audience).

The conference attracted much attention, spurring a lively discussion that expanded to wider audiences and continued well after its conclusion. It launched both a public media debate, 2 and an ongoing academic conversation (via email correspondence, discussions in the Israeli Social Sciences mailing list, and an unfolding research activity and academic collaboration).

---

2 E.g. in the daily newspaper Ha'aretz and the social blog Ha'oketz. See, for example, http://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/premium-1.2231043
1.2 Speakers

The following list includes the speakers who participated in the conference:

**Israeli speakers**

Mordechai Kremnizer, the Israel Democracy Institute
Yedidia Stern, Faculty of Law, Bar Ilan University
Yossef Schwartz, The Cohn Institute, Tel Aviv University
Isaac (Yanni) Nevo, Department of Philosophy, Ben Gurion University
Anat Matar, Department of Philosophy, TAU
Aviad Kleinberg, Department of History, TAU
Yigal Halfin, Department of History, TAU
Ruth Hacohen, Department of Musicology, The Hebrew University
Yaron Ezrahi, Department of Political Science, The Hebrew University (Emeritus)
Dani Filc, The Department of Politics and Government, Ben Gurion University
Eyal Chowers, Department of Political Science, TAU
Gideon Kunda, Department of Labor Studies, TAU
Joseph Zeira, Department of Economics, Hebrew University
Ariel Rubinstein
Tamar Hager, The Academic College, Tel Hai
Smadar Noy, The Department of Sociology and Anthropology, The Academic college, Ashkelon
Orna Amos, Social Worker, co-founder of the Coalition for Direct Employment
Daniel Mishori, The Porter School of Environmental Studies, Tel Aviv University
David Levi-Faur, Public Policy and Political Science, The Hebrew University
Iris Agmon, Department of Middle East Studies, Ben Gurion University
Yossi Dahan, Adva Center
Ayman Agabaria, Department of Leadership and Policy in Education, Haifa University
Nimrod Aloni, Institute for Progressive Education, The Kibbutzim College
Adar Cohen, former director of Citizenship Studies at the Israeli Ministry of Education
Hanoch Marmari, former editor-in-chief of Ha'aretz
Yofi Tirosh, Faculty of Law, Tel Aviv University
Yotam Feldman, Journalist, Director of the Documentary film “The Lab”
Yif’at Biton, School of Law, The College of Management Academic Studies
Gabriel Motzkin, The Van-Leer Institute, Jerusalem
Rivka Feldhay, The Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University
Raef Zreik, The Minerva Humanities Center, TAU
Adi Ophir, The Minerva Humanities Center, TAU

**Speakers from Abroad**
Juergen Renn, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin
Barbara Cassin, Centre Leon-Rubin, The Sorbonne, Paris
Dagmar Schaefer, Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin
Michael Steinberg, Cogut Humanities Center, Brown University
Richard Munch, Sociology, University of Bamberg (Emeritus)

### 1.3 Conference Program

The program of the conference can be found in the appendix.
The program, as well as videos of all the presentations delivered at the conference, can also be found here: [http://mhc.tau.ac.il/en/conknow/](http://mhc.tau.ac.il/en/conknow/)
The following is a detailed description of the various panels and the issues that were touched-upon in each of the panels and discussions.

**Greetings and Opening Remarks**
Aron Shai, Rector, Tel Aviv University
Eyal Zisser, Dean, Faculty of the Humanities, Tel Aviv University
Marianne Zepp, Heinrich Boell Stiftung, Israel
Shai Lavi, Director, The Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics at Tel Aviv University
Hagar Kotef, Minerva Humanities Center, Tel Aviv University

**Red Lines, Broken Lines: History and Theory of Academic Freedom**
Chair: Sinai Rusinek
Yossef Schwartz, A Story of Love and Darkness: Dualities of the European Academic Enlightenment Project
Rivka Feldhay, Non-political Reflections concerning the Political Relations between Academia, Society and State
Eyal Chowers, Violence, Language and the Hebrew University

3 Unfortunately, at the very last minute prof. Muench could not arrive and participate at the conference, although he has prepared and sent us his presentation in advance and was already on his way. We hope we will have further opportunities to continue our collaboration with him.
This panel set the historical and theoretical framework of “academic freedom”, which was later questioned and problematized during the conference. We asked how the idea of “academic freedom” or academic autonomy emerged, and how it crystallized and transformed through the changing relations between knowledge-producing institutions and political power in various historical eras. We tried to cover a broad context, both historically and geographically: from the constitution of universities in Medieval Europe (as an attempt to resolve the status of students and teachers within cities), through European enlightenment, Kant and Humboldt; from Europe to Israel, the establishment of the Hebrew University and the Israeli Council for Higher Education; the transformation in the status of the Israeli academia and its relations with the state, society and political power before the constitution of the state of Israel, continuing in its early years, the post-1967 period, and recent years. In the context of this wide historical and theoretical survey, we asked which apparatuses and ideologies have formerly created in the past, and are capable of maintaining in the present, a sheltered space of academic autonomy, and how are these related to more familiar phenomena recognized as “politics”?

**Fragile Autonomies: an Internal Wound or a Cultural Crisis?**

Chair: Naveh Frumer

Raef Zreik, On Drawing the Line and Breaking It: What Draws the Line?

Liviu Matei, Academic Autonomy and the Syndrome of Acquired Helplessness

Ariel Rubinstein, On the Self-Pity of (parts of) the Israeli Academia

After the previous panel, in which we saw how the concepts and institutions that organize the autonomy of knowledge were formed and transformed in various historical eras, this panel sought to raise questions concerning the ways academics themselves participate in forming the conditions in which the academia operates and universities are conducted. With this in mind, we asked to continue destabilizing the distinction between “inside” and “outside” that underlies the discussion concerning academic freedom. Thus, we asked how is the boundary between academia and its outside set, and when and from which position can this boundary be drawn. We examined the selective use of concepts such as “academic freedom” in various contexts and situations; the role of scholars, scientists and academics in shaping the relations of the academia with the nation-state and with various economic factors; the role of academics in creating a sense of “crisis” that permeates the academia in this era; and the ways other factors—ranging from local political factors to international ones, such as the EU, various examination and evaluation committees, and NGOs—are involved in these processes.
**Round Table: The Elements of Truth**

Chair: Michal Givoni

Orna Amos, Inclusion and Exclusion in the University as a Workplace

Tamar Hager, Not Serious Enough: On Hierarchies in Academic Knowledge-Production

David Levi-Faur, Stagflation in Education and Training of Doctoral Students in Israel: A Tale of Failed Governance

Anat Matar, Implicit Power

Yedidia Stern, Mutual Responsibility between Academia and Society

In this round-table and in the next panel we sought to tie together questions of academic freedom and the autonomy of knowledge with the material conditions in which knowledge is produced, and to reflect on the relations between academia and society not only in terms of freedom and autonomy, but also in terms of mutual responsibility.

Should the academia function as an active and engaged social power, or should it be a reserved, observant ivory tower which refrains from any social involvement or intervention? Could it be that the academia is itself a power that allows, reproduces and legitimizes existing social orders, including various modes of exploitation, oppression and expulsion (as is apparent from the distribution of symbolic capital between universities and colleges, and between center and periphery; from the exploitation and exclusion of groups or individuals from the academic community, whether as employees, students, teachers or scholars)?

How do various social and economic changes—the subjection of academia to market forces through the commercialization of higher education and the privatization of public universities; diminishing public funding and a shift towards independent and competitive per-project, short-term grant recruitment; transformations in modes of employment which practically annul tenure and socio-economic security, thereby materially subverting any concept of independence and autonomy of scholars— affect the solidarity and coherence of the academic community, both locally and globally, as well as its ability to act as a community, and to act for other communities in the public sphere?

**Academic Capitalism**

Chair: Noam Yuran

Ruth Hacohen and Yaron Ezrachi, The Melting Season of the Icebergs of Metaphysics, or Knowledge as a Start-up

Smadar Noy and Daniel Mishori, Some Implications of the ‘Flexible’ Employment System in Israeli Academia

Richard Munch, Academic Capitalism [unfortunately canceled at the very last minute]
In this panel we continued our inquiry into the relations between the material conditions of knowledge-production and the knowledge that is produced. Do the various aforementioned material processes and transformations affect the knowledge produced in academia and in other spaces and contexts, and if so, how and through which mechanisms? How are these effects expressed in knowledge itself: in which concepts, discursive transformations, and academic practices? In addition, we made a primary attempt to trace the “metaphysics” of these material processes, changes, conditions and conceptions. We asked what are the ideologies that allow or justify such processes? Is this the end of metaphysics or the transformation of a familiar one? What are the relations between the material, economic, political, ideological, and theoretical? And what are the underlying changes in the concepts of truth and knowledge, in what are considered legitimate objects of research and methodologies, in disciplinary distinctions and demarcations?

**Three Perspectives on Knowledge and the Political**

Chair: Yishai Blank

Isaac Nevo, Knowledge Production and Autonomy

Adi Ophir, On the Political Unconscious of Israeli Academia

Yigal Halfin, Democracy and Truth

In this panel we brought together three different perspectives on the relations between knowledge and the political, aiming to deepen our understanding of the conceptual web underlying the paradigm of the autonomy of knowledge.

Two of the speakers claimed that an autonomy of knowledge is impossible, since knowledge is fundamentally breached by- and breaches into the political, and the political always clings to knowledge. Yigal Halfin's perspective confronted us with the “totalitarian” predicament: what if a collective pursuit after some kind of collective and consensual truth is the condition of possibility of every political community, and what if this truth is thus always political? Adi Ophir’s perspective, which argues everything is potentially political, posits the pretension of a-political objectivity (or political neutrality or indifference) as a form of denial of how the political operates within and through knowledge; as mechanisms that in fact turn academia more susceptible to both political bias and political interventions.

On the other hand, Yanni Nevo's perspective insists on an autonomy of knowledge—autonomy from both economical modes of “production” and political modes of signification—by maintaining a protected sphere of rigorous scientific critique. His presentation posed the question whether it is possible to think of knowledge production without commodifying knowledge and commercializing research and scholarship? Could thinking about knowledge-production allow us to consider the historicity of truth and its materiality, to consider the ways knowledge is shaped through processes, institutions, historical and political conditions, and the epistemological-intellectual regimes inflicted by all these?
*Round Table: Spaces of Knowledge*

Knowledge, Politics and Market in Journalism, The Education System, The Legal System and the Military

**Chair:** Shaul Setter

Yifat Biton, Influencing the Production of Legal Knowledge through Social Change-Oriented Legal NGOs

Hanoch Marmari, The Mediation Gap: On the Commission Charged by the Media in Transmitting Knowledge to the Public

Yotam Feldman, The Most Moral Army in the World: The IDF as a Consumer and Producer of Humanitarian, Legal and Ethical Knowledge

Adar Cohen, The Complex Case of Citizenship Studies in Israeli Education System

In this panel we tried to place the academia alongside other spaces of knowledge-production and circulation, in order to consider the relations between the academia, the market and political power in a wider context, and especially in the context of what seems to be a generalized transformation in the Israeli regime: various recent maneuvers of Israeli governments, pertaining to the court system, the press, the education system, welfare state apparatuses, and the administration in the occupied territories.

This roundtable had a double purpose: to allow a comparative discussion which will take into account various spheres of knowledge-production; and through this comparison, to allow new insights into the changing nature of knowledge in general, especially as it emerges in this era, between the market and political power.

What is the relationship between the changing nature and status of knowledge and of academia, and the creative and selective production, use and implementation of economic, legal, political, scientific and “professional” knowledge and authority in different situations and contexts? For example, the use and production of techno-scientific, legal and humanitarian knowledge by and in the Israeli army and military industries; the invocation and mobilization of “expert committees”, consisting of academics and other professionals, which set policies in various social, political and public domains, including the restructuring and reorganization of higher education and academia itself.
**Institutionalizing Knowledge, Translating Political Cultures**

Chair: Yoav Kenny

Barbara Cassin, Translating the Dictionary of the Untranslatables

Juergen Renn, The Struggle for an Autonomy of Knowledge: Rethinking Cultural Abstractions

Dagmar Schaefer, Elusive Systems: History of China in a Globalized Academic Knowledge Economy

In this panel we tried to intensify the comparative dimensions of our discussion. We tried to do this through two concepts: translation and institutionalization.

How do the various questions we deal with in this conference appear in different places and different cultures? How are they embodied in institutions (from “discipline” to “university” to “academic freedom”)? How are they translated between languages, disciplines, cultures; between a case study and a general structure, pattern or theory, between the researcher and the research field, between personal experiences, scientific knowledge and institutions? Are models of knowledge institutionalization, of translating between cultures and languages, universal? Are they imperialistic? How do they emerge and how do they migrate through time, space, language and tradition?

What is the role of economic and political processes (the formation of the EU, the international dominance of the US, the globalization of markets), and of technological processes (the digitalization of knowledge, the alleged democratization of knowledge in the era of Internet and social networks, the strengthening of the hegemony of the English language through technology) in the translation and migration of knowledge, as well as the translation and migration of models for the institutionalization of knowledge and knowledge-production?

**Round Table: Education, Responsibility, Citizenship**

Chair: Itay Snir

Gideon Kunda, The Academia and the Foreign Communities in Israel

Nimrod Aloni, Towards a New Educational Sovereignty: Teachers’ Autonomy and the Independent Status of the National Board of Education

Ayman Agabaria, Producing New Knowledge in the Field of Education: Reading MA and PhD Theses of Arab Students in Israel

Yossi Dahan, Law in the Service of Privatization: On Parental Autonomy, Equal Opportunities and Democracy
In this panel we focused on various educational institutions with the aim of problematizing the hierarchies that organize them, and with the hope of overcoming the “trickle down” model of knowledge. Placing the academia within the broader spectrum of the education system allowed for a double transformation of the discussion. First, bringing into discussion extra-academic spaces of knowledge-production (e.g. schools). Second, thinking of the university as an institution of education rather than of research and scholarship. We examined the question of the responsibility of educators and education institutions, which spurred a discussion of the relations between knowledge, truth, democracy, citizenship, critique and social cohesion. We asked whose education is entrusted to the academia? What are the appropriate relations between research and education in universities? And how do the various social, political and economic processes we discussed in this conference affect fundamental conceptions such as the public’s right for education?

**Knowledge and the Humanities between Truth and Reality**

Chair: Gal Hertz

Michael Steinberg, Knowledge and the Humanities

Gabriel Motzkin, Contemporary Culture and the Crisis of the Humanities

Aviad Kleinberg, A Servant of Two Masters

In this panel we tried to inquire whether and how the various political and economic processes discussed during the conference, with the way they change the concepts of knowledge and truth on the one hand, and the status and role of knowledge and its relation to society and political power on the other, pose a unique challenge to the humanities or even change their function in this era.

If we think of the humanities via their Hebrew and German names—*Geisteswissenschaften* or *
מדעי הרוח*, literally “sciences of the spirit”—is it still possible to speak of such Geist or spirit in a world which has undergone thorough economization, commercialization and digitalization? Can we speak of truth that is neither totalitarian (or, for that matter, “pluralistic” in the worst post-modern sense), nor a mere blind and indifferent economic force? Do the humanities have a special status, role or perspective, compared with other fields of knowledge, in relation to truth, political power, and market/capital? Should we think of the humanities as bearing a unique and essential socio-cultural function, such as education for citizenship and critical thinking? Is it possible to conjecture other justifications, or missions, for the humanities in this era? is it possible, necessary, and desirable to justify the humanities, and to do so through any or all of the above?
Roundtable: Academia between Power and Capital

Chair: Lin Chaluzin Dovrat

Yofi Tirosh, Sex Segregation in Higher Education in Israel

Dani Filc, Academia, Power and Capital: The Garden of Converging Paths

Yosef Zeira, The Trap of Higher Education at the (Invisible) Hand of Market Forces

Iris Agmon, “We will be the First”: Production and Reproduction of Academic Hierarchies

Mordechai Kremnitzer, How to Guarantee Academic Freedom vis-à-vis Power and Capital

In this concluding roundtable we tried to tie together the various threads of the conference: to think about academia as a social institution that influences and is influenced by the conduct of government and political power on the one hand, and society, market and economic forces on the other; to look into the ways the political, social and economic shape and persist within knowledge itself; and to reflect on these issues both historically and philosophically.

We asked about the possible connection between the changing relations of academia, market and power and the general economic, political and cultural transformation of the now-widespread neoliberal economy—a transformation that includes, among other things, the dismantling of the welfare state, massive privatization, the effort to allow maximal mobility for capital and a simultaneous availability of flexible, disposable and cheap workforce. We also examined the context of the gradual erosion of the liberal-democratic regime in Israel and elsewhere (in Israel, the ongoing domination over non-citizen populations, and increase in direct, political intervention in spheres whose immunity form such intervention was, until recently, seen as imperative).

Are the changes in higher education systems, in the status of the academia, and in the conditions and conceptions of knowledge-production merely an aspect or a symptom of these widespread socio-economic and political processes? Is the academia simply a passive victim of these processes, or does it have a role in allowing, causing, shaping or perpetuating them?
2. Research Group: Sciences of Academia

Coordinators
Dr. Hagar Kotef, Prof. Shai Lavi, Dr. Anat Matar, Prof. Eyal Chowers.

Participants
Dr. Yofi Tirosh, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Tel Aviv University
Prof. Isaac (Yanni) Nevo, Ben Gurion University, Department of Philosophy
Prof. Oded Goldreich, The Weizmann Institute for Science
Prof. Dana Ron, Tel Aviv University, Engineering Faculty
Dr. Tamar Hager, Tel Chai Academic Center
Dr. Daniel Mishori, Tel Aviv University, The Porter School for Environment Research
Dr. Galia Plotkin, The Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics and Minerva Center
Dr. Noam Yuran, Minerva Humanities Center
Lin Chalozin-Dovrat, Minerva Humanities Center
Itay Snir, Minerva Humanities Center
Yoav Kenny, Minerva Humanities Center
Iftach Brill, Philosophy Department, Tel Aviv University
Asher Levy, Minerva Humanities Center
Dikla Bytner, Minerva Humanities Center

Rationale
As mentioned above, at the end of the 2013 academic year we have formed a collaboration with a group of scholars from the Safra Center for Ethics (Prof. Shai Lavi, Prof. Yishay Blank, Dr. Yofi Tirosh, Prof. Eyal Chowers) who shared our interest in the various questions related to academia and knowledge-production in this era. This mutual interest, together with the intellectual proximity of the two research centers, and their history of fruitful collaborations in the past, have spurred a new collaboration which, during the past year, took the shape of both the Knowledge in this Era conference as well as a joint a research group, "Sciences of Academia".

Our plan for next year is to dedicate our joint work to the compilation of an edited volume of papers arising from the 2014 international conference, together with the group's discussion sessions, as
well as from an additional workshop, Knowledge in this Place, which we are planning for next year (see below). The two centers will also fund a postdoc scholarship for a scholar who would direct and coordinate this publication.

During the current academic year, the research group met five times. In each meeting, one or two of the participants presented a text which we read in advance, followed by a discussion of the text and its relation to contemporary events. The discussions continued well after the conclusion of the sessions in a heated email correspondence among the group’s members.

### 2.1 First Semester

In the first semester, prior to the international conference, the group met twice, and the texts and discussions were aimed at elaborating the third interface our conference was organized around: a critical inquiry into the modes by which knowledge, power, the political, the social and the economical are woven into each other, and into traditional and contemporary conceptualizations of this fabric of relations.

In our first meeting, which took place on 31.10.13 and was directed by Anat Matar, we read her paper on the concept of "University", published in Mafte’akh 3 (Winter 2011). In the second meeting, which took place on 5.12.13, Raef Zreik presented his paper "Discipline in Kant and Foucault". We also read excerpts from Kant, including Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics; Critique of Pure Reason; and "What is Enlightenment?".

In these two meetings we tried to address questions concerning the political nature of knowledge as well as the scientific infrastructure of political rule (ranging from law and economics to medicine, and from ongoing administration to disaster-management and containment), by looking into the formative conceptions of these relations in modern Western thought (mostly Kant and his interpreters). We also sought to place these conceptions vis-à-vis recent developments: from the "out-sourcing" of teaching in peripheral universities to acclaimed academic centers via web-services, through the closing-down of traditionally fundamental university departments in Tel Aviv University and all over the world, to the proliferation, within universities, of projects and research centers as well as education and training programs, managed and ran in cooperation with military authorities and industries as well as commercial companies. We sought to clarify the distinction between political power, or political ruling power, politics and the political, and to raise questions pertaining to the possibility of differentiating and separating knowledge from its “political dimensions.” Is it necessary to

---

4 [http://mafteakh.tau.ac.il/2011/03/01-3/](http://mafteakh.tau.ac.il/2011/03/01-3/)

establish “scientific objectivity” in order to ground, authorize and legitimize knowledge? Is knowledge always-already political, only subsequently becoming non-political, or is it the other way around? How and under what conditions does knowledge become “political” or “non-political”—through which mechanisms, ideologies, knowledge-images and knowledge-ideals? What are the consequences of drawing a clear dividing line between academia and political power, and between knowledge and the political—the consequences, that is, for academic work and the knowledge it produces in various research fields (in the natural sciences and in the humanities)? And what are the consequences of questioning these lines and boundaries? In other words, what are the prices, and what are the gains, of the mutual permeation between the political and the scientific/academic/scholastic, on the one hand, and the prices and gains of their mutual seclusion (or unilateral fortification) on the other? How can we consider the various factors that come into play in establishing the complex array of relations between knowledge and its social and political dimensions? Finally, how is this complex web of relations reflected within academia and the university (in disciplinary distinctions, traditions, boundaries; in allocation and differential distribution of prestige, authority and budgets; in the internal organization and management of the university as an institution and a community), within knowledge itself (the shift from social and human sciences to neuro- and brain-sciences, the modes of establishing scientific objectivity or discerning political and normative commitment and bias, in (il)legitimate objects and methodologies of research, etc) and in the work and objectives of our group (a reading and research group; an emerging “expert committee” for anything to do with academia and universities; a possible alliance of present and future coalitions in the ongoing struggle over the character and place of academia and higher education).

2.2 Second Semester

During the spring semester of the 2013-2014 academic year we continued our discussion in meetings and email correspondence, this time clustered around the theme of “the public role of the academia”. The following description was sent as a call for participation to all scholars in the Minerva Center, to all the speakers who participated in the Knowledge in this Era conference, and to various other scholars whom we encountered and who had approached us thanks to the interest and discussion raised by our previous activities.

The university is a hybrid institution which produces, within itself, a set of tensions that are sometimes bridged and sometimes left unresolved. It is an institution which has one leg rooted in a universal discourse that demands scientific standards and traverse space and time, and another leg rooted in a specific national and cultural context. In some cases it functions as a public institution, and on
the other hand has a historical function of educating a ruling elite. It is an institution which trains professionals and produces knowledge for the benefit of the whole of society, and at the same time one that attempts to disengage from every discourse of legitimation and utility, save for a discourse anchored in the question of truth. These tensions produce crises of legitimation with which the university copes in various ways from its very inception.

The question of the legitimation of the university raises a series of other questions regarding the public role of academia, which we would like to address in the following semester. Which public needs should the academia fulfill? Does the university owe some kind of account to the public, to society or to the state, and if so, what kind of account should this be? Should academic research be "useful," and if so, in what sense? Should it be applicable? Should it serve to provide general education or to provide education for citizenship? Should it serve to unite or consolidate society or the nation; should it criticize political power, or have an enlightening or emancipating effect on groups or individuals? Does the university, as an institution, and those who teach or conduct research under its auspices, have a unique social responsibility, especially within the model of public education, and if so, what are the origins of this responsibility, and what are its manifestations? How are these reflected in the structural-institutional organization of the university and in the organization of knowledge beyond the university (in the relations between universities and colleges, for example)?

These questions, which are always relevant, are becoming sharper now, at a time when academia is faced with new challenges—economic, political, cultural and others. These changes both necessitate and allow us to rethink the social and public role of academia, the material and political conditions within which it functions, and the implications of these questions on its institutional organization and on the nature of academic knowledge. The last few years have spurred a renewed interest in these questions, and various important studies concerning higher education have been published. In Israel, where the dominant model is still that of the public university, there is heightened importance to holding such a public discussion, and questions concerning the responsibility of the university towards the public, the state and society are becoming more urgent than usual.

The Edmond J. Safra center for Ethics and the Minerva Humanities Center invite you to participate in a research group which will include scholars whose field of research is higher education as well as scholars who attribute a special significance to reflecting on this subject in their capacity as academics. The aim of our meetings is to examine these questions more deeply by reading and discussing contemporary literature on the subject. The texts we will read are intended to present a broad international context. Through the discussions in the group meetings we will try to localize and anchor our inquiry in the Israeli context.
**Third Meeting, 23.3.14**

**Speakers:** Hagar Kotef and Eyal Chowers.


Jean-Paul Sartre’s interview with Daniel Cohn-Bendit, 1968.


We can think of these three texts as representing three distinct traditions concerning the public role of the university: an elitist German tradition, a revolutionary-communist tradition and a communitarian-American tradition. It seems that all these traditions are foreign to us here in Israel. Another way to think about these texts is as representing three structures rather than three historical traditions: An instrumental discourse which subjects the pursuit of truth to other functions (Magnes); a synthesis and unification of truth and responsibility, without subjection or conflict (Barber: the university *is* a civic mission); and the third model, of fracture and split, within both the academia and society (the conversation between Sartre and Cohn-Bendit). The university has a responsibility towards society, and yet society itself is fractured. Thus, the question arises to which parts of society do we have to respond, and who is this “we” who is responsible to society, seeing as the academia is in itself split.

---

**Fourth Meeting, 6.4.14**

**Speakers:** Shai Lavi and Anat Matar.


With these two texts we were hoping to continue the discussion which began in the previous meeting and continued in an email correspondence between the group members. A possible interpretation of this discussion has to do with the question whether the university is a place of finding or exposing objective knowledge) as Yanni Nevo claimed, (or whether the academia and the knowledge it produces should be understood through the political, social and cultural contexts within which it exists.
Heidegger’s text is important since it shows, among other things, why these standpoints—science as culture, political, contextual, subjective (vs. science as objective knowledge)—are by no means adverse. Rather, they both belong to the same modern conceptual world. Heidegger offers us a different way of understanding the status of modern science—neither as a cultural product nor as a discovery of objective knowledge. He explains the deep challenges that modern academia confronts, as well as the relation between these challenges and the opposition which is not an opposition between the objective and the cultural.

Amsler’s text allows us to ground our discussion of Heidegger in current reality and to bridge the theoretical and the practical. This text is relevant for us here and now since it seems that the English university is pretty much in the same place as the Israeli one. Generally, the Israeli and English models are not too far removed: they are both mostly public, they share a similar half-national half-liberal ethos, and the structure of learning, teaching and degrees is more or less the same. The two are also unlike both the American and the German models. Also similarly, in the past few years there have been attempts, in both England and Israel, to adopt ever more American characteristics: privatization of higher education, cutting off positions and tenure tracks, a” mania ”of quantification and measurement, etc.

Both Amsler and Heidegger suggest regarding the crisis of the universities as part of the crisis of modernity. For Amsler, the crisis of the universities is entangled with the deep crisis of two other institutions: democracy and the Left. Rethinking the university has to be carried out through and alongside rethinking the latter two. Amsler mentions several reasons for binding these crises together. For example, certain values that seem to be constitutive of all three institutions, and seem to be subverted in the neoliberal era: responsibility to the community; freedom of speech and academic freedom; the right to education; immanent resistance to quantification, to reification, and to the translation of all measures into economic terms; the ability to assign value to certain things, for example research and knowledge, for the sake of their own good. Despite these similarities and proximities, however, one should not forget that the university has traditionally served privileged classes, and has not always accounted for that. Yet again, such social reproduction might also be true of democracy and the left, and might be yet another string which binds these crises together.

Reading Amsler next to Heidegger allows us to reconsider some aspects of the former’s argument. It seems that, according to Amsler, the problem resides in the political and neoliberal interventions and effects on the university. Heidegger’s starting point seems to be diametrically opposed: Heidegger would like to put aside politics and economy, and to consider the university in and of itself. He claims that there is a deep and fundamental problem with what the university, as the place where we think and talk about truth, does. It will turn out that there is a connection between these two outlooks,
which are nonetheless distinct. Heidegger asks what are the conditions of possibility of knowledge, of truth, of research, which are simultaneously the conditions which will later make the neoliberal process possible. That is, if we think with Heidegger, we have to ask how the deepest sense of what we do in the university when thinking about truth is related to the neoliberalization of academia, without putting these questions in terms of cause and effect. As long as we understand the autonomy of the university in terms of non-intervention, this, according to Heidegger, is the problem rather than the solution. Research-for-research’s-sake is part of the problem. The alternative is not to look for a way back (back to being a scholar rather than a researcher, for example), but to think more radically about such concepts as university, democracy (in the sense of freedom) and the left (in the sense of radical thinking).

It is tempting to say that Heidegger’s text concerns the internal economy and politics of knowledge, but it is precisely our thinking through these concepts of economy and politics that is problematic. For Heidegger, both the attempt to establish some kind of subjective position (a socio-economic position, a political position), and the attempt to establish the objectivity of knowledge or the autonomy of the university, are two sides of the same coin. The fact that it is “the anthropological” that is always opposed to “objective truth” posits both of these as the mirror image of each other: both are “a world picture”, the place where the subject meets objective reality. Heidegger does not seek to return from objective truth to subjective truth (power, politics, anthropology, critique etc.), but rather to return from objective truth back to the world. Hence it is not enough to reconsider the humanities. One must also consider the natural sciences, exact sciences etc., as all these sciences, along with the humanities, complement each other as “subjective” and “objective”, “scientific” and “anthropological”, in shaping our “world picture”.

Fifth Meeting, 11.5.14
Speaker: Yanni Nevo


Derrida’s first assumption is that the modern university is an institutionalization of the principle of reason. Derrida’s second assumption is that the principle of reason realized by the university is the traditional rationalist “principle of sufficient reason”, and particularly Leibniz’s version of it. The fact that Derrida relies on the rationalist tradition is part of his polemics. The principle of sufficient reason—not simply a cause, but a reason—states that for every proposition there is a rational basis; that is, everything should be derived from a rational foundation, which is given to the subject, to the cogito, and we must never begin our reasoning from something which is simply posited. Derrida’s
third assumption is a twofold maneuver against the principle of sufficient reason: first, there is no way to ground the principle of sufficient reason in reason itself. It can only be grounded in power or in will. Second, the principle of sufficient reason is a total and totalizing principle. It attempts to contain actuality in its entirety in one system which can be calculated and rationalized. And this totality is contradictory as well, since reason is both part of this totality and the whole of it. Thus, the principle of sufficient reason collapses into power (rather than into reason), and since the principle of sufficient reason is fundamental to reason, reason itself collapses with it into incoherence, and becomes a realization of power rather than rationality. The same is true of the university, which is the institutionalization of reason, collapsing in its turn into incoherence being founded on the principle of sufficient reason. Thus, the university collapses into “technoscience” enslaved to military interests.

Yanni suggested that we should pay heed to the structure of Derrida’s argument. Derrida claims that the principle of sufficient reason is essential to reason (x is essential to y), and the principle of sufficient reason collapses into incoherence (x collapses into incoherence), thus reason collapses into incoherence (y collapses into incoherence). This is a valid argument, yet the validity of the argument is insufficient to establish the validity of the proposition. Why should we accept that x is essential to y, that is that the principle of sufficient reason is essential to reason? Kant, for example, claims that reason is a faculty of principles but not a faculty of understanding. That is, Kant does not project reason onto the world. Alternatively Peirce, who proposes the “pragmatic principle,” sees action as central to cognition.

Clearly, then, there are alternatives to the principle of sufficient reason, and Derrida chooses this principle for polemical reasons. Through a consistent allegiance with rationalism, he can show that we must go beyond reason, into the realm of deconstruction, which is in fact more consistent with reason and more loyal to rationality than its critiques. In the text we read, the dichotomy between a complete adherence to rationalism is posited in terms of the modern university: a techno-science subjected to economic and military interests vs. a utopian reform of the university, centered around the humanities and around deconstruction, which is thought that goes beyond reason.

This dichotomy is destructive if we accept it as the basis for our thought concerning universities. If, on the other hand, we accept a different concept of reason, a non-totalizing empiricist reason which does not pretend that the whole of actuality is rational, then we can posit, as the foundation of the university, the principle that there is a space of criticism, within which every proposition, every theory, has to be put to an independent test which results must be accepted. This is an endless process through which the less rigorous theories are sifted, and a constant progress towards justified propositions takes place. This is a common ground for all fields of knowledge, which allows for the formation of an integrated – not a split – university.
A different interpretation of Derrida’s text also emerged in the discussion. It is possible to read Derrida’s argument not as a philosophical argument, but rather as an historical, indeed empirical one. Derrida does not adopt the Leibnizian principle of sufficient reason as his concept of reason or as the philosophically “correct” concept of reason. Rather, he claims that this rationalistic and totalizing conception of reason is at work, and is institutionalized, reflected, reproduced and enforced in and through the modern Western university and the conceptions of knowledge and knowledge-production it historically embodies. This might not be apparent in the explicit conceptions of knowledge and reason expressed in scientific and philosophical research and scholarship, but it is apparent if one pays heed to the historical course of the “progress” of knowledge in the modern West. While for Kant it was still possible to demarcate a sheltered sphere of criticism and knowledge for the sake of knowledge and truth, and to differentiate object from subject, world from reason, nature from culture, in the late twentieth century such a demarcation seems no longer possible, or at least much harder, under the rapid short-circuiting of all of the above distinctions through techno-scientific progress coupled with economic growth and biopolitical governmentality, all designed to calculate and allow for the uninterrupted and smooth flow of progress and growth which have become an objective force of nature and a categorical imperative, which, if disrupted, might cause a universal crisis. Under this drift (of progress and growth, of thinking as reason and of reason as calculation), ever-growing portions of knowledge and knowledge-production are subsumed under an ideal of objective knowledge, indifferent to human meaning and history, calculated and anticipated in advance to be assimilated into a political economy which both allows the ongoing progress towards truth and is allowed and justified by this progress. What Derrida calls for is not irrationality, but rather an insistence on additional modes of thought and reasoning, which are still reasonable (and perhaps even more reasonable, or more humanly meaningful and intelligible than reason as calculation), yet are not homogenous with calculation, be it logical, economic or political-military.

2.1 Future Plans

2.1.1 Knowledge in this Place workshop

Following the Knowledge in this Era conference that took place this January, the Minerva Humanities Center and the Safra Center for Ethics will organize a workshop focusing on the particular problematics of academic knowledge and intellectual discussion in Israeli Academia. The workshop will take place over two days in early February 2015. The project will be led by Hagar Kotef (Lexicon Group) and Shaul Setter (Living Together group) from the Minerva Center. The workshop seeks to go beyond the questions already unpacked in the previous one, concerning the relations between academia and political power in Israel, and beyond a mapping of the different regimes of separation within which the Israeli academia operates (between Jews and Palestinians, citizens and non-citizens,
universities and colleges, private and public higher education, periphery and center, etc). Drawing on these important issues, the workshop seeks to situate the discussion in the junction of "East" and "West" as a crucial junction that frames some of the unique aspects of Israeli academic knowledge. What, for example, is the array of relations that emerges from the gap between the German university model, which served as model for the Israeli academia, and, on the one hand, the increased Americanization processes it undergoes in recent years; or between this German (subsequently American) model and the Middle Eastern space within which Israeli academy is situated? What are the relations between the ideal of universal, abstract knowledge (simultaneously Christian and secular) and a locality rooted in other traditions of knowledge? What are the meanings and implications of academic research in the Global periphery? Is such knowledge necessarily provincial (and what would that mean)? What are the various limits and limitations, as well as possibilities and opportunities, of a local thought on this particular locus?

2.1.2 Research and Writing Group: Sciences of the Academia

Next year, the joint reading group will change its form to become oriented more towards research and publication. We plan on assembling together 15 researchers—some from the group that operated this year and some new participants, coming from various disciplines and academic ranks. While the group will center on reading and research during the first semester, the second semester will be dedicated to working on drafts authored by members of the group. The goal is to publish a book of collected essays within two years. The publication will focus on the civic, social, and political roles of the academia (particularly in the contemporary Israeli context, but introducing global and historical perspectives). Both the Minerva Center and the Safra Center made budgetary commitments to support the researchers, in order to create a commitment to the processes of joint inquiry and writing.

2.1.3 Future Israeli-German Cooperation

We are hoping to continue the fruitful collaboration of the Minerva Humanities Center and the Heinrich Boell Stiftung in Israel, which formed and developed through the conference we organized together.

We hope that this collaboration will take the form of a joint research group, bringing together German and Israeli scholars, who will meet for at least one intensive workshop. Within this framework, we are hoping to continue our previous conversations and to facilitate a comparative research into our intertwined academic and intellectual traditions, as well as the institutional, political and economic transformations of knowledge-production and higher education in Germany and Israel; and finally, to embed this comparative research in a broad, global and historical context.
We see such future research as focusing on one or more of the following themes:

a. *The migration of knowledge and academic traditions between Germany and Israel, past and present.*

The construction of the Israeli Academia in the early twentieth century, prior the establishment of the state of Israel, was heavily influenced by scholarly and institutional traditions of German academia. This influence of the modern German university is of course by no means unique to the Israeli case. And yet the relations of the Israeli academia and the modern German university in general, and specific traditions in both the Geisteswissenschaften and in science and engineering, had a major effect on prominent Israeli academic institutions from their very inception, including the Hebrew University, the Technion, and Tel Aviv University. How did these models and knowledge migrate from Germany to Erez Israel? What was their impact on the young, emerging Jewish academic community in Israel? How did these interact with existing local intellectuals and intellectual traditions in Israel/Palestine? Did it have any reciprocating influence on German scholars and institutions? What kinds of relations and collaborations between German and Israeli scholars and institutions were taking place during these early years of the constitution of a Jewish academic community in Israel?

b. *“New Histories”.* Both Germany and Israel have been witnessing, over the past few decades, the emergence of new local, historiographical studies and historiographical approaches relating to their recent past. These “new histories” have commanded heated public debates that touched not only on sensitive questions of national identity, national collectivity, national past, present and future, but also upon the relations between knowledge and the political, intellectuals and the academic community, the public and the nation-state. We would like to look into these Israeli and German historiographical and public discourses with a comparative framework in mind, placing them within a historical, intellectual and political context, in order to address questions concerning the relations between academia and the nation-state, knowledge and national identities, academic communities and civil communities, academic discourse and public and political discourse, scientific and scholarly methodologies and political and historical processes, the making and breaking of disciplinary demarcations and the “red lines” of scientific knowledge and objectivity.

c. *Changing academic traditions — past and present, between the global and the local.* Both the German and Israeli academia have been going through major transformations over the past few years: extensive budget cuts (or shifts of interest, legitimacy and funding between various fields of knowledge), transformations in modes of scholarly employment and research-fund recruitment, institutional and disciplinary reorganization (some of them relating or effecting the modes of justification of research and scholarship, and the relations between “pure” and “applicable” knowledge, academic and commercial research, etc). These processes occurred differently in Israel and Germany, and yet there are many similarities, as well as a shared global context connecting the two states and effecting academia all over the world. We would like to combine a comparative local research with an integrated global perspective into the various processes that shape and transform Israeli and German higher education, and higher education worldwide, over the past few decades.
1. The Book Review Project

The Book Review Project is a series of conferences dedicated to recently-published books in the Humanities and related Social Sciences. Leading researchers from these various disciplines—including Philosophy, History, Linguistics, Literature, Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, Cultural Studies, etc.—and from all research universities in Israel, as well as authors and public intellectuals, participate in these events. By providing a stage for these encounters, MHC aims to establish a fertile and critical discussion, which meets the highest standards of academic research, as well as being accessible to the general public, and relevant to the social and political questions of the present.

During the last academic year, the program included ten conferences. These were attended by large audiences, and have received public attention in the media, and high acclaim by both their participants and the audience. In addition, one conference each semester was dedicated to an issue of general public interest. The selected issues this year were the participation of women of minority groups in the academia, and animal rights. These topic-based conferences too were attended by a large audience, and inspired a vibrant intellectual debate which had impact outside the confines of the university. We look forward to continuing this tradition next year by expanding our circle of colleagues, and to further our contribution in forming a vital and intellectual community.

The following is a list of Book Review conferences that took place this year, including an estimated number of attendants.

1.1 List of Minerva Book Review Events

8/12/13 Modernity and the Holocaust, by Zygmunt Bauman. Hebrew translation Yaniv Farkash. Participants: Hanna Polin Galay (Tel Aviv University), Moshe Zuckerman (Tel Aviv University), Amos Goldberg (The Hebrew University), Nathan Snaider (Academic College of Tel Aviv). Attendance: 30.

22/12/13 Topical Conference: “Participation of Women of Minority Groups in the Academia”. Participants: Revital Madar (Tel Aviv University, MHC), Yonit Naaman (Ben Gurion University of the Negev), Hannah Herzog (Tel Aviv University), Claris Harbon (McGill University), Raghda Alnabulsi (Hebrew University), Orly Binaymin (Bar Ilan University). Attendance: 40.

29/12/13 The Human Condition, by Hannah Arendt. Participants: Idith Zertal (Tel Aviv University), Itay Snir (Tel Aviv University, MHC), Yaron Ezrahi (Hebrew University), Hagar Kotef (Tel Aviv University, MHC), Anat Matar (Tel Aviv University), Dotan Leshem (Columbia University), Eva Illouz (Hebrew University, Bezalel), Yoav Kenny (Tel Aviv University, MHC). Attendance: 130.
2/1/14 “The Philosophy of Education.” A discussion of three, recently-published Israeli books on the philosophy of education. Participants: Itay Snir (Tel Aviv University, The Open University, MHC), Nimrod Aloni (Kibbutzim College), Hagit Gur Ziv (Kibbutzim College), Yitzhak Kashti (Tel Aviv University), Yossi Yonah (Ben Gurion University of the Negev), Aiman Agbaria (Haifa University). Attendance: 40.

9/1/14 In the footsteps of Psychoanalysis: A Postmodern Gendered Criticism of Freud, by Lyat Friedman. Participants: Maya Mukamel (Haifa University), Immanuel Berman (Haifa University), Effi Ziv (Tel Aviv University), Lyat Friedman (Bezalel Academy of Art). Attendance: 40.

27/3/14 A Treatise of Human Nature, by David Hume. Hebrew translation: Iftach Brill. Participants: Idan Shimoni (Tel Aviv University), Ruth Weintraub (Tel Aviv University), David Enoch (The Hebrew University), Iftach Brill (Tel Aviv University). Attendance: 60.

7/5/14 What Money Wants: An Economy of Desire, by Noam Yuran. Participants: Anat Matar (Tel Aviv University), Roy Kreitner (Tel Aviv University), Anat Rosenberg (IDC Herzliya), Noam Yuran (Tel Aviv University, MHC). Attendance: 80.

13/5/14 I and Thou, by Martin Buber. Participants: Asher Levi (Tel Aviv University), Hagi Kenaan (Tel Aviv University), Maya Kahanov (The Hebrew University), Aaron Flashman (The Hebrew University). Attendance: 50.

18/5/14 Towards a History of Photography, by Vilem Flusser. Participants: Ruthie Ginsburg (Tel Aviv University, Ben Gurion University of the Negev), Aim Deuelle Luski (Tel Aviv University, Bezalel Academy of Art), Yannai Toister (Shenkar, Bezalel Academy of Art), Yonatan Soen (Tel Aviv University), Itzhak Benyamini (Bezalel Academy of Art, Haifa University). Attendance: 30.

5/6/14 “Philosophical, political and cultural perspectives on Animals”. Participants: Elia Etkin (Tel Aviv University), Tzachi Zamir (The Hebrew University), Adi Weinstein (The Hebrew University), Adi Winter (Animal liberation activist), Michal Gleitman (The Polonsky Academy, Van Leer Institute). Attendance: 60.
ימ גן לכתבי הספר
مفחתת – מבחר מכתבים פוליטיים
יום חמישי, 7 באוגוסט 2014

משתתפיה
י.ד. הללאן
עוזי אופר, גד תרגוב, עז חלוץ-ברר, יוסי מודר,
עניל רדרגר, יואב קני, גלית פיש

אורח בחריין

משתתפים
י.ד. יואל נומר
 tileSize קול, אלן שטרן, יואב מ. דניאל פיכל, אסף טמר,
גור בוקינס ואוריאל חניא, אמיתי זיו, רבקה פלדה

ספסלה קפה

משתתפים
י.ד. יוחנן זיו
 אורי אלקין, אראל אלמק, מתי אייפרגן, דנה בן-שלום,
רצני מוכאל, נדנדה אלנבל eSports שורט

ספסלה קפה

镈ית
ניליל שלח, "مفחתת, מה היא פורשה?"

הרצאה עכשווית

Day 1 (June 29)

9.00-9.30 Registration & Coffee

9.30-10.30 Greetings and Introduction

Greetings:
Olivier Tourny, Centre de recherche français à Jérusalem (CRFJ)
Eitan Bar-Yosef, Ben Gurion University and the Van Leer Institute

Introduction:

10.30-13.00
The political economy of the settlements
Chair: Merav Amir, Queen’s University Belfast
David Newman, Ben Gurion University, Settlement as Suburbanisation: The Banality of Colonisation
Erez Maggor, New York University, State and Market Relations in Israel’s Settlement Project: Housing Policy and the Shift from Messianic Outposts to Urban Settlements in the 1980s
Manes Stihade, The Hebrew University, The Welfare State of Settlers

Dana Rubin, Open University UK and SOAS, Haredi Settlers: Religion and Neoliberalism on the West Bank Frontier

Discussant: Ian Lustick, University of Pennsylvania

13.00-14.30 Lunch

14.30-16.30 Inside the settlements (anthropological perspectives)
Chair: Eitan Bar-Yosef, Ben Gurion University and the Van Leer Institute
Hannah Mayne, University of Florida, Personal Narratives of Female Settlers: Uncovering Alternative Routes and Networks
Callie Maidhof, UC Berkeley, Beyond Separation: Affective Annexation between the Green Line and the Wall
Shimi Friedman, Open University, Hills, Farms, and the Local Council: A Heterogenic Society in Conflict at Southern Hebron Settlements

Discussant: Hadass Weitz, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies

16.30-17.00 Coffee break
17.00-18.30
Comparative views on settlements
Chair: Erez Maggor, New York University
Johannes Becke, University of Oxford, Taking Tiger Mountain by Strategy: Typological Theory and the Case for a Transnational Perspective on Israeli Expansionism
Discussant: Sandi Kedar, Haifa University

Day 2 (June 30)

10.00-12.00
The heterogeneity of settlers
Chair: Ariel Handel, Centre de recherche français à Jérusalem (CRFJ) and Tel Aviv University
Lee Cahaner, Oranim Academic College, Ultra-Orthodox Settlements in Judea and Samaria
Sivan Hirsch-Hoeffer, IDC and Haifa University, Organized We Stand, Divided We Fall: The Effect of Organizational Membership and Collective Identity on Radical Collective Action

Discussant: Dani File, Ben-Gurion University

12.00-13.30 Lunch

13.30-15.30
The spatiality of settlements
Chair: Marco Allegra, Instituto Universitario de Lisboa
Ariel Handel, Centre de recherche français à Jérusalem (CRFJ) and Tel Aviv University, ‘Our Grapevines’ Life is Hard’: Terroir and Territory-Making in the West Bank
Haim Yacobi, Bezalel Academy, and Wendy Pullan, University of Cambridge, The geopolitics of neighbourhood: Jerusalem’s colonial space revisited
Erez Tzaadia, Sapir College, The Grey Space of Israel’s Settlement in the West Bank
Discussant: Ronen Shamir, Tel Aviv University

15.30-16.00 Coffee break

16.00-17.30 Concluding remarks
Are Modern Societies Racist?

International Conference | RACISM AND XENOPHOBIA IN ISRAEL AND EUROPE TODAY
20-21 November 2013 | Tel Aviv University, Gilman Building, 496

Wednesday, 20 November 2013
17:30 Gathering
18:00 Chair: Yoav Schwartz, Director, Cohen Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Judaism, Tel Aviv University
Mina Lehrer, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to Israel
Aharon Shal, Rector, Tel Aviv University
Angela Stern, Director, Raumklang, Hamburg, Israel Office
Keynote Address (in Hebrew):
Shlomo Rabinovitch, Racism and Ethnonational Conflicts are Challenges to Humanity
19:30 Screening of the film “Your Extra Soul” (Racism Versus Freedom, 1974-94, Israel, German with Hebrew subtitles)
With the opening of the Israel Ethnographic Society.

Thursday, 21 November 2013
10:00 Gathering
10:30 Chair: Michael Evzerovich, Tel Aviv University
Opening Talk: Noam Sheiber (Tel Aviv), The Constitution of Religion in New Mumbai: Independent Jain Community
11:45-12:30 TALK 1
Chair: Haidar Sethi (Tel Aviv)
Mahdis Malakouti (Tel Aviv University of Applied Sciences, Rania Alizadeh)
Asad Bashir (HU), Analysis of Persecutions as Sources of Knowledge and “Racism”
Julien Kavenard (Freiburg University) International Perspectives in the Field, Racial Concepts in School Education in Ten African Countries
Shuki Levi (Tel Aviv), On the Line and Area of Racism for Holocaust
13:45-15:45 TALK 2
Chair: Marcella Forte (Tel Aviv)
Manuel Castells (USA), The Internet: Monster, Cyber-Pirate, Archeologist and Global Gatekeeper
Muminah Saffari (Tel Aviv), The Possibility of Collective Action for Change under Neoliberal Regime and Drug Enforcement
Government Scholars: The History of Memory, Social Dynamics: The Case of Greek Diaspora
Anoush Mahan (International Association for the Study of the History of Science, Technology and Medicine, Iran) International Perspectives on the Middle East: The Case of Iran, Analysis from the Perspectives of an Anti-Israel NGO

Free Admission | The Conference will be held in Hebrew and English, and will be broadcast live via
www.mwx.msu.ac.il and www.mhx.msu.ac.il: 03-4624800, 03-4624995
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From Settlers to Natives? Lecture Series

Dirk Moses, Department of History and Civilization, European University Institute, Florence, Italy
From Settlers to Natives? A View from Australia

Raeif Zreik, Tel Aviv University
From Settlers to Natives? Ethical and Political Reflections
The Research Group Living Together

Minerva Humanities Center - Annual Report 2013-2014
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Shimon Shel Mekomot

living together

An International Workshop at Tel-Aviv University for the Study of Place and Community: Interdisciplinary Approaches

Yom Rishu, "I and the Community," 14th January 2014

The Workshop

14:00-15:30
14:10-14:00
15:50-16:10

The Opening Session

Prof. Ido Ben Porat

The Plenary Session

Prof. Gal Tadmor

Panel 1: The City and the Community

Chair: Prof. Gal Tadmor

Prof. Yehuda Elitzur

Prof. Alon Tal

Prof. Yehuda Elitzur

Participants: Prof. Yehuda Elitzur, Prof. Gal Tadmor, Prof. Alon Tal

Panel 2: The Community and the City

Chair: Prof. Alon Tal

Prof. Yehuda Elitzur

Prof. Gal Tadmor

Prof. Yehuda Elitzur

Participants: Prof. Yehuda Elitzur, Prof. Gal Tadmor, Prof. Alon Tal

Panel 3: The Interdisciplinary Approach

Chair: Prof. Alon Tal

Prof. Yehuda Elitzur

Prof. Gal Tadmor

Prof. Yehuda Elitzur

Participants: Prof. Yehuda Elitzur, Prof. Gal Tadmor, Prof. Alon Tal

The Closing Session

16:50-17:30

Dr. Yehuda Elitzur

Dr. Gal Tadmor

Dr. Alon Tal

Dr. Yehuda Elitzur

Participants: Dr. Yehuda Elitzur, Dr. Gal Tadmor, Dr. Alon Tal

A New Urbanism (in Hebrew) by Rami Kwarco and Yehuda Elitzur

The Center for the Study of the City and Community

am.dahamshe@gmail.com

Dr. Yehuda Elitzur
The Research Group Living Together

The Research Group Living Together:

A Living Program that meets the challenge of the present day

יום שישי, 17 ביוני 2014
ויתורפוסות הגדול, בניין לילה, חדר 280, 16:00-19:30

16:00 מושב ראש
ייזר: שאול סטיר אוניברסיטת תל אביב
ענות לפרסום: פירידית מונה ולי
דמוקרטיה ללא דמוקרטיה? זירות וויתור בחברות
מהו מוספים המרכז למדעי אקולוגיה, אור יזרו
אינטראקציה של הדרמה הפוליטית, דמוקרטיה והאינטלקטואלים
הquisar לתחום המנהיגות

17:45 הופעה
ייזר: רבקה פלדמן אוניברסיטת תל אביב
אמונת ד"ר קאבי אוניברסיטת בר-נוריYN בונב
הכל היזרו מקהל:
לאומיות, הולנדיות וישראלים
מסכת על טבע האדם

עורashi שמעוני, אוניברסיטת תל אביב
רותי ויינברג, אוניברסיטת תל אביב
דוד אנגל, אוניברסיטת נברשת
איסמט ביד, אוניברסיטת תל אביב
יומא בול, אוניברסיטת תל אביב

27.3.14
יומאΊח, בשעה 16:00
_pol condom אולם גיר
ואוניברסיטת תל אביב
הכנסה חופשית
הכינוס חוה לשבט
ה(!(ןורטס הלכדר החודש לופור על יולמ פלוסר
לקראת פילוסופיה על העולם
תרגומ: יותם ו. סואן

רחבי ג'בורה
אוןיברסיטת קיימן
אוןיברסיטת ב. גורן, בכובב

חיים לגוזר לוסיק
אוןיברסיטת ת'יא, ברצאל

יאיר פוספר
שער, ברצאל
אוןיברסיטת סרני

יונה ו. סואן
אוןיברסיטת פֶּרֶּה

יצחק בנימין
ברצאל, אוניברסיטת חיפה

יום ראשון: 14.5.14, ושעה 18:00
בנין 306, בניין גלמא, מחלקה 326, אוניברסיטת תל אביב
הכינוס חוה
ערב עニー מימה: גבעים פילוסופיים, פילוסופים ותרבותים

 LoginActivity
ואליה אטקני (יודר)
אניב ברלין

עדר יונשטיין
האוניברסיטה הפתוחה ירושלים

עדר יונשטיין
האוניברסיטה הפתוחה ירושלים

מעיל לילימן
אקדמית פולונסקיה
מקוב ולייר בורנשטיין

יום חמישי, 14.5.14, בשעה 16:00
בנין גולדברג, חדר 277, אוניברסיטת תל אביב
היכיונה חיות