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This research aims at studying and analyzing the transformation (material, spatial, socio-economic, etc.) of public spaces in armed conflict zones looking at the Palestinian case during second Intifada (2000-2005). This focused perspective on public spaces is a reaction to the urgent need to look at this spatial case. Generally speaking, most researchers who studied the Palestinian Israeli conflict focused on the macro-spatial scale, the territorial and urban level without analyzing the micro-spatial scale of public spaces.

The complexity of the political, military, and territorial situation since the Israeli emergence in 1948 until its occupation of the POT in 1967 left significant impacts on the formulation and the re-shaping the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) spaces. Consequently, those spaces can be defined as disconnected, fragmented, and limited in terms of expansion on one hand. On the other hand, the hierarchy between the different levels of spaces within its (OPT) borders does not exist and almost disappeared.

This research will study and analyze this form of transformation based on two working hypothesis. **First**, there is a relation between the transformation of spaces and power; as the exercise of power (especially in armed conflict zones) over spaces makes transformations and changes on the spatial structure ‘physical’, socio-economic, and mental levels, and to argue that Israel has a planned and prepared **strategy of power to control and shape the OPT spaces** both on the territorial, urban and public space levels, though it started on the territorial level as a preliminary step for the other levels. This Israeli power-knowledge strategy was implemented through many tools and techniques of planning, urban design, and architecture with the help of the knowledge Israel accumulated from previous laws and planning schemes (Ottoman and Jordanian).

In studying the relation between power and space one shouldn’t ignore the relations between the transformations of space and the management of power, because if this is ignored this will mean to lose the very sense of these transformations and to reduce them to purely technical actions, deprived of political will.

The second hypothesis assumes that there are five critical political periods that caused major spatial and socio-economic transformations in the OPT, to argue that public spaces’ major transformation and destruction took place in this time of conflict history. This chronological classification is based on the major historic-geopolitical events in the Israeli Palestinian conflict since 1948 till now.
Foucault’s concepts and analysis (methodological precautions) of power and space are used and will be also tested if they can be uses as methodological tool in this research. This methodology is argued to give a deeper understanding of the relations between power, knowledge and space.

Power theories and concepts can be traced back in the writings of Nicollò Machiavelli (The Prince, early 16th century with his book the strategic and decentralized power) and Thomas Hobbes (Leviathan, mid-17th century his book the hegemony, centralized and sovereign power). Their books are considered to be the classics and the basis of political writing on power. They represent a two different schools of thoughts on which the contemporary theories on the discourse are based (Clegg,1989) (Sadan 2000: 33).

Then other powers started to show up in scholars’ writings such as, the economic power, class struggles and capital power that are strongly present in Marx’s writings and conception of power in his notion of ‘economisim’ Ali (2006). Marx believing in the ‘primacy’ of economic relations defines power in terms of capability to extract or to avoid surplus labor. The primary source of capitalist power is to be taken by Marx in terms of certain relations of production in which a class with the passage of time owns the means of production in such a way that the other class exclusivity depends on the owner class even for basic necessities of life (Ali 2006 xx)

After the second world war the power in social sciences emerged in the writings of Weber, Dahl and Giddens. Max Weber work theonis on ‘domination power’ form in 1947 served as a point of departure for theories on power as it was rational continuation of Hobbesian line and it at the same tile developed organizational thinking. (Sadan 2000: 35) Weber’s was interested in power as a factor of domination, based on economic or authoritarian interests. (Sadan 2000: 35), but for Dahl he located the discussion of power within the boundaries of an actual community.

Anthony Giddens (Giddens, 1982, 1984) developed his approach as a continuation – and also as a critique – of Foucault and his predecessors. He constructed an inclusive social theory which he called structuration or duality of structure. (Sadan 2000: 38).

These old models of power always tend to argue that exclusively dominant groups in society hold power which is one way direction power. They also argue that the sovereign power of the law and these kinds of power are not productive.

Foucault’s work on power had different direction. He is very critical of dominant power notion; that power is something which a group of people or an institution possesses and that power is only concerned with oppressing and constraining. Foucault’s power goes beyond the previous definition power as repression of the powerless by the powerful to an examination of the way that power operates within everyday relations between people and institutions (Mills 2003:33). Power for him is omnipresent in the social body because it is coterminous with the conditions of social relations in general. (Foucault 1980: 245-6).
Foucault ‘developed an analysis and understanding of power. At the same time he formulated methodological precautions to understand and analyze power-space relations by classifying power relations, techniques and typology. He tested this methodology in different cases that varied from architectural institutions (prison, hospital, schools) to Military Camp (exceptional case) to urban design cases of towns –walled and un-walled- cases of Colony of Leper, Plague City, and Colony of Mettary, and these cases varied from being new, constructed on will, enclosed, ordered, walled buildings and camps as temporary places, to open towns, un-walled and permanent places which gives power to his methodology.

This research will analyze and study Foucault’s methodology; its theory, approach and application to identify its limitations and strength and to test how it can be applicable for other case such as the the case of this research.

It should be noted that the Foucauldian concepts of power are Western concepts so it might not be directly linked with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict case in terms of context, time and power relations. So the methodology and its application will be questioned in these terms.

**Hence, the Foucauldian methodology and approach will be tested and modified in accordance to the Israeli Palestinian conflict case. The methodology will be applied on the three spatial levels; territorial, urban and public space level.**

The relevance of this study to the Palestinian Israeli conflict can also be significant. Although many studies were found about the destruction of Palestinian cities, and village in the 1948 war, the 1967 war such as the work of Walid Khalidi "all that remains, 1992". Many others are interested in the Israeli colonial projects in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) and process of its spatial territorial transformation such as the work of Ghazi Falah (2000, 2002, 2005 and other publications). Other researches focused on the contemporary Israeli invasions and devastation of the Palestinian urbanity and territoriality such as the work of Eyal Weizman (2005, 2006) and the work of Sari Hanafi (2006). While the work of Nurhan Abujidi, Stephan Graham and Alesandro Petti focused on spatial transformation on the urban level. These important initiatives dealt with spatial transformation on the territorial and urban level from different perspective. For example Weizman’s work concentrated on the military strategy adopted by the Israeli army in these destructive military policies and their impacts on reshaping the territory. While Hanafi’s work focused on the general process of Spacio-cide of the OPT. No detailed documentation or analysis have been proceeded on public spaces transformation in the OPT post 2000 Intifada.)

The previously mentioned researches will be analyzed in terms of methodologies used to understand the Territorial/urban spatial transformations, at the same time to chart how their analysis explained the
exercise of power and policies for reconfiguring the OPT on the territorial and urban level and how it can be present on the public space level. Consequently, to see if they have similar experience or if they will have other dimensions dynamics that are taking place on the public space level.
Power and space: The Foculdian approach

Foucault’s’ approach and theory on space and power is strongly present in the contemporary research and writings on this discourse. Margo Huxley for example, stressed Foucault’s perception of space ‘space is fundamental in any form of communal life; space is fundamental in any exercise of power.’ (Crampton; Elden 2007:190) Others such as Elden (2001) explicitly characterizes Foucault as the practitioner of ‘spatial history’, setting him in a complex intellectual heritage, encompassing Heidegger, Nietzsche and Holderlin

“In terms of Foucault’s own work I have argued that Foucault’s historical studies are spatial through and through, and that this is a fundamental legacy of his work to those interested in the question of space…understanding how space is fundamental to the use of power and to historical research into the exercise of power allows us to recast Foucault’s work not just as a history of the present but as a mapping of the present” (Elden 2001:152)

Elden argues that Foucault’s ‘histories are not merely ones in which space is yet another area analyzed, but have spaces as a central part of the approach itself’, meaning that; rather than merely writing histories of space, Foucault is writing spatial histories’ (Philo 2004:125)

This research will discuss Foucault’s power concepts in terms of definition, analysis, methodological precautions and implication in his own works and cases, and power-space concepts and the criteria he used to study and analyzed them.

Foucault’s Perception of Power

- Power Analysis and Understanding

Taking Foucault’s concepts of power-space as an approach, this research has to follow his analysis, understanding and methodological precautions he formulated to analyze and understand power-space relations by looking at **power relations, techniques and typology**.

For the analysis of power in its positive mechanism Foucault developed his theory by draong on the previous writings and research of others such as, Bentham and Marx, and these analyses are.

1- No single power exists, but several powers. Powers, which means to say forms of domination, forms of subjection, which function locally. The existence of regions of power, society is an archipelago of different powers. **(Power relations)** (Crampton; Elden 2007:156)

2- These powers cannot and must not be understood simply as the derivation, the consequence of what would be a primordial, central type of power. **(Typology of power)** (Crampton; Elden 2007:156)
3- These regional powers are, in reality, to be producers of an efficiency, an aptitude, procedures of a product, (Crampton; Elden 2007:157)

4- The mechanism of power, these procedures of power, must be considered as techniques, which is to say procedures that have been invented, perfected and which are endlessly developed. There exists a veritable technology of power, or, better, powers, which have their own history. (Mechanism of power) (Crampton; Elden 2007:158)

So for Foucault to analyze and understand power it is essential to understand and analyze the relations of power, power typology and mechanism of power, and these are similar to his methodological precautions to understand power in what Foucault argues:

“...analyze the way in which the phenomena, techniques, and procedures of power come into play at the lowest level; we have to show, obviously, how these procedures are displaced, extended, and modified and, above all, how they are invested or annexed by global phenomena, and how these technologies of power, which are at once relatively autonomous and infinitesimal (Foucault 2003:30-1) He adds that “We have to study power outside the model of Leviathan, outside the field delineated by juridical sovereignty and the institution of the state... We have to analyze it by beginning with the techniques and tactics of domination. (Ibid:34)

Dreyfus and Rabinow point out that when analyzing power it is important to” begin the analysis with a “how”: not in the sense of “How does it manifests itself?” but “by what means is it exercised?” and “what happens when individuals exert (as they say) power over others?” (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982:217)

The aim for Foucault, ‘is to move less toward a theory of power than toward an analytics of power: that is, toward a theory of power than toward a definition of a specific domain formed by power relations and toward a determination of the instruments that will make possible its analysis (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982: 185)

This research will discuss and study the previously mentioned relations of power, typology of power and power mechanisms and techniques presented by Foucault to chart how he used them in his cases and to test if his methodology can be applicable to the Palestinian Israeli conflict case study.

So in the following sections we will discuss Foucault’s concepts on power, and then will discuss his methodological analysis of power-space relation.

- Power for Foucault

From the Foucauldian points of view power is not possessed by certain groups of people or interest groups and was critical of other theories that followed that line of definition. He redefined power forms to go beyond the oppressing and constraining power, a perspective that added to the significance of Foucault’s’ approach. Instead, power for him is something that can be used and
brought together by particular people in specific situations. In this sense, power will not depend on specific groups or identities. (Velibeyoglu 1999)

Foucault argued in the History of Sexuality, vol. 1 1978 that Power is something which is performed, something more like a strategy than a possession. Power should be seen as a verb rather than a noun, something that does something, rather than something which is or which can be held onto. (Mills 2003:35), power produces, it produces reality which is employed and exercised through a net-like organization (Rabinow 1984:204-5), (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982:185)

**Foucault stressed the social dimension of power in which power is omnipresent in the social body because it is coterminous with the conditions of social relations in general.** (Foucault 1980: 245-6)

**Analysis and methodological precaution of Power**

Foucault formulated a methodology to understand power-space relation for which he emphasized that understanding of **HOW** the exercise of power takes place.

**1- Power Relations**

Many analyses of power have focused on the role of institutions, but Foucault analyses the operation of power largely outside the realm of institutions; for this reason, the body is one of the sites of struggle and discursive conflict upon which he focuses. Rather than a top-down model of power relations which examines the way the State or institutions oppress people, he is concerned to develop a bottom-up model, where the body is one of the sites where power is enacted and resisted. Smart argues that: (Mills 2003:82)

“An analysis of the techniques and procedures of power at the most basic level of the social order which then proceeds to a documentation of changes and developments in their forms and their annexation by more global forms of domination is radically different from an analysis which conceptualizes power as located within a centralized institutional nexus and then seeks to trace its diffusion and effect in and through the social order”.(Smart 1985: 79)

This first type of analysis is a Foucauldian one, focusing on the way those mundane power relations at a local level feed into the constitution of institutional power relations. Maybe it would be more accurate to say that Foucault is attempting to privilege neither side of the power relation, but is concerned to describe the interaction of institutions and the individual without assuming that one of them is primary in the relation. (Mills 2003:82)

For Foucault, unless these unequal dimensions and tracks of power are traced down to their actual material functioning, they escape our analysis and continue to operate with unquestioned autonomy, maintaining the illusion that power is not applied by those at the top to those at the bottom. (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982:185).
Thus, we can classify power relation as follows:

- Power has **two way relations of power**, Foucault means that in order for there to be a movement from above to below there has to be capillarity from below to above at the same time. (Foucault 1980: 201)
- Foucault’s insistence on the use of the concept of power in a **relational** rather than a substantialising mode. (Foucault 1980: 245)
- As Foucault claims, are “intentional and nonsubjective”. Their intelligibility derives from their intentionality. ‘they are imbed, through and through, with calculations: there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objectives; (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982:187)
- Power is exercised upon the dominant as well as on the dominated (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982:186)

2- Typology of Power
Foucault discussed three types of power in his work, so this research will go through these types of power and their spatial relations, and which type of power he choose to work on and use in his power-spatial analysis and why. This will help the research to see the difference between the three types and how they were enforced on space (spatiality). Especially that the concern of the research is power-space relations, so it would be good to see what types of power exercised over space and how, but this doesn’t mean that the research shall use one of these types alone or any of them at all, this will be decided after studying the three types.

It should be taken into consideration that Foucault’s work in these typologies of power was applied to Western societies and context and the research is working in the Palestinian context which is extremely different, so this point should be taken into consideration in studying these types of power.

1- **Macrophysics of power: Sovereign power:**

**Definition of sovereign power:**
Foucault defined the sovereign power: The theory of sovereignty is, a theory which can found absolute power on the absolute expenditure of power, but which cannot calculate power with minimum expenditure and maximum efficiency (Foucault, 2003: 36)

**Sovereign power spatiality**
The spatiality of the theory of sovereignty is bound up with a form of power that is exercised over the land and the produce of the land, much more so than over bodies and what they do (Foucault, 2003: 36), and that sovereignty is exercised within the borders of territory (Foucault 2007:11, this means that sovereign power work in a macro scale of space which is the territory.
A good sovereign, be it a collective or individual sovereign, is someone well placed within a territory, and a territory that is well policed in terms of its obedience to the sovereign is a territory that has a good spatial layout. All of this, this idea of the political effectiveness of sovereignty, is linked to the idea of an intensity of circulations: circulations of ideas, of wills, and of orders, and also commercial circulation. (Foucault 2007:15)

Sovereignty capitalizes a territory, raising the major problem of the seat of government. (Foucault 2007:20)

2- Microphysics of power: Discipline power

The study of microphysics presupposes that the power exercised on the body is conceived not as a property, but a strategy; that its effect of domination are attributed not to “appropriation”, but to disposition, maneuvers, tactics, techniques, functionings;........... (Rabinow 1984:174)

- This power is exercised rather than possessed
- That microphysics of power produces knowledge (and not simply by encouraging it because it serves power or by applying it because it is useful); that power and knowledge directly imply one another, that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that doesn’t presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations (Rabinow 1984:175)

Power-knowledge can’t be understood outside spatiality and this Foucault insisted and emphasized on: that to test of the hybrid of power-knowledge, he (Foucault) introduced 'disciplinary power' of prisons, hospitals, schools or asylums. Disciplinary power, he maintains, relies on surveillance to transform the subjects. In relation to knowledge tied to systems and human beings as objects of disciplinary knowledge, Foucault introduced Panopticon. Foucault selected Bentham's idea of Panopticon to explore his concepts on power-knowledge. He saw that space was arranged to carry out disciplinary power through knowledge of surveillance. (Velibeyoglu 1999)

Discipline structures a space and addresses the essential problem of a hierarchical and functional distribution of elements (Foucault 2007:20)

3- Biopower

For Foucault biopower is a number of phenomena that seems to him to be quite significant, namely, the set of mechanism through which the basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy, of a general strategy of power, or, in other words how, starting from the eighteenth century, modern societies took on broad the fundamental biological fact the human are species (Foucault 2007:1)

In terms of spatiality biopower that takes the assumption for ‘security’ is exercised over a whole population. (Foucault 2007:11) Security exercise of power will try to plan a milieu in terms of events
or series of events or possible elements, of series that will have to be regulated within a multivalent and transformable framework (Foucault 2007:20)

The milieu is never employed to designate towns or planned spaces, this kind of power has to do with biology, disease and population birth rate and fertility which are not the concern of this research, so this research will focus on Foucault’s work on sovereign power and discipline power.

The research agrees with Foucault in that the transformation and difference of the three types of powers is not at the level of political theory, but rather at the level of the mechanism, techniques, and technologies of power (Foucault 2003: 241), so these levels were taken into consideration when Foucault worked on typology of power and in his decision to choose one of them to do his power-space analysis

Foucault in his work on typology of powers he related and studied them in relation to spatiality as de facto, but Foucault was more interested to work on microphysics of power (Discipline) as his point focused on the analysis of power just when power is visible and in the ideological state (in institutions, schools, prison,) where power is disciplines and not sovereign power (Foucault 1980: 115-6). Moreover, he pointed out that the mechanism of power in themselves were never analyzed before in the concepts of power both on in the left and right: For the left on the Marxist side, power is discussed only in terms of the State apparatus without analyzing the power mechanism (Foucault 1980: 72-3). While on the or the right the non marxist or the West as Foucault defines them power is discussed to point to the constitution, sovereignty, etc., that is, in juridical terms. The West conception of power did not have a system representation. The formulation and the analysis of power was limited to law and the system of law (Crampton; Elden 2007:155-6)

Foucault argues that juridical model of sovereignty was not, as he believes, able to provide a concrete analysis of the multiplicity of power relations….sovereignty is the theory that goes subject to subject, that establishes the political relationship between subject and subject. It seem to him that the theory of sovereignty assumes from the outset the existence of a multiplicity of powers that are not powers in the political sense of the term. Theses relations are capacities, possibilities, and potentials that can constitute them as powers in the political sense of the term, only if it has in the meantime established a moment of fundamental and foundational unity between possibilities and powers, namely the unity of power (Foucault, 2003: 43-4). He further argues that the relations ship between different forms of power cannot be separated and they are overlapping in a complex form with different web of relations. Refusing the definitions of the age of legal power, or disciplinary power or security power, as it is difficult for the different types of power to take place in different separated milieus. Hence, different types of power complex can take place in one place, what changes are the techniques themselves that become more refined, what really changes is the system of correlation between Juridico-legal
mechanism in relation to disciplinary power mechanisms and the security power mechanisms according to Foucault (2007:10).

This means that the same space can have more than one type of power exercised at the same time but the difference between them is in the techniques and relations of powers and how you define and organize the space and this can be seen clearly in the two examples Foucault gave in his the lectures of 1977-1978 where in the case of the town Le Maitre La Metropolitee. The layout of the town was basically thought of in terms of the most general, overall category of the territory. The town was thought through a macrocosm, since the state conceived itself as an edifice. in short the interplay of macrocosm and microcosm ran through the problematic relationship between town, sovereignty, and territory. However, in the case of towns constructed in the form of camp like in the case of Richelieu, it can said that the town is not thought of on the basis of the larger territory, but on the bases of a smaller, geometrical figure, which is a kind of architectural module, namely the square or rectangle, which is in turn subdivided into other squares or rectangles (Foucault 2007:16). Thus, for Le Maitre La Metropolitee what was involved was ‘capitalizing’ a territory, in Richelieu it is a case of structuring a space. Discipline belongs to the order of construction (in the broad sense of construction) (Foucault 2007:17)

This explains that the understanding of power depends on how the space and the time are defined which will consequently define the type of the power or powers exercised in space-time relations.

The difficulty of Foucault’s work lays in his concentration on discipline power in relation to spatiality. Hence, this research argues that the definition of space was not clear in the work of Foucault. A more defined conception of space is going to be elaborated using the research case study. The other difficulty in Foucault’s work is his focus on discipline power. Though this research will analyze discipline power yet, the research main assumption that there is more than one power exercised over the same space and time that depends on the space scale, power relations and techniques.

3- Mechanism and Techniques of power: Microphysics of discipline power:
The discipline power will be studied to know how Foucault used his methodology of working on power relations, typology, and mechanism to understand and analyze power-space relations.

The peculiarity of the disciplines is that they try to define in relation to the multiplicities a tactics of power that fulfills three criterias. The first criteria points out that, to obtain the exercise of power at the lowest possible cost (economically, by the low expenditure it involves, the political dimension of power, its discretion, and its low exteriorization. Relative invisibility, the little resistance it arouses). The second criteria of the power tactics is to bring the effects of this social power to their maximum
intensity and to extend them as far as possible, without either failure or interval. The third, criteria is related to link this “economic” growth of power with the output of the apparatuses (educational, military, industrial, or medical) within which it is exercised; in short, to increase both the docility and the utility of all the elements of the system (Rabinow 1984:207)

**Discipline and spatiality:**

Discipline, Foucault defines as a “technology” aimed at: ‘how to keep someone under surveillance, how to control his conduct, his behavior, his aptitudes, how to improve his performance, multiply his capacities, and how to put him where he is most useful: that is discipline in my sense’ (O’Farrell 2005:102) and it is a set of strategies, procedures and ways of behaving which are associated with certain institutional contexts and which then permeate ways of thinking and behaving in general. (Mills 2003:44)

**Discipline spatiality:**

- Disciplinary treatment of multiplicities is space, that is to say, [the] constitution of an empty, closed space within artificial multiplicities are to be constructed and organized according to the triple principle hierarchy, precise communication of relations of power, and functional effects specific to this distribution. (Foucault 2007:17)
- Discipline is, above all, analysis of space: it is individualization through space, the placing of bodies in an individualized space that permits classification and combinations (Crampton; Elden 2007:147)
- Discipline: general formula of domination, not the body itself, but the spatial and temporal distribution and regulation of the body: time was divided into smaller units to allow for total control of activity, likewise space was constructed so as to enclose but also to partition. Bringing these concepts together is the idea of productive ordering: the classification and arrangement of all kinds of properties and entities into ‘tableaux vivants’, to maximize their usefulness. (Crampton; Elden 2007:247)
- Discipline is basically the mechanism of power through which we come to control the social body in the finest elements, through which we arrive at the very atoms of society, which is to say individuals, techniques of the individualization of power. How to oversee someone, how to control their conduct, their behavior, their aptitudes, how to intensify their performance, multiply their capacities, how to put them in the place where they will be most useful: this is what discipline is, in my sense (Crampton; Elden 2007:159)
- The spatiality of disciplinary power is best described as an intensive, institutional time-space geometry of local and concretized power relations whose uniformity or relationality over space cannot be assumed (Phillo 2002). (Crampton; Elden 2007:322)
Methodology for analyzing power-space relations in discipline power

Referring to Foucault methodology by looking at relations of power, typology and techniques to understand power-space relations, he used this methodology by choosing the discipline power to work on (type of power and relation) and its technology of power (techniques), and so he analyzed power relations and techniques in disciplinary power. This research will study Foucault methodology in analyzing disciplinary power spatiality; and to see how this methodology was used in the cases he studied and to see if this methodology will be applicable in the particular case of this research.

Mechanism/techniques of disciplinary power: Art of Distribution:

Foucault analyzed the ‘art of distribution’ by underlying a host of disciplinary mechanism. All depending upon detailed manipulation of space, and he traced the enactment of spatial innovation across all manner of institutions from Bentham’s design of ideal prison, the high-walled ‘Panopticon’ to the example of unwalled reformatory of Mettary (Phillo 2004:126), but discipline proceeds from the ‘art of distribution’ of individuals in space. To achieve this end, it employs several techniques (Foucault 1977:141), which facilitated the operation of these mechanisms of power (O’Farrell 2005):

1- Organization of Space- Control space
2- Organization of activity and behavior- Control Time
3- Hierarchical observation- Panopticon- Surveillance- State of objectivity (visibility)
4- Normalization- Normalizing judgment
5- Examination- building knowledge

This research argues that these techniques of disciplinary are relations of/between techniques which control the space, time, and body, and building knowledge. Furthermore it argues that the basic technique/relation is the organization of space/control space as by this technique the other techniques can be achieved and exercised and vice versa.

It should be noted that these techniques/relations of power were only done/examined for one type of power which is the discipline power, this research is not sure of using discipline power in its particular case, so a general mechanism for powers should be discussed and developed out of this, to do this the cases Foucault worked on should be studied and analyzed to see how his methodology was implemented to understand power-space relation and to highlight the limitations of this methodology.

Foucault’s cases to examine the discipline techniques to understand power-space relations:

It is important to note here that Foucault worked on different cases to analyze disciplined power over space and these cases varied from architectural institutions (prison, hospital, schools) to Military...
Camp (exceptional case) to urban design cases of towns –walled and unwalled- cases of Colony of Leper, Plague City, and Colony of Mettray, and these cases varied from being new, constructed on will, enclosed, ordered, walled buildings and camps as temporary places, to open towns, unwallaed and permanent places which gives power to his methodology (: to look for relations of power, typology-which is here discipline- and techniques to understand the power-space relation).

This research argues that there are two power-space classifications in Foucault’s work; the same was suggested by Rabinow in 1980 but the difference is that are not based only on hierarchal order but on the inclusion and exclusion and partitioning:

1- **Architecture**: prisons and its Panopticon, schools and hospitals –temporary cases
   They all are new designed spaces, empty spaces, spaces of enclosure, temporary places, where the definition of discipline literary can be seen there: “Disciplinary treatment of multiplicities is space, that is to say, [the] **constitution** of an **empty, closed** space within **artificial** multiplicities are to be **constructed** and **organized** according to the **triple principle** hierarchy, precise communication of relations of power, and functional effects specific to this distribution. (Foucault 2007:17)”.

2- **Urban design**: Military camp, Leper colony, Plague colony, Mettray colony
   a. Walled towns- Enclosed spaces- temporary places- Military Camp and Mettray colony
   b. Un-walled- not enclosed spaces – permanent places- Leper colony and Plague colony
   -These two cases are existing towns where they had diseases, so they were not constructed from zero, but they will clarify about space and architecture, but not to forget that they are European methods for controlling individuals in space

The definition of discipline doesn’t work on the urban design level of second type, as the cases Foucault worked on urban level -like towns and cities- do not fit with it at all, so this research argues that the definition Foucault put for discipline was very limited in its spatiality and has to be redefined.
**Preliminary conclusions about Foucault’ power-space theory**

The Foucauldian concepts of power are thought of and about Western theories and implement on western culture in specific time and space, and for specific relations. Thus the applicability of his methodology on this research context, culture and relations of power is questioned and is going to be tested in the Palestinian-Israeli context. This will mean that Foucault’s work should be studied carefully within their contexts so as not to misunderstand and mix his analysis and understandings for power-space relations with the research contexts.

After reviewing Foucault methodological precautions (relations of power, typology of power, and power techniques) which he used to study and analyze the power-space relations and going through the cases he worked on to test his methodology precautions, this research have found several limitations and critiques.

First, Foucault understanding of power came mainly from his focused research on discipline power for which he developed a methodology that he tested using his own reasoning and cases., This research argues from the first study of the Palestinian Israeli conflict case that there are **two types of power that are exercised** on the same space and time and not only one as Foucault argues. These two powers are discipline and sovereign power. They can be exercised with different techniques and different levels but in the same space and same time. Disciplinary power varies according to locally specific norms and punishment as Mathew Coleman and John A. Agnew argued;

Foucault has been rightly criticized for expelling law from his analysis of power (Crampton; Elden 2007:323). law for this research plays a central role in the exercise of power in different levels (sovereign). This is clear in Foucault’s work in his case of Mettray, in this case there were two kinds of power (sovereign and discipline) exercised though Foucault articulated only the exercises of discipline power.

Foucault’s **definition of discipline power** using different cases articulated this power to exist in [the] constitution of an empty, closed space within artificial multiplicities are to be constructed and organized according to the triple principle hierarchy, precise communication of relations of power, and functional effects specific to this distribution. (Foucault 2007:17) to explain that definition he used two types of cases one is confined to one building level; architectural buildings, very typical to his definition, and the other is on urban level of towns and cities not confined physically (with walls and buildings); Though inn both cases discipline power was exercised. Yet, Foucault did not give clear definition of closed and empty spaces. It was not clear if he refers to the mental space that is also physically confined or just if his space was only a physical one. The other confusion is related to how power was exercised in terms of its techniques and how its relations differ in the two different types of spaces.
This research agrees with Foucault’s notion and concept of power relations, but with the caution that Foucault’s selected cases to test and study his concepts and methodological precaution existed in specific context and with specific power relations. Hence, this research argues that when the definition and scale of space changes this will mean that the relations of power change regarding to this and this will imply that the typology of discipline power exercised will change accordingly to changes in these relations and techniques within specific space and time. To study spatial conditions and power relations in different contexts than Foucault’s selected cases, different typologies of discipline powers operates in different ways needs to be defined an elaborated. Consequently this research argues that there are typologies of discipline power that is exercised over space. Their difference relies on the variation in power relations and techniques exercised over that type of space.

Several modification and adaptations of Foucault’s methodology can be elaborated based on the previous critical reading

1- Taking into consideration the existence of two typologies of power exercise over the same place and space: sovereign and discipline. The power exercised over space is discipline power

2- Methodology to analyze discipline power-space relations we need to consider
  - Define the space and the scale of the space and its boundaries
  - Define the relations of powers within this space
  - Define the typology of discipline power exercised over this space
  - Define discipline power typology techniques practiced over space
  - Define the impacts of this power on the spatial, socio-economic dimension of place/space

In short the analysis of power –space should start with the an understanding of the mechanism, techniques and effects of power with focus on “HOW” this exercise of power takes place in space.
Transformation of public space in conflict time-case of Palestine

To start with the techniques is to start with the transformation of the spaces and to study this transformation the previously developed methodology updates will be used and tested.

The complexity of the political situation since the Israeli emergence in 1948 and until now left significant impact on shaping the Palestinian spaces. During this time Israel developed and implemented several strategies and plans to transform the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) spatial hierarchy to a disconnected, fragmented and limited (in terms of expansion), without a defined borders between the different spatial levels. So be able to understand the transformations on the public spaces level it is important to contextualize this spatial scale in relation to the other spatial levels namely, the Territorial and the urban.

The previously elaborated and modified methodology will be tested in the OPT in the three spatial levels: territorial, urban and public spaces. As mentioned before several researches exist on the territorial and urban spatial transformations. On the territorial level the work of Eyal Weizman, Ghazi Falah, Sari Hanafi and Alessandro Petti are representative among others. While the writings of Nurhan Abujidi, Stephan Graham and Eyal Weizman dealt with the urban spatial level.

The exercise of power and policies for reconfiguring the OPT on the territorial and urban levels will be tested first by the Facualts’ modified methodology as a major tool in this research to see how if they correspond with the major assumption included in the modified methodology framework. as well as to check if these assumptions are also present on the public space level to figure out if they produce similar spatial experience on the three spatial level or if they formulate other dimensions and dynamics specific to the public space level.
On Territorial Level –: Matrix of Control

This research argues that the transformation of the Palestinian spatial structure on the territorial level is a result of a long process of re-shaping and shifting border between the state of Israel and the occupied Palestinian Territories. Israel unilaterally wanted to define the border between it and Palestine, using complex techniques, policies, and strategies that include architectural and planning to expand their border following the 1967 war. These borders, according to Weizman (2003), have been dissolved and transformed: from being fixed fortified lines, laid out at the edges of the occupied territories, to fragmented and scattered inner frontiers across both horizontal and vertical dimensions.

Jeff Halper (2001) and Eyal Weizman (2002, 2003, 2004, 2007) are prominent Israeli researchers on the Israeli Palestinian conflict from a planning point of view. Their research and analysis of the Israeli policies focused on the territorial level. Their methodologies and analysis will be highlighted in this part and will be analyzed in terms of the major methodological characteristic. As well as to figure out the major links between their methodologies and the Foucauldian one discussed and adapted for this research.

Jeff Halper (2001) argues that Israel, since its occupation to the Territories in 1967, started to establish and implement a matrix similar to the Japanese game "Go". The aim of "Go" is winning the game not by defeating but by immobilizing the enemy by controlling key points of the matrix.

The matrix is composed of three overlapping steps and requires careful analysis to know how the matrix of control is structured and how it works. (Halper 2001)

Halper (2001) divides the Israeli matrix of control of the OPT into three interconnected layers and mechanisms, the physical, the legal and the violence.

1- Physical

This means the control of key links and nodes that create the matrix of control: he mentioned the colonies and their extended master plans, where colonies are crucial to preserving the matrix because of the control mechanism that necessary surround them (bypass roads, checkpoints and control of border crossings, army bases, closed military area, area A, B, C, D, H-1, H-2) (Halper 2001).

2- Legal

This layer refers to all the planning, permits, and policies that entangle the Palestinian Population in a tight web of restrictions (Halper 2001)

3- Violence
To maintain control over the matrix violence to control the territories with its populations is implemented by the military occupation itself- (Halper 2001)

Halper used this matrix of control to analyze the transformation of the spatial structure of OPT and to show how the Israeli power operated to transform and shape them. Connecting Halper analysis with Foucault ‘understanding of power the first layer of the matrix, namely its physical part can refer to the discipline power. While the second and third layers of the Israeli control matrix with its legal, planning and violence elements can be directly linked to sovereign power. However, this reasoning and link of the two types of power with the Israeli matrix of control affirms the research main hypothesis and critique of Foucault’s division of power over space. Consequently, two types of powers exist in same space and time in the OPT ; the sovereign power and the discipline power, contradicting with Foucault emphasis on the discipline power as a unique and the only power exercised over space in his cases.

Eyal Weizman 2002 developed the work and methodology of Halper especially on the physical part of the matrix of control. He highlighted that the implementation of the matrix of control have formulated what he calls a geometry of occupation. This geometry of occupation is exhibited in the OPT through strategic and political realities, as the strategic and political realities though particular geometrical characteristics that can be reconstructed across the map from zero to three dimensions in Points, Lines, Surface and Volumes (Weizman 2002). Weizam classifies the layers of the matrix in

- **Point:** settlements
- **Line:** roads and barriers to connect settlements with each others and with Israel
- **Surface:** settlements boundary and master plans
- **Volume:** Israeli settlements and Palestinian settlements, topographical location between Palestinian built up are and Israeli Settlements

Weizman used these four points of cartographical classification to discuss how the Israeli colonial policies and exercise of power are reconfiguring the spatial realities of the Territories and are at the same time deployed by Israel to constantly shift and reshapes its borders with the OPT.

The matrix of control Halper (2001) adapted to analyze and study the Israeli power to control and shape the OPT spatial structure and border, while Weizman analysis focused on the physical part of Halper’s classified matrix for which he developed the cartographical classification of the geometry of occupation. Weizman’s approach corresponds with Foucault’s concept on the archipelago of discipline power that he articulated in the Mettray colony case. In this case study Foucault-as elaborated in earlier sections- analyzed the concept of carceral-network-archipelago (cloister, prison, school, regiment) that followed the compact or disseminated forms, with insertion, distribution, surveillance and observation systems (Foucault 1977: 304).
His main argument for those cases entails that the archipelago of discipline power is an incorporation of more than one institution and all work together as one unit (decentralized in terms of function but centralized in terms of goals and objectives) of observation, surveillance and are distributed in a very strategic spatial way to achieve the goals they were put for. Same argument can be applied to the Israeli matrix of control specially the physical part. For which the Jewish colonies were built to incorporate a larger spatial zones that includes their master plans, bypass roads, checkpoints, military basis, close military zones, and the wall. All the subsystems of the colonies are designed to operate were as one system.

The case study of this research is not a case of spatial confinement and neither an urban design project. It deals with free open spaces mainly public spaces for which the individuals who use it are assumed to have the freedom to adapt it, transform it or totally redesign in still a limited dimension due to the Israeli military occupation and its exercise of power over those spaces. Which means that the research cases are larger in scale in comparison to the cases that Foucault used in his research. The research argues that when the scale of the space changes the relations of power and typology of discipline power changes and this is what Weizman did when he suggests a typology for the power Israel exercised over OPT namely “occupying power”.

It can be pointed with reference to the previous analysis that the methodology and analysis Weizman and Halper (mostly Weizman) developed and implemented are similar to the techniques Foucault used to analyze discipline power and the power-space relation (organizing the space, organization of activity, hierarchal observation: Panopticon, surveillance, normalization and examination-building knowledge). It is not clear yet if they elaborated them with an understanding of Foucault’s’ theory.

To find the links between Foucault’s theory and methodology with Weizman; three intersecting issues can be highlighted:

- **Organizing the space**: this spatial dimension of Weizman’s analysis and methodology emphasized how Israel have re-shaped the spatial structure and the border of the OPT and the strategic distribution of the matrix of control in the OPT are together working to organize the OPT spatial structure and its border.

- **Power-knowledge**: Weizman highlighted in his research that the Israeli leaders, generals and military institutions, architects and planners developed their knowledge on the basis of power relations to guarantee a full control the OPT’s spaces. This was achieved by producing maps and manipulating archeology. Furthermore he pointed out that the territories are governed by the production and dissemination of knowledge as much as they are governed by military force.
Maps have always been principal tools in the understanding and governing of territories according to Weizman (ibid)

- **Observation and Panopticon**: Weizman found that the Jewish colonies in the OPT produce in spatial terms a “Panoptic fortress”. They can be seen as urban optical devices for surveillance and the exercise of power (ibid)

Abujidi 2008 argues that the matrix of control expands from the national, regional, district, and city scale, which correspond to this research observation but with the emphasizing the issue of space scale that will affect power relations and types of power. Hence in the coming sections the research will apply the matrix of control on the urban level to analyze the transformation of the spaces on urban level while taking the changes factors into consideration.
1.1 Matrix of control impacts on the urban level

The Israeli occupation power exercised over the OPT spaces through the matrix of control produces effects on the spatial structure, that in effect reshape the territories into enclaves and exclaves, or as Petti(2004) describes them the archipelago of occupation power that is based on inclusion and exclusion.

Falah argues that the transformation is a matter of a border shift, and that partitioning within the OPT seeks to reinforce and reproduce spatial, economic and military hegemony over a dependant population, through fragmentation and manipulation of territorial, social and economic space (Falah 2003: 185). Consequently, this process creates as he argues enclaves and exclaves patterns. Falah defines ‘enclave as small pockets of land lying outside the main territory [but] within the territory of neighboring state, where exclaves are small islands of land located within another’s territory, functioning along similar lines of a portioned geometry.’ (ibid) This explains the exclaves of the colonies and their master plans and associated structures which were built within the OPT and the enclaves of the Palestinian cities, towns and villages. He argues that if the state is able to maintain an enclave located at some distant means it is successfully exercising power beyond its immediate sovereign power.

For Hanafi (2003) this kind of transformation is defined as Spaciocide. Spacisode for him refers to the above explained process of transformation of the OPT spaces into Bantustans, noncontiguous enclaves and camps. This dynamic reshaping of the space and boundaries is desnged as Hanafi argues to exclude the OPT inhabitants by land zone classification.

The archipelago of discipline power for Foucault, the matrix of control of Halper and Weizman, and the enclaves and exclaves of Falah were defined in Alessandro Petti 2004 as archipelago-enclave model which is based on unequal system which determines who is in and who is out. Petti considered this model as new territorial model and that analyzing it can be achieved only when the connection between territorial transformation and the management of power exists. The most radical manifestation for this new model is in the OPT, where the archipelago of colonies and bypass roads and the Palestinian cities enclaves are close to one another, sometimes overlap through tunnels and bridges. Petti agrees with Weizman and Halper in that the physical devices of the wall, fences, checkpoints, surveillance towers construct the spaces of control. While urban planning and architecture are the instruments for the implementation of the political agenda in order to control, to segregate, to isolate, to disconnect, to connect, entire communities.

The research will use the previous argument on the selected urban spaces with the assumption that the matrix of control creates enclaved spaces with exclusion mechanisms and policies.
2- On Urban Level: spaces of enclaves and exclusion

The major transformation of the Palestinian spaces on the urban level intensified during the second intifada that will be the period focus for this research (2000-2005).

The relation of power in the discussed political period (2000-2005) is between the Palestinian resistance group and the Israeli army. It refers to the relationship between the diverse forces operating within the Palestinian local populations, Palestinian security forces, guerrilla fighters, journalist, photographers and humanitarian agents that at the end is projected as exercises of power over the built environment. Weizman describes this dynamic power relations in what he calls the contemporary urban warfare that plays itself out within a constructed, real or imaginary architecture, and through the destruction, construction, reorganization, and subversion of space.

Control techniques implemented on the urban level are different from those applied on the territorial level. For which the Israeli policies were based on manipulating of the urban infrastructure with reshaping and replacing elements of the built fabric. The Israeli military controlled the urban spaces and built up environment by transforming them either by destruction or change in use. This took place by working on different techniques; deal with the city as planner to learn how the city works so they may control them by manipulating their various component, and design by destruction, organizing the city in a way that serves the attracting force guaranteed the Israeli military control according to Weizman, Misselwitz (2003)

Matrix of control was used on the city scale in different mechanisms than the matrix that was implemented on the territorial level. Nurhan Abujidi in her analysis of Nablus city during the Israeli invasion of 2002 illustrated the mechanisms of the matrix of control on the urban level. Abujidi (2008) developed a spatial hierarchy classification based on the destructive impacts of the matrix. Consequently, she classifies the Palestinian spatial condition and experience into four states or spaces; State/spaces of siege, States/spaces of urbicide. Within State/space of urbicide she formulates and defines a sever spatial condition of urbicide, namely spaces of strangulation. A space of strangulation refers to spaces that lose their essential elements as public spaces by being strangulation or destroyed either by control mechanisms, or by the direct destruction of the built environment. The infamous case of Jenin refugee camp is a strong example beside other Palestinian cities such as Nablus, Hebron, while in the space of siege the space transformed as a result of the urban space being under complete siege as in the cities of Qalqilia and Ramallah.

- **Spaces/of Urbicide**: Nablus city and Jenin Refugee Camp
- **Spaces/of Siege**: Ramallah and Qalqilia
- **Spaces/of Strangulation**: Hebron city
3- On Public Spaces Level

Effect of the matrix of control and military invasions on Spaces of Enclaves –

Based on the previous analysis on the territorial and urban level in the following section an overview of the public space level will be elaborated. The research will develop Abujidi’s and Weizman’s methodologies to test if they can be implemented on the public space level. As well as to see if the three spatial scales (territorial, urban and public spaces) have similar experience or if the public spaces will have different dimensions and dynamics.

Within the previously urban spatial hierarchies’ classification, the spatial structure of the city in general and the public spaces in particular are transformed as a result of this,. So we have transformed public spaces within spaces of urbicide, siege and strangulation.

To select a case study for studying the public spaces transformation from these three cases, two cities will be taken in two different spaces so as to compare the transformation in two different spatial condition, these two cases are Nablus and Ramallah.

The field work is not conducted yet, so the researchers’ methodologies and work will be tested through:

1- Hierarchal mapping through the five states of political period
2- observations of the physical and socio-economic dynamics
3- interview/perceptual and mental
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