Arab and Jewish Youth in Israel: Voicing National Injustice on Campus

Rachel Hertz-Lazarowitz[*]

Haifa University, Israel

Haifa University (HU) is the stage for a prolonged social drama between Arabs (20%) and Jews. 86 students (38 Arabs and 48 Jews) were interviewed on their experiences of injustice. Three major differences emerged. For the Arabs, 92% of injustice took place on campus compared to 40% for the Jews. Arabs attributed injustice to discrimination (60%), Jews to the actors' personal characteristics (58%); the Arabs transformed injustice events into a political struggle for national recognition, identity, and narratives. The analysis intimates that Arabs' "social being" is developing through the staging of negative expressive acts, namely, respect/contempt and power/weakness. Thus actors at HU can stage social processes, and change sites of surveillance and injustice into places of reconciliation and coexistence.

Youth can encounter injustice individually or as a group (Daiute & Fine, this issue). On April 4, 2000, a highly violent conflict took place on the Haifa University (HU) campus, involving Arab (minority) and Jewish (majority) students, the police, and HU authorities. It was one more act in a persistent pattern of conflictual rituals that disturb the seemingly serene routine of academic and social coexistence on campus, and launch the Arab and Jewish students into annual "campus wars" (Arthur & Shapiro, 1995). Often those conflicts are the outcome of deep feelings of injustice and surveillance experienced by different groups of students.

Campuses in general are significant and symbolic spaces for youth empowerment around the world, for example, the United States, South Africa, and Israel

(Hare, 1985). University campuses have become a stage for political activism, with violent and sometimes non-violent conflicts. By confronting authorities of power, students are the "actors" who are "playing" various types of "social being" in order to test and redefine power, status, identity, and majority-minority relations, including the legitimacy of opposing collective narratives.

Harre, in his theoretical construction of the Social Being (1979), suggests a model of a Social Drama, applying concepts from the theater to social psychology. During the past 25 years HU campus has indeed become a major stage in Israel for intergroup social drama. In keeping with this model, feelings of injustice and surveillance on the campus are studied and conceptualized here first on the *academic personal level* and then as they shift to the *ethnic and national group level*. This transformation takes place when the actors, Arab and Jewish students and their leaders, realize the significance of their acts.

Based on Arthur and Shapiro (1995), *Injustice* is defined as personal experiences of unjust actions by one person or group against another without consent and causing harm and feeling of anger and alienation. *Surveillance* exists when these actions are transposed from the personal level to the collective level and are interpreted as acts against the collective. *Violence* is reactive or proactive actions to disturb the routine of teaching and research on campus.

This study continues my inquiry into social developmental processes within HU's unique *Umwelt*, this term being defined by Lewin (1935) as the physical environment crossing its social meaning. An earlier study (Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1988) of the perennial conflicts between Arabs and Jews followed the Harre model and focused on the physical environment of this *Umwelt*, including the architecture of the setting, the sequence of events, and the presentation of the conflict in the public sphere (printed documents). The present study focused on the "social meaning" of the *Umwelt* by means of interviews seeking data on experiences of injustice and surveillance as perceived by Jewish and Arab students and their leaders. It is argued that lessons learned from the HU *Umwelt* and conflict on campus can suggest directions to restructure Arab-Jewish relations on the HU campus and in Israel.

The study probed two issues: first, the relationship between personal experiences of injustice and justice and the culture of perceived surveillance on campus, and the way it shaped students' social being, and second, how students' leaders transformed their own and other students' personal experiences into collective messages. Our basic assumption on both issues was that the university is a space for advantaged and disadvantaged groups of students to achieve academic excellence in a just and moral way. The qualitative data based on personal interviews served to conceptualize and discuss the messages/themes voiced by the students. This may further social scientists' understanding of the causes of conflict or coexistence to the campus and lead to the experience of and experimentation with new visions of a more peaceful social drama on campus.

The Dramaturgical Model

Harre's (1979) dramaturgical model guides the theoretical current analysis of injustice and surveillance on campus. Harre's focus was on interpersonal relationships, but in an earlier study (Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1988) we found the model highly applicable to the Israeli intergroup conflict situation. In the present study we rely on Harre's three pairs of concepts, as were modified to actions of injustice and acts of surveillance of ethnic and national relationships on HU campus. The three original pairs of concepts are presented with examples from HU *Umwelt* and a fourth pair developed in our 1988 study is added. The first pair is *Practical/Expressive* aspects of social activity, in which activities viewed by one group as practical, are interpreted by the other as expressive, and vice-versa. For example, at HU, the speaking of Arabic by Arabs openly on campus or their socializing in large groups in central areas of Eshkol Tower (the main building on campus, with 30 stories) are viewed by the Arabs as natural and *practical social activities.* But the Jews consider them *expressive* of threat to the Jewish identity of the HU, and metaphorically to the future of the Jewish homeland.

The second pair, *Action/Acts*, differentiates a sequence of behavior, namely, the Actions, from their interpretation and meaning, namely, the Acts. Each ritual can be analyzed as a sequence of action types. For instance, kissing, handshaking, and nodding are interpretable as the Greeting Act. In the sequential structure of conflict, Actions such as shouting, catcalling, and fighting during a demonstration constitute either an Act violating freedom of speech on campus or an Act of war between the minority and majority groups. Every facet of the social drama on campus requires interpretations of behaviors as Actions, and of Actions as Acts: "the very stuff of social life" (Harre, 1979). The dynamic of the contradictory interpretation of Actions and Acts is the reflection of expressive activities of people striving to present acceptable and recognized selves.

The third pair, the *Respect/Contempt duality*, refers to publicly expressed opinions (e.g., policies, newspapers, and other documentation) and to private feelings (e.g., personal interactions, interviews, and self-reports). Based on our earlier study we concluded those relations between Arabs and Jews on campus are highly motivated by the ritual of Respect and Contempt. For some participants in the drama these forces may operate unconsciously, and for others it is highly conscious.

The fourth pair, the *Power/Weakness* duality, was developed following the Hertz-Lazarowitz study (1988). Jews referred to this duality more then the Respect/Contempt duality. Power is expressed in terms of control and moral legitimacy while threat and fear of losing the homeland express weakness. This cultural difference was supported by social scientists, claiming that Respect/Contempt has a significant meaning, as an expressive Act, within the Arab culture (Dwairy, 1998) while Power/Weakness has a significant meaning as an expressive Act in the Jewish culture (Bar-Tal, 2000). In relating to those pairs the reader should be ever

aware of the significance of the shift across the duality in each pair of activities, in relating to personal and group events of injustice and surveillance.

Using this theoretical model, we sought to document young people in conflict and confrontation using events of injustice and surveillance to develop critical and political thinking. Thus they could create space for negotiation about their social being as expressed in themes of recognition, identity, and narratives. In doing so they could alter inter-group relations on campus (and off campus), and offer social scientists a new understanding of the interplay between personal and collective factors (Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1988; Hofman, 1988; Stephan, 1999).

Haifa University, Israel—A Site for Conflict and Coexistence

Despite its small size and population (about six million), Israel, like most societies in the Western world, is becoming ever more diverse in the economic, social, and cultural spheres. Social scientists in Israel name four major cleavages in Israeli society. These are the national cleavage between Jews (80%) and Arabs (20%); the religious cleavage between orthodox (14%) and secular Jews; the ethnic cleavage between Jews of Middle Eastern origin (Sephardim, about 50%) and Jews of European and American origin (Ashkenazim); and most recently the cleavage between immigrants, mostly from former Soviet Union (17%), and non-immigrants (Horowitz, 2000; Smooha, 1997).

Notwithstanding some changes in the intensity of the cleavages among the different groups, the Jewish–Arab cleavage has persisted since 1948, the year of the birth of the State of Israel. It centers on issues of narratives, identity, civic equality, loyalty, domination, and oppression. Within the Arab minority in Israel today, constituting 20% of the population, the majority is Muslims (85%), the rest are Christians (10%), Druze (5%), and other small groups of non-Jewish citizens. Most Jews and Arabs live in segregated cities or villages, and enroll in a fully segregated educational system (Al-Haj, 1998; Mar'i, 1978). The University is the sole place for meetings and interaction, hence the unique experience of HU for both groups.

HU with its 13,000 students, is located in one of the five mixed cities in Israel, and for the last 25 years HU had the largest Arab student body in Israel, which equals Arabs proportion in the population (20%). The contribution of HU to meet the academic aspirations of the Israeli Arabs is well documented (Al-Haj, 1998; Hofman, 1988; Hofman, Beit Hallahmi & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1982; Mar'i, 1978).

On the HU campus, "The structure of a setting may be an icon of the social theory . . . . The physical settings are not neutral, they contribute to the action" (Harre, 1979, p. 192). In HU the Arabs' presence gives them an expressive sense of power and respect, which they had not experienced before, in a mixed *Umwelt*. Conversely it makes many Jews feel threatened by the loss of power and the weakening of the Jewish identity of their *Umwelt* (Stephan, 1999). Consciously or

unconsciously the HU campus proclaims messages of power, territory, distance, and a struggle over recognition and control. Arabic, which is heard predominantly in the halls, has caused folk culture to label HU as "Palestine University" and "Fatahland." Thus, the architecture of Haifa University creates a social topography of distance and power (Lewin, 1935) between the actors in the social drama. Over the years, with the annual social drama taking its course, the two groups have become aware of the remarkably expressive meaning of the architecture and its messages (for a detailed analysis see Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1988).

Method

Participants

Participants were 86 students, 38 Arabs and 48 Jews. They were interviewed on campus or around it. Of them 26 were males (14 Jews and 12 Arabs) and 60 were females (26 Arabs and 34 Jews) from different department, and in age they ranged from 19 to 31 (average age of Arabs 23 and of Jews 25). In addition in-depth interviews (lasting each 3–4 hours) were conducted with a group of Arab ($N = 10$) leaders in the *Vaad*—the nonrecognized union of the Arabs—and Jewish ($N = 5$) leaders in the *Aguda*—the recognized student union (Avidan, Mahmoud, & Shochat, 2001).

Procedure

All participants were approached individually in the main space of the campus or elsewhere. They were asked: "Are you willing to participate in the study and tell about an event in which you felt that someone of authority controlled or acted toward you in an unjust way." Almost all students agreed; a time and a quiet place were assigned for the interview. The leaders' interviews began with the same 15 questions as described above and then moved on to their history, goals, and visions.

Interviewers

The interviewers were students enrolled in a research seminar (11 Arabs and 11 Jews). They worked in mixed cooperative teams (Miller & Harrington, 1992; Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1993; Deutsch, 1994) to obtain qualitative (interviews) and quantitative (questionnaires, not reported here) data. They were trained in interview procedures and analysis within the seminar meetings (about 12 hours).

Each team conducted a structured interview with five university students and the same number of high school students from the same national group. (The high school interviews are not reported here.) Interviews were in Hebrew (Jewish interviewers with Jewish interviewees) and Arabic or Hebrew (Arab interviewers with Arab interviewees).

Interview Measures

The interview included 15 open-ended questions and lasted 30–45 minutes. All interviews were tape-recorded, and transcribed to 3–4 typed pages. The transcription was analyzed by categories derived from Fine et al. (this issue) and Hertz-Lazarowitz (2001). The categories, derived directly from the 15 open questions, were: (a) context; (b) location; (c) participants; (d) feelings of the person under surveillance (A); (e) self-description; (f) interpretation (A's); (g) focus of the harm done; (h) whom A told about it; (i) coping; (j) generalizations; (k) internalization; (l) negotiations between A and B; (m) perception: can A see B's point of view? (n) voice in key quotes; (o) unique elements.

Based on the 15 categories a text-table summary form was developed for each interview; this served for later summaries across nationality. Agreement (reliability) of three Jewish and Arab readers, judging each transcript as to its categories, reached 90%.

Table 1 presents an example of the analysis by categories regarding a security check event on campus as reported by Jewish and Arab male students.

Results

Cases of Injustice as Perceived by Arab and Jewish Students

In the university context the two groups reported on perceived injustice related to *personal and academic matters*, such as unjust grades, not being listened to, and not being treated fairly. About half of these events occurred in private between the students and the teacher, the other half in public such as in a lecture. The Arabs reported more severe cases of perceived injustice in public, such as discrimination in security check (see Table 2).

The most notable difference between the Arabs and the Jews lay in the contexts (university and other contexts) and sites/locations (private vs. public). Of the Arabs, 92% reported on injustice at HU, while only 40% of the Jewish students did so ($\chi^2 = 22.84$, $p < .001$).

Yet we found similarities also between Arabs and Jews regarding perceived unjust events. Both groups stated that the injustices caused personal harm (80%), and they told friends and family members about them (85%). They shared similar feelings of anger, rage, and loss of self-worth (90%), and they developed negotiation and coping skills. The major difference was in the way the two groups interpreted, internalized, and generalized the cases of injustice. The Arabs consistently attributed every specific unjust event to a general context of discrimination against them (23 students; 60%). A race related attribution was mentioned by only three Jews (6%). Nasarin, a young Arab student who scored 84 on a paper when 85 would have won her exemption from the final test, applied for this point and

Table 1. Categories for Analysis of the Interview on Perceived Injustice: The Security Check Event

Category	Jewish Student	Arab Student
Context	The student had in his car some heavy apparatus that he had to deliver to the faculty building. He asked the guard to let him drive into the reserved campus car park for few minutes, but his request was refused.	The student noticed that the Russian security guard made a thorough search only of Arab students and not of Russian students. He refused to be searched. A conflict developed and the security officer was called in.
Location	Entrance gate to the campus area (for cars).	Entrance doors to the campus building (for people).
Participants	Security officer and student–driver.	Security guard, security officer, student, other students.
Feelings	Upset, angry, tense.	Angry, humiliated.
Self-description	They don't care about the students.	He is racist because I am not a Russian.
Interpretation	They are rigid and make life unpleasant, it could easily be changed if they were a little more flexible.	Feeling fierce discrimination and deciding to rebel.
Harm done	Helplessness at being unable to solve the problem; how can one lug the apparatus to the faculty building so far away?	To his honor and dignity.
Told it to	Other students in his faculty.	Other students.
Coping	Either find someone who has an entrance permit or tell a lie that is believed.	Getting in an argument about the way the guard treats Jews and non-Jewish students.
Generalization	Devaluing his faculty, concerned about telling lies.	This is what is going on at the university every day.
Internalization	Not giving up, telling the authorities that they are unjust.	One more evidence to the discrimination.
Negotiation	Every time he tried to explain the problem and they made impractical suggestions.	Open conflict with the guard. He insists on calling the security officer.
Perception of the other	They represent the university; they have their work to do; they could be more flexible.	Perhaps he wanted to appear considerate and nice to his own people.
Voice	They don't trust you; they don't believe you; they devalue the faculty.	Everyday we are put into such situations, we are used to it.
Unique elements	Telling a lie in order to drive into the campus.	Insisting on the involvement of the security officer who reproached the guard.

was refused. She said in the interview: "I think the grading was discriminative on purpose. It cannot be that all Jews got grades that exempted them from the test and no Arab or immigrant got this grade . . . . Why should I feel I always need to beg for a good grade? Especially on one point." The Jews attributed events to personal

Table 2. Context and Location of Unjust Events: Arab and Jewish Students

Context		Jews (N = 48)		Arabs (N = 38)	
		N	%	N	%
University					
Public sites	Classes	5	11	7	18
	Tests	3	6	4	11
	Library	2	4	1	3
	Entrance	1	2	4	11
	Halls on floors 6 & 7 of the Main Building	—	—	2	5
	Coffee shop	1	2	—	—
	Total	12	25	18	47
Private sites	Lecturers' offices	6	13	14	37
	Committees (discipline)	1	2	3	8
	Total	7	15	17	45
Workplace		10	20	1	3
Army		12	25	—	—
Other		7	15	2	5

characteristics of the people (40%). Haggit said: "I was late in submitting my research seminar paper, I was penalized by losing 10 points from my grade. I felt very distressed. The teacher hardly talked to us. I realized he does not see me as a person, just a number . . . . I never thought the university could be such a cold place."

For the Arabs, talk of discrimination, backed by feelings of rage and being regarded as worthless, had become a collective and generalized voice, as expressed in over 60% of their interpretation statements of the events. They charged the university with maintaining a culture of control and surveillance. The Arab students concluded, "many of our teachers will always favor the Jewish students." They developed strategies of finding out who were the more tolerant professors, taking their courses, and avoiding the others as much as possible. They could tell many stories of injustice and surveillance, and they believed firmly in their own interpretation on the reality.

Gender differences were found in the sites of injustice; Arab females experienced similar injustice in private academic spaces (offices) as did Arab males (overall 18%). Unexpectedly Arab females experienced more injustice in lectures (16%), and in tests (11%; overall 27%), than did Arab males (6%) or male Jews (16%). Females in general did not experience, as males did, discrimination in security checks. Females shared their injustice experiences with more participants than did males, and Jewish females shared the most.

Cases of Injustice as Perceived by Arab and Jewish Leaders

All of the ten Arab leaders reported on political and national injustice. The Jewish leaders reported on personal-students' life issues. Both groups were engaged

in political intergroup issues: the Arabs on identity, recognition, and political calendar, and the Jews in keeping HU as a Jewish-Israeli University. As a result clashes between Jews and Arabs, initiated mostly by Arab leaders, took place, often expressing the national and political power/weakness duality. The Arab leaders transformed Actions (for example; events of academic disagreements with professors) to Acts (such as planned discrimination). Most of their own and others' personal experiences with actions on campus, were perceived as acts of injustice, non-recognition and contempt on a national level. The Arabs did not question their own perception or the legitimacy of a given action. They voiced strong views that HU policies and regulations were acts of surveillance, beyond injustice: "They are afraid of our becoming educated." In this way academic events/actions became an issue of identity legitimization and civic rights. This transformation from personal to political awareness was voiced in most of the leaders' interviews.

Kullud said:

> I felt discrimination right from my first semester on campus. I compared what I got from the university after I left the classroom with what the new immigrant got. How they got all the help and how we did not. How I felt I was placed in the margins and they in the center. Therefore I decided to center on these issues and help new students on campus so they would have it better.

Her development as a strong (and controversial), locally and nationally political leader is a typical example of the transformation of the Arab leaders on campus. Overall three themes emerged from all the interviews with the Arab leaders: recognition, identity, and the war of opposing narratives. Those are presented and discussed on the basis of Harre's (1979) concepts with students' voices.

The Politics of Recognition

The dilemma of recognition was voiced by the Arab leaders first and foremost based on their shared experience that they were *not recognized* as a unique group of students on campus, a feeling that was intensified when they observed the recognition and privileges of Jewish groups of students. The Arabs rejected the explanation of HU authorities that practical matters explained the different allocations of money (that from the Jewish agency being only for immigrants). They perceive this as an *expressive* act of a policy of discrimination. The significant meaning of higher education for Arabs, and the hardships they encounter on campus to succeed and graduate, colored every experience with a feeling of being held in *contempt* in relation to their identity, language, culture, religion, and history. They did not see the positive aspects of HU and its doing for them, a position that frustrated many Jews on campus.

For the Arabs, recognition as a national group on campus was perceived as crucial to attain their academic goals. The leaders conducted a prolonged struggle for an Arab Union (the *Vaad*), in addition to the recognized *Aguda* (Students'

Union, which includes all students on campus). For many years the *Vaad*, not formally recognized, has been the most influential Arabs' representation and agency of communication with HU authorities (Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1988).

The leaders' most declared goal is to receive recognition, respect, and political power as a collective on the institutional and national level. They are very active politically on campus and are in coordination with national political parties. Many of the Jews, students, and faculty interpret this as an Act of political uprising against Jews and rejecting the Jewish identity of the State/University. Those contradictory perceptions of the Actions and Acts are rarely discussed openly between and within the groups at the university, so the same troubled plot of the social drama continues on campus.

The dilemma of recognition is also rooted in HU vision and perspectives. No doubt HU is the most tolerant institution of higher education in Israel. Political activities at HU are encouraged, under a set of regulations, in contrast to other universities where political actions on campus are restricted. HU perceives its role as significant to empowerment of Arab students, and the Dean of the Students develops new and examines old regulations to increase justice. However, all political actions of Jews and Arabs include the need for permission and security approval for public functions; obeying Israeli laws; and observing HU regulations. The sanction arm of the university is its disciplinary committee.

Most of the interviewed Arab leaders were in the *Vaad* and the Jewish leaders were in the *Aguda*. They took leading roles in protest and demonstrations that sporadically result in conflicts and violence on campus. The Arabs struggle for more rights, while the Jews guard the existence of a Jewish university. All leaders understand that the social drama is rooted in the dilemma of the politics of recognition. Taylor (1995) expresses this notion by writing:

> [It] is given urgency by the links between recognition and identity where this latter term designates something like a person's understandings of which they are, of their fundamental defining characteristics as a human being. The thesis is that our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others. (p. 249)

Mirroring this feeling, Manar, an Arab women student, described an event where a conflict with an old Jew in a bus about whether to keep open a window inflicted contempt on the personal level and transformed from personal misrecognition to the core of her national identity. In this conflict she heard the following: "You Arabs should leave the country, this country does not belong to you, go and live in Arab countries." Manar said,

> This made me feel very bad. I felt he was thinking of us as inferior, uneducated, not part of the society, with no respect and no feelings for us. I felt that this incident reflects the views of many Jews who feel they can look down on Arabs as second-rate people. But at the same time it sharpened my feeling that I should stick to my identity and demand my rights, and make Jews accept us as equals and not test us all the time under a magnifying glass.

The Message of Identity

All of the leaders, Arabs and Jews, discussed identity as a major issue on campus. Following the unrest on campus in 2000, HU became more sensitive to the issue of academic equality and gave more resources and help to the Arab students. But the leaders (and many of the Arab students) see now the root of injustice in the politics of legitimization of identity and their narratives. Identity is a central theme for Jews and Arabs. It is a dynamic field of research (Hofman, 1988; Rouhana, 1997; Smooha, 1997), where dramatic changes took place in the way the Israeli Arabs and the Israeli Jews (the definitions commonly in use since the 1960s) redefine their identity. However, the common assumption held in Israel, namely, that national and civic definitions (Israeli-Jew and Israeli-Arab) will coincide, cannot be taken for granted with respect to young Palestinian citizens of Israel within its 1948 boarders. Dramatic political events in Israel and/or in the West Bank and Gaza and/or in the neighboring Arab countries are milestones that have changed the ways Arabs and Jews define their own and others' identities. Within this framework, students at HU are significant agents, functioning as seismographs to predict changes in identity definitions.

In 1988–1989 in the shadow of the first Intifada 12th grade high school students already documented a dramatic change in their self and mutual identity definitions (Hertz-Lazarowitz, Kupermintz, & Lang, 1999). That study investigated the impact of coexistence programs on a variety of social measures, including data on identity definitions and political orientations. High school students ($N = 929$) were asked to rate the appropriateness of eight identity definitions.

A principal component analysis of the ratings revealed two main factors in the Arab identity definitions. The first was *Palestinian–Arab Identity*; the second factor was *Israeli–Palestinian*. The results showed that in 1989, 52% of the Arab youngsters chose a definition that integrated two national definitions, namely, Palestinian and Arab, and 31% chose the definitions of either "Palestinian in Israel" or "Palestinian Arab in Israel." Thus the great majority used a double national categorization identity with no civic (Israeli) identity. This is in contrast to how Jewish youth defined the Arab identity: 74% of them integrated the national (Arab or Palestinian) and the civic (Israeli) identity, while only 26% used the definition Palestinian Arab. The growing detachment of the Arabs from the Israeli civic identity shown then was re-documented a decade later by Suleiman's (in press) findings among HU students:

> Our results also show that the Palestinian respondents view their national identity as more central to their self-identification and alienated from their civic identity . . . [t]his minority perceives its national and civic identity as diametrically opposed and rejects the latter as part of its collective identity . . . The fact that Israeli Jews use the term Israeli Arabs to define the minority is not new. This term was coined by Jewish "Arabists" and not by indigenous minority members.

At this stage we find an incisive dissociation of the Arab students from the civic (Israeli) identity, which may be explained by two processes. The first is rage turned upon civic discrimination, which is not perceived as a personal action but as a collective Act. Even if the Arab students misjudge those events, it becomes political. Second, the identity of the minority is interfaced with the political orientations of the majority. The fear of the Jews from Arabs' identity formation is rooted in its impact on future peaceful coexistence. The fear of the Arabs is rooted in maintaining privileges to Jews. Thus both groups are threatened by the double definitions. Specially when national events and local events become critical, further research on identity using qualitative methodologies is important in order to understand the powers that re-define identities and also those who serve as levers to dialogues.

The Political Calendar of Opposing Narratives

Identities strive to voice their personal stories and collective narratives expressed utmost in an emerging political/national calendar. Recently Arab students on HU have resisted the dominant Israeli-Jewish narrative and moved from the periphery to the center. The rise of the opposing narrative is part of the debates in Israeli society, where the "new historians" rewrite some of the dominant and oppressed narrative of Jews and Arabs (Pappe, 1995). Most Israeli Jews expect, from the Arabs, greater civic respect for and identification with Israel's national symbols, the flag and the anthem, and greater loyalty to the Jewish state as part of Arab-Israeli citizenship. The major themes dominating the conflictual relations between the two groups have transformed. In the 1980s it centered on the right to "freedom of speech" (Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1988). In the early 1990s it became the battle of identity, and now it is a war of narratives and calendars, as a symbol for one side's legitimacy and a challenge of the other side's. This has changed the course of what is just and unjust on campus, and became the source for several stormy and violent demonstrations.

In the interviews all leaders referred to four such calendar dates: March 30 commemorates a bloody demonstration within Israel (1976). May 15 marks the birth of the state of Israel (1948). June 5 commemorates the outbreak of the Six-Day War (1967), and December 9 is the anniversary of the outbreak of the Intifada (1987). The Arab leaders perceived these days as symbolic markers, expressing their identity by seeking legitimizing for their opposing narratives. They plan ceremonies on campus, which often develop into open conflicts. Two events are described below.

March 30, Land Day (Yawm al-ard)

On this day (in 1976) a large-scale demonstration was held in an Arab village in Galilee, protesting the Israeli government's policy of land confiscation. The police

intervened, and several Arab citizens were shot and killed. Since then Arabs in Israel commemorate this day by demonstrations. In recent years Arab students began to ask permission to mark the day on campus.

On April 4, 2000, the students at HU engaged in an unauthorized demonstration on the campus, which turned into a major violent conflict. A large police force entered the campus and the riots continued for several hours. Khulud said in her interview about the April 4 demonstration:

> We asked permission to protest because of Land Day and because of the murder of the old woman. [This is the interviewee's terms. The autopsy indicated that the 74-year-old woman had died of a heart attack; but the Arabs have never accepted this medical finding.] The authorities authorized it for the next day but we wanted to do it the same day, so we decided to make our protest at Cafe Deshe [an outdoors eating area adjacent to Eshkol Tower]. The next day the police came and wanted to arrest Raja [a student leader] because of a complaint that he had hurt a Jewish student [this proved to be a provocation by a right-wing student who called the police and impersonated the head of the security on campus]. Raja refused to get into the police car. He studies law and knows that the police may not enter and detain students on the campus grounds. The police pushed him into the police car by force. I went and called the students who were on floors six and seven to come. In 15 minutes there were over 500 students. We blocked the roads around the university and the police could not take Raja. We argued with the police, and a big crowed gathered. The Jewish right-wing students came in large numbers and confronted us. They sang the Jewish anthem Hatikva, and we started to sing Biladi, Biladi ("My land, my land"). We had posters stating I am a Proud Palestinian.

This confrontation lasted over four hours, and was at last settled through negotiations between an Arab Knesset (Parliament) member who was called to the scene and the president of the university. Raja was taken to the campus security office, which handled the matter thereafter, and the Arab students lifted the siege of the university. The demonstration won nationwide coverage in the press and on TV. Some headlines in the Jewish Hebrew press read: "Land Day Riots Move to Haifa University" (*Yediot Aharonot*, 2000), "A Nationalist Battlefield on Haifa Campus: Back to the Sights of the Eighties" (*Yediot Aharonot*, 2000), "Coexistence Is a Daily Reality but It Has Been Crushed" (*Kolbo*, 2000). As a result of these serious demonstrations the HU president suspended the right to hold political activities on campus and called for a short time-out (Shochat, 2002).

It was evident from the interviews that the Arab leaders were driven by the motive of ". . . We have to change the situation, because we are not only leaders of the students but also national leaders of the Arabs."

May 15, Nakba Day (Yawm al-nakba)

Nakba Day commemorates the events of 1948. It is the opposite narrative to the Jewish Independence Day. For the Jews it is the celebration of the birth of Israel, for the Arabs it is the day of the disaster (catastrophe, holocaust) when they mourn their national destruction. In recent years Nakba Day has acquired a central place in the rewriting of the Arab–Palestinian narrative in Israel. The Arab students

request permission of the HU authorities to mark Nakba Day on campus, where it is invariably a source of tension as the Arab students are watched closely by the security personnel. Because of differences between the Jewish and the Gregorian calendars, Independence Day and Nakba Day coincide only once in 19 years.

In May 2001 the Arab students wanted to mount a photographic exhibition of the destruction of the Arab villages in 1948. They appealed to the Dean of Students for permission, which was granted on a very small scale. The Arab students organizers perceived this as an extreme sign of surveillance and injustice (Mahmoud, 2001). On HU campus the Nakba Day (May 15) is a source of concern in each academic year, and the Arab *Vaad* (Union) is planning ahead ceremonies that are perceived by the Jews as opposing the core existence of Israel.

Conclusions

From Surveillance to Reconciliation

Jewish and Arabs students alike are intent on being recognized and respected, as individual and group members. Their academic goals have to be guarded in a caring and just context. In the university *Umwelt*, the political and the personal cannot be separated. Personal injustice, as well as territory, power, identity, language, calendar, and narratives, are metaphysical representatives of having a homeland or being homeless (Gur-Ze'ev, 2000).

Each of the messages presented suggests transformation from injustice and violence to recognition and reconciliation and a potential for negotiation and dialogue. The remaking of the social drama is more on the majority group but the minority group has also a significant role. Following the violent Land Day events, a new treaty of "Justice and Fairness on Campus" was negotiated. The University took measures to give more rights to the students as individuals and collectives. Constantly open lines of communication with Arab and Jewish students' leaders were established, relating to the main messages described in the paper. And indeed the academic year of 2001 was more peaceful then 2000. Notwithstanding coexistence is always fragile. Following the social drama model, extreme people or extreme political events inside or outside the campus might cause it to revert to a violent confrontation.

University education has to be viewed as a political matter related to the power structure of the society (McLaren & Giroux, 1994). HU as an institution can do far more to transform Arab-Jewish relations. Based on its diverse student body it can build a field of academic knowledge and reduce ignorance about Arabs and Jews (Stephan & Stephan, 1996). HU has students who desire to gain and develop knowledge based on their experiential learning and become change agents in the field. From other work with mixed communities in Israel, it was shown that a spirit of synergy, democracy, coexistence, and academic excellence can inspire a

system-wide change (Hertz-Lazarowitz, 1999). Haifa University, more than other Israeli universities, developed the vision, and the leadership to pursue it. The mission of continuing the dialogue, within a conflictual reality, is a never-ending challenge.

References

Al-Haj, M. (1998). *Education, empowerment and control: The case of the Arabs in Israel*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Arthur, J., & Shapiro, E. (Eds.). (1995). *Campus wars*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Avidan, S., Mahmoud, M., & Shochat, I. (2001). *Surveillance and violence on campus: Background and interviews*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Haifa.

Bar-Tal, D. (2000). *Shared beliefs in a society*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deutsch, M. (1994). Constructive conflict resolution: Principles, training and research. *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 13–32.

Dwairy, M. (1998). *Cross-cultural counseling: The Arab Palestinian case*. New York: Haworth Press.

Gur-Ze'ev, I. (2000). Introduction. In Ilan Gur-Ze'eV (Ed.), *Conflicting philosophies of education in Israel/Palestine* (pp. 1–6). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Hare, A.P. (1985). *Social interactions as drama: Application from conflict resolution*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Harre, R. (1979). *Social being*. London: Blackwell Publishers.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1988). Conflict on campus: A social drama perspective. In J. E. Hofman (Ed.), *Arab-Jewish relationships in Israel* (pp. 271–299). Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1993). Using group-investigation to promote Arab-Jewish relationships at Haifa University. *Cooperative Learning, 13*(3), 26–28.

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2001). *Manual for the analysis of the interview on violence and injustice on HU campus*. Unpublished manuscript, Haifa, Israel. (Hebrew).

Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Kupermintz, H., & Lang, J. (1999). Arab-Jewish students' encounters. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *Handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 565–585). New York: Continuum.

Hofman, J. E. (Ed) (1988). *Arab-Jewish relationships in Israel*. Bristol, IN: Wyndham Hall Press.

Hofman, J. E., Beit Hallahmi, B., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1982). Self-concept of Jewish and Arab adolescents in Israel. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43*, 786–792.

Horowitz, T. (2000). *Violence as a social phenomenon*. Jerusalem: The Szold Institute. (Hebrew).

Lewin, K. (1935). *Principles of topological psychology*. Trans. F. Heider and G. E. Heider. New York: McGraw Hill.

Mahmoud, M. (2001). *Perceptions of Arab students' leaders on surveillance at Haifa campus*. Paper submitted as part of the requirements in a research seminar, Faculty of Education, Haifa University.

Mar'i, M. (1978). *Education in Israel*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

McLaren, P., & Giroux, H. A. (1994). *Between borders: Pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.

Miller, N., & Harrington, H. J. (1992). Social categorization and intergroup acceptance: Principles for the design and development of cooperative learning teams. In R. Hertz-Lazarowitz & N. Miller (Eds.), *Interaction in cooperative groups* (pp. 203–227). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pappe, I. (1995). Critique and agenda: The post-Zionist scholars in Israel. *History and Memory, 71*(Spring–Summer), 66–90.

Rouhana, N. (1997). *Palestinian citizens in an ethnic Jewish state: Identities and conflict*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shochat, I. (2002). *Students' political achievement as a result of the Arab-Jewish conflict (April–May 2000) on Haifa campus*. Unpublished manuscript, Haifa University.

Smooha, S. (1997). Ethnic democracy: Israel as an archetype. *Israel Studies, 2*(2), 198–241.

Stephan, W. (1999). *Reducing prejudice and stereotyping in schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1996). *Intergroup relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Suleiman, R. (in press). Perception of the minority's collective identities and voting behavior: The case of the Palestinians in Israel. *The Journal of Social Psychology*.

Taylor, C. (1995). The politics of recognition. In J. Arthur & E. Shapiro (Eds.), *Campus wars* (pp. 243–269). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Turner, J. C. (1978). Social categorization and social discrimination in a minimal group paradigm. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation between social groups*. London: Academic Press.

RACHEL HERTZ-LAZAROWITZ, PhD, is a social-educational psychologist in the Faculty of Education at the University of Haifa. Her areas of research include the study of existence and co-existence of different ethnic and national groups in Israel. She works and conducts research within educational systems such as schools, universities, and Arab and Jewish co-existence organizations, and with leadership groups in mixed communities. The social psychological principles of cooperation inspire her work. In the last ten years Prof. Hertz-Lazarowitz has worked in Acre, a mixed Jewish-Arab city, where she studied change in large systems. She has published widely in English and Hebrew. Her edited book (with Norman Miller) *Interaction in cooperative groups: The theoretical anatomy of group learning* was published in 1992 by Cambridge University Press.