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Abstract:

In seeking political and racial authority within a borderless world or flexible borders, people and governments increase and build up political, ideological and social boundaries. The paper discusses both Ephraim Sidon’s children poetry book *Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu* (1987) and Renen Yezerski’s film *The Invisible Enemy across the Wall: Israeli and Palestinian Children’s Perspective of the Other* (2015), and shows how borders are being enforced. The film reflects Israeli and Palestinian children’s opposing perspectives concerning the meaning and nature of borders. It also shows discrepancies of opinions between old and new generations. The paper introduces a controversial study and evaluation of contemporary Palestinian/Israeli society. Art and literature allow people to express their experiences and investigate ideas without fully committing themselves. Only through art, the poetry collection and film, Palestinians and Israelis can live together in peace on the Palestinian land. While Israelis may seek reconciliation with Palestinians, the latter sees the former as colonizers and violators, and refuses such agreement. Besides, borders, physical or symbolic, still have many roles and functions in contemporary world. They affect people’s lives, actions and attitudes. Some borders may become softer or harder because of political transformations. Because of terrorism and political concerns, boundaries become a symbol of security, yet from the other side, they are means of oppression. The research focuses on the process of bounding and how people and groups are confined within severe economic, social and spatial restrictions.

The paper discusses people’s rights within a confined society, and examines the nature of restriction and control of who should pass the border to the other side and who are not allowed. This detention process raises questions of ethics, principles and human rights. People’s loyalty and identity are questioned. Closing the borders for securitization, the prevention of suicide bombers, is against morals, since ordinary people confront serious and oppressive dislocation. Legitimate security justifies violent actions on both sides. The focus of the borders shifts from being only a physical location to be a psychological, cultural, security and an economic barrier.
Creating Complex Borders within a Borderless World in Ephraim Sidon’s poetry book
Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu (1987)


المناطق الحدودية والفنون المرئية

في البحث عن السلطة السياسية والعرقية في عالم بلا حدود أو حدود مرنة، يقوم الناس والحكومات بزيادة وبناء الحدود السياسية والإيديولوجية والاجتماعية. وتناقش الورقة الفيلم رنين يزيرسكي "العدو غير المرئي": من منظور الأطفال الإسرائيليين والفلسطينيين للأخر"(2015)، ويبين كيف يتم فرض الحدود. ويعكس الفيلم وجهات نظر الأطفال الإسرائيليين والفلسطينيين المتعارضة فيما يتعلق بمعنى وطبيعة الحدود. كما يظهر اختلافات في الآراء بين الأجيال القديمة والأجيال الجديدة. وتقدم الورقة دراسة وتقييمات مثيرة للجدل للمجتمع الفلسطيني/ الإسرائيلي المعاصر. ويسمح الفن والأدب للناس بالتعبير عن تجاربهم ومناقشة الأفكار دون إلزام أنفسهم بها بالكامل. فقط من خلال الفن وجميعة الشعر والأفلام، يمكن للفلسطينيين والإسرائيليين أن يعيشوا معًا بسلام على الأرض الفلسطينية. وفي حين أن الإسرائيليين قد يسعون إلى المصالحة مع الفلسطينيين، فإن الأخير يعتبر الأول مستعمرًا ومنتهاً، ويرفض مثل هذا الاتفاق على أرض الواقع. الي جانب ذلك، لا يزال للحدود، المادية أو الرمزية، العديد من الأدوار والوظائف في العالم المعاصر. فهي تؤثر على حياة الناس وأفعالهم ومواقفهم. فقد تصبح بعض الحدود أكثر ليونة أو أصعب بسبب التحولات السياسية. وسبب الإرهاب والمخاوف السياسية، تصبح الحدود رمزا للأمن، ولكن من الجانب الآخر، فهي وسيلة للقمع. ويركز البحث على عملية التضييق وكيف يتم تقليد الأشخاص والجماعات ضمن القيود الاقتصادية والاجتماعية والمكانية.
Introduction:

In seeking political and racial authority within a borderless world or flexible borders, people and governments increase and build up political, ideological and social boundaries. The paper examines both Ephraim Sidon’s children poetry book *Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu* (1987) and Renen Yezerski’s film *The Invisible Enemy across the Wall: Israeli and Palestinian Children's Perspective of the Other* (2015), and shows how borders are being enforced. Both works of art call for reconciliation, reflect opposing perspectives of Israelis and Palestinians concerning the meaning and nature of borders, and show discrepancies of opinions between old and new generations. The paper introduces a controversial study and evaluation of contemporary Palestinian/Israeli society. Art and literature allow people to express their experiences and investigate ideas without fully committing themselves. Only through art, the poetry collection and film, Palestinians and Israelis can live together in peace on the Palestinian land. While Israelis may seek reconciliation with Palestinians, the latter sees the former as colonizers and violators, and refuses such agreement. This result is due to historical facts. In 1917, Britain occupied Palestine during World War I after successfully driving out the Ottomans. British Foreign Minister Arthur Balfour at the time issued his famous promise that “His Majesty's government looks with sympathy to the establishment of a national home in Palestine for the Jewish people, and will make every effort to facilitate the achievement of this goal” (United Nations). In 1947, after Britain announced the termination of its mandate, the United Nations recommended dividing Palestine into two Arab and Jewish states and subjecting the city of Jerusalem and the surrounding areas to international control. Nevertheless, the Arab Higher Committee rejected the partition decision (United Nations). There were many conflicts and killings throughout years. In 2014, Israel responded to the kidnapping and killing of three Jews in the occupied West Bank by arresting several Hamas activists. Jewish extremists responded by killing a Palestinian teenager by firing rockets from Gaza at Israel (BBC News). While these facts express harsh reality and its complications, the film and poetry collection introduce hope for both Palestinians and Israelis.

Borders, physical or symbolic, have many roles and functions in contemporary world. They affect people’s lives, actions and attitudes. Some borders may become softer or harder because of political transformations (Juss 2008). Because of terrorism and political concerns, boundaries become a symbol of security, yet from the other side, they are means of oppression. The study focuses on the process of bounding and...
how people and groups are confined within severe economic, social and spatial restrictions.

The paper follows the methodologies of both colonialsation and imperialism. It discusses people’s rights within a confined society, and examines the nature of restriction and control of who should pass the border to the other side and who are not allowed. This detention process raises questions of ethics, principles and human rights. People’s loyalty and identity are questioned. Closing the borders for securitization, the prevention of suicide bombers, is against morals, since ordinary people confront serious and oppressive dislocation. Legitimate security justifies violent actions on both sides. The focus of the borders shifts from being only a physical location to be a psychological, cultural, security and an economic barrier.

This study will explore the concept of borders and problems and challenges of understanding boundaries. It will focus on how borders become sites of technological control of people and goods within territories which are dominated by power hegemony.

The Concept of Nation and Nationalism:

The concept of nation and country becomes a cultural heritage, a part of people’s identity and life. Nationalism is necessary, and has an important role in forming people’s thoughts, feelings and actions. Homi Bhabha says, “Nation-ness, indeed, is the most universally legitimate value in the political life of contemporary society” (17). Nationality becomes a political nation- state relationship. Nation consciousness gives international dimensions within a bounded space and social boundaries. It is shaped by land and culture (Holsti 2004, 73). Ethnic background should not interfere with or separate from political aspects. Nationalism is the product of political ideology where cultural, physical and political boundaries influence one’s life and society. The concept of nationalism changed from the standards of citizenship, religion and territory to a more political nation- state relationship and rules like borders control.

Nation means people, language, religion, land and culture. This definition is inadequate for either the Israeli’s or Palestinian’s society. Both lack certain characteristics of being a coherent nation. While facing each other’s sovereignty, Israelis and Palestinians try to find an identity in their own community, since national identity means strong struggle against the other’s colonial and imperial hegemony. Nationality becomes
a kind of shared suffering and a feeling of sacrifices (Renan 10). Thus people have a deep unity of spiritual principles, historical background, culture, religion, language, economy and land.

What is a border?

In seeking political and anthropological society within a borderless world or flexible borders, people, authorities and laws reinforce economic, political, ideological and social boundaries. Yezerski’s film *The Invisible Enemy across the Wall: Israeli and Palestinian Children's Perspective of the Other* shows how borders are being enforced. It starts with Prof David Newman’s question, “What is a border?” (00:11) He is interested in what young people and children know about the border, noticing that they have never crossed to the other side. He says that most people think that the border is a “fence or a wall separating two countries in the world” (00:13). In the introduction to the children poetry book, *Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu*, Sidon introduces an allegory of two brothers Uzu and Muzu in Kakaruzu who used to be close friends. The story conveys hidden meanings through symbolic figures, actions, events and imagery to create political and moral assumptions and conventions. The author uses rhyming lines and images which suggest important life events and lessons. The story focuses on the importance of communication to keep healthy relationships with the other.

Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu
Far, far away beyond the mountain,
In the village of Kakaruzu by the fountain,
In a white house, Where red flowers grow,
Two happy brothers Lived long ago.
Two brothers.
And so we can remember and tell them apart,
The eldest was named Uzu; the young one they called Muzu.
Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu.
Now how’s that for a start?
Each brother loved the other true and right.
They never quarreled; never had a fight.
There were no better friends, there were simply none.
And more often than not, they seemed to be one. (ll.1-14)

The story of love and hate is told through a narrative voice. The rhyming words, “grow” and “ago” (ll.4-5) and “right” and “fight” (ll. 11-12) suggest the harmony between the two brothers in peace and war. The
question, “Now how’s that for a start?” (l. 10) is ironical, since the speaker knows that everything is going to change. Words like “quarreled” (l.12) and “fight” (l.12) express the upcoming clash between the two brothers. In the film, the border between the Israelis and Palestinians asserts their oppositions and idiosyncratic national identities. This is expressed by the presentation of the two characters, Uzu and Muzu. Their clash introduces two opposing perspectives.

From an anthropological perspective, the research explores how culture and society intersect with political boundaries, and discusses ways in which state power structures cultural identity. In societies like Israel and Palestine, people’s loyalty and identity are questioned. The concepts of citizenship, nation and state start to contest, and are transformed into a new absorbed identity formed by political concerns. Gender, ethnicity and race are examined and experienced from the opposite side of power authorities. This changing process of living between two worlds, cultures and hegemonies creates “new and important categories of transnationalism, and increase[s] the significance and proliferation of images and a host of other messages about the relevance of “other” world cultures in the everyday lives of us all” (Wilson, Borders Identities 6). This hybridity of ideologies, images and messages form an incomplete idiosyncrasy.

The film introduces the lives and hardships of Israelis/ Palestinians who are exposed to confinements. Their main struggle is to survive, since they suffer from a disturbing identity, culture and home. Each group of Israelis and Palestinians has an ethnic identity with its own distinguished social places, collective imaginings, losses, locales and absences. For examples, Palestinian young men and children have a sense of belonging because they are excluded from their land. Ethnicity is the active characteristic of ethnic and political dimensions. (Antias 2008).

All politics is by definition about the use of authority and power to direct the behaviour of others, thereby achieving an individual or group's public goals (Wilson 7).

Identity depends on interests and achieving personal or public targets. Building borders connotes political and social hegemony of one group over the other. Social activities, symbols, images and motifs within borders impose an authorized cultural hegemony.
In the film, Israelis and Palestinians symbolize elements of belonging and exclusion. These manifestations of actions affect people’s lives, actions and attitudes. The process of bounding encloses people and societies within economic, political, social and spatial compartments (Newman, *Journal of Borderlands Studies*, 128). A border could be a symbol of security and peace, or a wand of limitation and oppression.

**Political- Economy of Borders:**

The world has become a small village mainly because of technology and trade. Many boundaries have become more accessible for people, goods and information. Yet because of terrorism and political and security concerns, borders still have many roles, limitations, convictions, assumptions and functions. They could be physical or symbolic boundaries. K.J. Holsti argues, for example, that “it is certainly a myth that borders today are more “permeable” than ever” (109). It is not easy to pass a security border. In the film, Oded Revivi says, “By building the wall, it only increased the challenge to those who want to overcome it. So instead of suicide bombers crossing the border, they started firing missiles over the wall” (9:35). For Israeli, there is an insistent need to build the border, mainly for protection and security. Nevertheless, our perception of the concept of border has been changed, challenged and re-interpreted through history. The function of borders as barriers raises the economic and political tendency to make them active standpoints. Borders harden economic relocation of goods, products and labours from one side to the other. In the film, Revivi says,

> The Palstinians authority has no economic prospects if it is shut behind a barrier... The people, who came up with the plan of two states for two nations, didn’t take the Palestinian’ source of income into account. They did not take road access, or where their airport will be, where they’ll exchange goods with other countries (12:04).

The situation becomes very hard for the Palestinians economically. In the film, Anat Heffetz, a founder of Gaza Movement for peace, says that it is necessary for both the Palestinians and Israelis to establish a movement for peace, “Without negotiations and an arrangement with them, and without improving their living conditions, we won’t have peace or quiet either” (23:54). Bar Haffetz adds, “You can see the houses of Nirmin
there, it’s no problem to fire an anti-tank missiles directly at them. If not… there’ll be tunnels. If not… there’ll be parachutists. There’ll never be an end to it” (24:05). Neoclassical or marginalist theory sees that the borders become barriers when they disrupt economic transformation, which should be ideally free from discontinuities. Consequently, the cost of transportation increases (Pijpers 420). Newman writes,

But borders are equally there to be crossed. From the moment they are established, there are always groups who have an interest in finding ways to move beyond the barrier. They may be seeking jobs, visiting family and friends from whom they have been cut off, smuggling goods, drugs or weapons. But crossing the border does not always bring the expected benefits. The grass is not always greener on the other side. (Journal of Borderlands Studies, 3)

People have many reasons for crossing the borders. Professor Muhammed Dajani, a speaker in the film, sees that the border separates Palestinians from Palestinians. He says that it takes him one hour instead of ten minutes to reach his university, “A wall that separates people, and prevents them from moving. And the consequences are not satisfied as expected” (Dajani, 7:45). According to the actual circumstances, Israelis become the major winners and well-paid employers. Palestinians are treated as minorities, and occupy lower positions in the class structure, since their Arabic and Muslim backgrounds limit their education chances and job opportunities.

Some borders may become softer or harder because of political transformations (Juss 2008). In the film, Shlomo Brom, head of the institute for National Security Studies, says that the border has two connotations: If it is bad, “it brings up the connotation of the Berlin wall” (Brom, 6:28). And if the border is good, it means a “fence,” like the one between two neighbors. He claims that the border is an obstacle between Israel and the West Bank, not Palestine. Another character, Shaul Arieli, calls it a “security border” (6:47). Many Israeli characters accept and defend the construction of the border. In Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu, when Uzu’s wife asks, “Why that ugly wall stretched through their house by and by” (l.141), her husband relies, “It defends us and keeps that mean neighbor out” (l.146). The wall is thought to be a barrier of defense. In
the film, Chaled Da’na, from Hebron, says that he can remember himself as a child with his father shopping in Hebron. His father has taught him Arabic. Yoni Nahon, who was born in Kiryat Arba, used to go to the markets in Hebron, “A town where Jews and Palestinians lived together. Life was cheaper and more peaceful” (2:05). Yoni comments that there is nearly no relationship now between the two sides because of the border.

Security border imposes more restrictions on both sides. The border has an effective impact on people’s daily life and practices of local inhabitants. After the Six-Day War in Israel/Palestine (1967), Israel announced that the green-line boundary will be removed. But for the next forty years, it determined the citizenship of both Israelis and Palestinians. In 2003, the Israeli side built a barrier (wall/ fence) (Newman, Border Lines, 2009). Because of economic interests, the border sometimes might have become softer for goods and people, strengthening the economic relations between the Israeli’s and Palestinian’s sides. But after 2005, both governments sought to re-close and re-sealed the borders, which prevented the movement of people and goods. Economic discourses oppose security targets. Economic border seeks to reduce restrictions and facilitate economic prosperity between the two sides.

Geographical divisions and boundaries affect people’s culture and history. Their identity is affected by the place of birth and social activities and practices. Borders separate the land into two isolated territories; each has its own history, culture, religion, economy and politics. In “The National Longing for Form”, Raymond Williams says,

‘Nation’ as a term is radically connected with ‘native.’ We are born into relationships which are typically settled in a place. This form of primary and ‘placeable’ bonding is of quite fundamental human and natural importance. Yet the jump from that to anything like the modern nation-state is entirely artificial (McGuigan 228).

“Placeable bondings” have many local forms, such as mountains or cities. People belong to these places and marks. They start to have regional identities and affiliations. Real relationships are economically dominated by individuals, ruling families, groups and governments.

Stephen Krasner’s argues that there are four main components of modern territorial state and its borders – conventions, contracts, coercion, and imposition (198). Peoples agree to abide by certain standards and principles. They can also agree on certain policies and treatises for their
mutual benefits. Although governments or peoples can argue and compensate, sometimes they are coerced to function unwanted demands, as in the case of Syria or Iran. Otherwise, they will suffer sanctions. This is true if one looks at trade and economy. When governments, parties, troops or militias control territories, they may harden the movement and activities of authentic people according to their own interests. (Paasi 2009a).

In the film, Palestinian characters think that the border separates Palestinians’ land. DA’na says, “It’s Our land, 2,500 acres” (8:14). It is a problem of the concept of territory. Palestinians see that they owe all the land including the territory of Israel. The characters start to question the importance and effectiveness of the border, “Is the barrier the dominant factor in the security we’ve enjoyed in the recent years?” (Shaul Arieli, 8:32). The barrier prevents attacks from terror organization. But the security comes first from the security coordination with the Palestinians. Second, the IDF (Israel Defense Forces) works on both sides of the barrier. The third reason is that the authority of Palestine does not encourage terrorism. Arieli adds, “Hamas is relatively weak in the west Bank” (10:53). The barrier is one of the security guarantees. Workers have to pass to the other side of the barrier to go to work.

The man who lives over there,
Is a bloodthirsty crook, and that’s to say the least.
To make it short- he’s a man in the shape of a beast.
And that’s what the wall is all about,
It defends us and keeps that mean neighbor out (ll.142-6).

The nature of restriction and control of who should pass the border to the other side and who are not allowed raises questions of ethics principles and human rights. Closing the borders for securitization, which is the prevention of suicide bombers, is against morals, since ordinary people suffer serious and oppressive dislocation.

Borders in globalization are the meeting points of globalizing forces of security, trade and migration flows with emerging technologies, self-determination and regionalization around the world. (Konrad 1)
Legitimate security justifies violent actions on both borders. The focus of the borders shifts from being only a physical location to be a psychology, culture, economic and secure barrier.

There are still groups or individuals who try always to cross or escape from the social circumstances or spatial location to the other side. In the film, children think the grass is always greener on the other side of the border. Da’na says, “Everyone likes to see what’s on the other side. My kids do, too” (13:37). People think that they are imprisoned, and want to see the outer world. Henk van Houtum writes,

> What is important to the study of the ontology of borders is hence not the item of the border per se, but the objectification process of the border, the socially constituent power practices attached to a border that construct a spatial effect and which give a demarcation in space its meaning and influence. (50)

The border emphasizes the differences which exist on either sides, and creates binary oppositions between them and us and here and there. The existence of borders imposes a specific order and policy within the inside and outside territories, which are dominated by a broader system of order and power. Thus this process of bordering creates order through the construction of differences. In the film, Chald Da’na and Chald Arafe reflect their opinions concerning the situation before and after 1987. Both Israeli and Palestinians lived together in the past in Hebron. The narrator says, “Business was booming all over Hebron” (3:12). Nevertheless, the border affected their social life greatly. Da’na says, “Security and economic circumstances become harder nowadays… almost no relations between us. Living was cheaper then, and it was more peaceful than it is now” (2:05). Things changed through time.

In the second section of the poetry book, *The Violent Conflict*, the narrator continued the allegorical story of Uzu and Muzu, and how they started clashes after their brotherhood. He says,

> And then, one rainy day  
> Both windy and cold  
> As they sat by a hearth  
> Both reddish and gold  
> And as flames started dancing higher and higher  
> An argument arose  
> As stormy as fire (ll.59-65).
Sidon says that the fire danced in the fireplace. And suddenly a heated argument broke out. Uzu and Muzu started fighting, “I think Muzu was the first one to pick up a hoe, and Uzu, a pitchfork” (3:52). At the time, the concept of the fence did not exist.

In the third part of the poetry book, *The Wall*, the narrator continued the allegorical story of Uzu and Muzu. They built a stone wall in the middle of the house, “that divides the bathroom, kitchen and living room and continues out… silent and angry, another layer of cement…The brothers would never see each other again” (l.120-22).

Uzu and Muzu are building a wall,
That cuts through the bathroom, the kitchen and hall...
And it goes on and stretches out to the garden.
Without saying a word or thinking of pardon,
The brothers are mixing and pouring cement,
Adding stones, and then bricks,
Filled with rage and resent (l.124-30).

In the film, Oded Revivi says, “Buses were blown…Kids went to the movies not knowing if they’d come in one piece… Everytime there was a major attack, a curfew was imposed” (4: 20). Arieli says,

The mental barrier began to be built in December 1987. The Israeli people wanted an immediate solution. He started blaming the Palestinian side including Hamas. And because of the attack in Beit-Lahd in 1995, the prime minister took the decision to continue building the barrier and fighting, which led to more killings and terrorism (4: 42).

Israelis built the border for security, yet there were more killings and bombing from Israelis and Palestinians. It was a kind of mess, and both sides were involved.

The Palestinian Professor Mohammed S. Dajani, another character in the film, says that the border separates Jerusalem from Kalandia. And he sees that the wall separates Palestinians from Palestinians, and thinks that the wall “prevents people from moving” (7:44). He takes an hour instead of ten minutes in order to reach his university.
More years passed by and Uzu passed away. 
And his son Yasu is now old and gray. 
Now, Kababu, Yasu’s son, who is a bright guy, 
Asks his father about that wall which climbs up 
so high. 
And his father answers with an old trembling 
voice, 
“It’s because, well you see, we really had no 
choice. 
On the other side lives a demon (Uzu and Muzu 
from Kakaruzu, 169-75).

The narrative voice describes the current situation. People who live inside 
the border think that the outer side is full of evil. Newman says, “The 
stronger the barrier function of the border, the more powerful the 
imagined, the more abstract the narrative of what is perceived as lying on 
the other side” (Journal of Borderlands Studies, 20). The barrier has 
many stories and functions; it has become the core of Israelis’ and 
Palestinians’ lives. In the poetry book, Yasu’s father says,

On the other side lives a demon. 
A real demon with three tails, 
With red fiery eyes, And pale skin full of scales.
He’s so bad that if he’d get you, you can’t even 
imagine, 
Through his teeth- that’s a sure way to get into 
heaven! (175-79)

The speaker uses violent imagery in “red fiery eyes with three tails” 
(l.177) to describe the savage other, the demon. From generation to 
generation, hatred and fear control both sides. The rhyming lines suggest 
that the situation continues as it had started. The new generations have the 
same resentment towards each other, “we really had no choice” (l.174). In 
the film, Da’na says, “My father suffered, and he felt he suffered, but my 
children suffer more than I did” (13:28). This trauma goes on from one 
generation to the next.

Communicative and Collective Memory:

Communicative memory is based exclusively on everyday 
communications. A group of people receive their unity and uniqueness
through conversations, images, telling jokes, gossiping, memorizing events and criticizing situations. This exchange of historical, social, economic or environmental knowledge produces a shared experience of this society. The French Maurice Halbwach states that people of such a society meditate memories and repeated stories form history (47). He introduced the concept of collective memory in 1925, and believed that personal memories affect people in dealing with their past and present throughout generations. They speak the same repetitive narrative stories and behave in the same attitudes. Halbwach says, “These memories are repetitions, because they are successfully engaged in very different system of notions, at different period of our lives” (Coser 47). In the film, Many old Palestinians have lived three generations; they share a kind of communicative and collective memory. The former generation had a direct contact with the actions and events, and was able to transform the same spirit and behavior to the next (Assmann 125). Younger generations acquire cultural memory through art media such as films, paintings and photographs. What they remember about their past becomes part of their shared memory and present. In *Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu*, the narrator says, “Generations pass/ And no one can stop recounting/ The tale of the devil behind the wall/ Generations pass” (ll.176-79). The same story continues on; it saves memory and history.

Besides, cultural heritage introduces a distinguished society to itself and others. What make both the Israeli and Palestinian societies different are food, language, religion, land and history. In the film, Israeli and Palestinian children are asked to draw some paintings about their expectations of the border’s other side. These paintings reflect a pictorial memory, which develops a social and cultural awareness. These drawings are related to actual situations, and reconstruct figures of memory. The third and youngest generation of children inherits the previous generations’ beliefs, views and language of Hebron, a Palestinian village, and Kiryat Arba, an Israeli one. When they are asked to draw their expectations about the other side of the border, they give self-images of their culture and history. For example, Yusuf, six years old and from Hebron, draws a house with a Palestinian flag, a tree and prison. Adi, twelve years old and from Kiryat Arba, draws a dirty road and security one. Jewish children look at Palestinians as inferior. Ariel, eleven years old and from Kiryat Arba, speaks with a superior tone: “They [Arabs] burn their garbage and throw it on the street. We maintain ours; we plant things” (15:50). Amir from Hebron says, “The Jews are provoking the Arabs” (16:04). He draws a prison, and says, “This is where they
imprison the Arabs.” Muhammed, from Hebron, then paints Jewish kids who play with guns, and says, “They’re taking more people to prison” (16:26). He paints numbered-cells filled fully with Palestinians. Ahmed, from Hebron, says, “I drew the land of freedom.” Wafaa, twelve years and from Hebron, says, “I drew missiles falling on houses, and the Jews killed the woman and her son is lying on the ground and she’s bleeding” (17:22). As a young feminist, she cares about women’s and children’s rights. Those children start to explain, distinguish, interpret, criticize, censure, control and explain the function of the border and their relationship with the other. Both sides start to blame each other; they are full of resentment, “They can do anything, and we have restrictions” (Ariel, 18:27). Each group forms its own collective and communicative knowledge through history and memory.

Collective memory is based on the concept of territory. Social groups “represent the past through place in an attempt to claim territory, establish social boundaries and justify political actions” (Till 289). Israel started land looting and displacement of Palestinians after 1948. Palestinians see that the more Israel takes land, the more it gains power and political rights. Besides, political power and expansion change through history, and constitute ethnic and cultural struggles, “The linking together of history and territory is essential for the conceptualization of a land as a national homeland” (Kaiser 235). Both history and land are elements of having a national spirit. This is the reason people are ready to defend their land to the last breath and inch.

The terrain invested with collective significance is felt to be integral to a particular historical culture, community or ethnic, and the ethnic community is seen as an intrinsic part of that poetic landscape. (Smith 150)

Ethnic unity becomes a matter of collective continuity of social culture and shared history. Being on a specific land, sharing the same past, and talking the same language form people’s national identity.

**Imperialism within Borders:**

While imperialism is the process or policy of controlling and ruling a distant territory, colonialism is a kind of settlements on that territory. According to the Palestinians, Israelis have taken their lands, and tried to spread an imperial hegemony over the Palestinians, especially in the economic and political spheres, yet the Palestinians succeed in building a distinguished cultural and social community. In the film, the clash
between the Israelis and Palestinians shows the heterogeneous nature of their problems, rather than their trials to homogenize these representations of opposite sides. The story of Uzu and Muzu also explores the story of Israelis and Palestinians through the examination of place, time and events. Both the film and the book of poetry become the medium through which colonizers and colonized people express, defend and assert their own history, identity and rights. From an imperialism point of view, the one who owns land is the one who can control, work and settle on it. The poem sheds light on the differences between “us” and “them.” This discrepancy connotes some sort of xenophobia (Said xiii). The Association for Civil Rights in Israel (ACRI) published reports documenting racism in Israel, and the 2007 report suggested that anti-Arab racism in the country was increasing. One analysis of the report summarizes the situation that over two-thirds Israeli teens believe Arabs to be less intelligent, uncultured and violent. Each culture connotes political and ideological tendencies and actions. Each group seeks unconscious and uncontrollable behavior as a reaction to dangerous situations or events.

None of us is completely free from the struggle over geography.
That struggle is complex and interesting because it is not only about soldiers and cannons but also about ideas, about forms, about images and imaginings (Said 7)

The foreign other is an essential component of national self-definition. Through their paintings, Israeli and Palestinian children define themselves, their needs and fears.

The border imposes a territorial line which separates internal people (we) from exterior ones (they) in terms of culture, religion and history. People who live inside such a bounded land are socialized and nationalized. Jean Gottmann states that what describes a land as a territory with specific identity is “a strong belief based on some religious creed, some social viewpoint, or some pattern of political memories, and often a combination of all three” (Ashgate 397). Human beings need borders for independence and difference. **The Truth about Borders:**

Since our world becomes like a village, people are supposed to live in a borderless world. A border is not only a line on a map or an object to prevent harassment or terrorism; it also connotes social power activities.
People begin to acquire spatial awareness of their political, security and economic rights.

There are many examples of countries which have transcended the barrier problematic issue such as German/ Belgium and Denmark/ Sweden. In the late 1980s, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland demolished the barrier between them. Dutch inhabitants sent their children across the border to Belgium schools because they thought that those were better (Newman, Border Lines, 40).

Through the use of both symbolic unifiers (flags, hymn, number plates, signs) and educational unifiers (language, geography and history education), the Dutch border is daily reproduced in space (Ibid 41).

National politicians want to show the Netherlands as one identity and as an important country. European tourists go through both sides of these borders without noticing their existence. Some countries make use of the history of border to attract more tourists; borders with flags and posts become tourist attractions. These border-countries start to sell souvenirs, commercial products and symbols about those past borders. In the film, Naaem Al Baida, a peace activist, says “I always tell Israelis who are afraid to come here that the only way to get over it, is to come here, to allay your fear, there’s no other way” (20:28). There are many voices from both sides that call for peace, because they cannot stand for war. Ruval Rut says, “We hope that peace will come to us as soon as possible.” He comments that peace means a real path of conciliation and healing, “I call it alternative healing through real deeds. We’re neighbours; we should have a bond.” In the end of Uzu and Muzu from Kakaruzu, the newly couple finds an agreement between them, and starts a new united life. The narrator says,

Far, far away beyond the mountain  
In the village of Kakaruzu by the fountain  
Into a little white house, where red flowers grow  
A newlywed couple moved in long ago.  
Who is that couple?!  
Do you really need to guess? ... Well all right, be my guests, you can try...  
The bride in the white dress is… Muza  
And the groom is… our Uzu, with a fancy bow tie.
A border serves the interests of a national identity, a territorial power, a militia, an elected political party and an academic study. Countries define themselves with the limits of borders. The borders deliver certain messages about Israel/Palestine troubles, and revive the old violence, ideologies and strategies for contemporary generations. Through the film and the collection of poetry, the speakers introduce and examine the binary oppositions of their societies.

“What fools have we been, believing that lie…?
Why didn’t we try to investigate?
Believing rumors, and loving to hate?
We made no effort to find out and reveal.
How did we accept?
And didn’t suspect,
Preferring old tales to what’s right and what’s real?”
And then Uzu says: “Well, that’s how it goes.
When you don’t know your neighbors,
You believe they’re your foes.
And then instead of trying to become their friend,
You build thick tall walls and you start to defend.(ll.370-381)

The various questions reveal the reality about both sides. This is also expressed by the use of the opposing words, “accept, suspect,” “love, hate” and “foes, friend.” The poet also uses parallelism in “believing” (1.372) and “preferring” (1.376), which illustrates the difference between assumptions and facts.

In the film, the contesting voices of both Israelis and Palestinians reveal reality with its violence, struggle and discrepancy. These voices introduce fragments, events, images and memories, which encourage people to reconsider their personal and social lives within a troubled society. The clash between these voices reflects the relationship between oppressor and oppressed, coloniser and colonised, the powerful and the weak. The characters also condemn violent and incompetent relationships, and seek new complementary and prosperous ones. The oral and interactive discourse of these challenging voices introduces new pragmatic readings, which are interpreted by new generations. This post-modern poly-vocalism is important to understand and criticise a bordered-society.
Dr Asmaa Ahmed Youssef
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