NURIT ELHANAN

Hebrew university and David Yellin Academic College, לארשי

THE GEOGRAPHY OF HOSTILITY - DISCURSIVE AND SEMIOTIC MEANS OF TRANSFORMING REALITIES IN GEOGRAPHY SCHOOL BOOKS

Abstract:

This paper examines the linguistic and semiotic ways in which ideologies are recreated in Geography schoolbooks and transform Geo-political realities.

Five schoolbooks currently used in Jewish mainstream schools in Israel were analyzed for the use they make of language and visuals such as photographs, maps, graphs, icons and colour in order to recontextualize both disciplinary and political discourses to education.

The paper argues that in all those books scientific conventions and principles of visual and verbal representation are compromised by political messages and the commitment of these schoolbooks to promote Jewish territorial and national Identity, which is largely based on the denial of the identity of Palestinians, both the citizens of Israel and those that live under Occupation. The distortion of geopolitical and social facts and the concealment of any meaningful life beside the Jewish one promote hostility and reproduce Elite Racism .

Keywords:

Social semiotics. Discourse Analysis. Multimodal analysis. Geography. Racist discourse.

JEL Classification: I24, I29, F54

This paper examines five Israeli mainstream schoolbooks2 of geography published between 1994-2003, after the Oslo Peace Accords between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. All books declare they are compatible with the current national curriculum and all but one were authorized by the Ministry of Education3. The sample of schoolbooks was chosen according to the popularity of the books among teachers4. The books5 will be referred to using the following abbreviations:

PIS *People in Space: A Geography Textbook for 9th grade* (Rap & Fine, 1996/1998)

IMS *Israel–The Man and the Space: Selected Chapters in Geography* (Fine, Segev, & Lavi, 2002)

GLI *The Geography of the Land of Israel* (Aharony & Sagi, 2002) [grades 11 - 12]

SIS *Settlements in Space*: *Chapters in the Geography of Settlements in the World* [grades 8 - 9] (Rap & Shilony-Tzvieli, 2002)

TMC *The Mediterranean Countries for 5th Grade* (Vaadya, Ulman, & Mimon, 1994)

The first section of this article discusses the Zionist ideological basis of geographic studies in Israel and the recruiting of geography to the perpetuation of Jewish territorial identity. The second section discusses the verbal and visual representations of Palestinians in geography schoolbooks. The third section discusses the cartography of exclusion, namely the ways in which maps distort the geo-political reality of the region and exclude the indigenous population of the land. Next, the paper discusses the impersonalisation of Palestinians by means of stereotypical representation, through cartoons, racist icons, and demeaning photographs.The next section describes classification images used in Israel's meta-narrative of *development*, in which progress means the victory of *Jewishness* over *Arabness* or the conquest of the Middle East by the West. This section also discusses colour as a semiotic resource of meaning.

Study Question

The general question this paper sets out to answer was best formulated in Van Leeuwen (1996, p. 35):

How are social practices transformed into discourses about social practices[…] both in the sense of what means we have for doing so, and in the sense of how we actually do it in specific institutional contexts which have specific relations with the social practices of which they produce representations?

The institutional context and social practice addressed in this paper are geography teaching in Israeli mainstream schoolbooks. The means by which the books transmit their messages are multimodal. The specific relations they have with the social practices of which they produce representations are those of hypertextuality, in the sense used by Genette (1982, p. 12-14). Hypertextuality, according to Genette, is any relation a certain text B has with a previous text A, the hypotext from which it is derived or on which it is *grafted.* Genette explains that this derivation can have many forms: Text B may not even mention text A but cannot exist without it, for it is its transformation.

Schoolbooks are hypertexts both of the dominant socio-political hypotext and of their respective disciplinary hypotexts; they are the transformation or, rather, the recontextualization (Bernstein, 1996) of these hypotexts to education. Transformation is defined by Hodge and Kress (1993) as "permissible tampering." It involves "deleting,

substituting, combining or reordering a syntagm and its elements." Hence "Transformations are not 'innocent'" (p. 10). As Van Leeuwen (2007) makes clear, "what exactly gets transformed depends on the interests, goals and values of the context into which the practice is recontextualized" (p. 96).

Bernstein (1996) maintains that pedagogic communication acts selectively on the "potential discourse that is available to be pedagogized." (p. 42). The writers of textbooks who "work in the field of recontextualization" (p. 39-41), select the suitable elements from the disciplinary field, and redistribute them in the pedagogic communication according to rules that are not ideologically free (p. 49). The recontextualizing rules regulate not only the *what* of teaching but mostly the *how*, in other words, they constitute the theory of instruction. Along with the rules of recontextualization comes a set of evaluative rules whose purpose is "to transmit criteria [and] produce a ruler for consciousness." (p. 46).

Hence, Bernstein argues, in the process of recontextualization, discourses are being "dislocated, relocated and refocused according to pedagogic principles" (p.47). Therefore, the discourses of textbooks are never identical with their disciplinary discourses and, as Coffin (1997) states, in her study of secondary school history, "at stake is the disciplinary politics of truth" (p. 201).

Methodology and Theoretical Basis of the Study

Geography schoolbooks are multimodal texts. They use an array of verbal and visual modes in order to transmit values and meanings. The multimodal analysis applied in this paper adopts social-semiotic principles of inquiry (Van Leeuwen, 2005b), and relies mainly on the works of Kress and Van Leeuwen, whose main assumption is the following:

"Since Meanings are made as signs in distinct ways in specific modes… That which is represented in sign or sign complexes realizes the interests, perspectives, values and positions of those who make the sign […] representation is always 'engaged.' It is never neutral. (Kress, 2003, pp. 37, 44) This standpoint rejects the idea of arbitrariness, maintaining that The relations between signifier and signified are always motivated, that is, the shape of the signifier, its 'form', materially or abstractly considered, is chosen because of its aptness for expressing that which is to be signified. (Kress, p. 42) Therefore, as Kress states, "We have to find ways of understanding and describing the interaction of such meanings across modes into coherent wholes, into texts" (p. 37).

Zionist Ideological Basis

Zionism has "recognized at the very outset the importance of teaching territorial identity" (Bar-Gal, 1993b, p. 421). The ideological basis of geography teaching in Israel consists of the Zionist message regarding the redemption and resettlement of the *Homeland* by the *Children of Israel* who, possessing exclusive historic rights to the *Land*, have returned home after 2000 years of exile. In a recent study of Israeli schoolbooks, Firer (2004) asserts that "The state of Israel was **re-established** in 1948" [emphasis added]. This sentence is based on the assumption – or rather on the belief – that there had been another "state of Israel" in some other, ancient time.

Yiftachel (2006) explains that in Israel "An exclusive form of territorial ethno-nationalism developed, in order to quickly *indigenize* immigrant Jews, and to conceal, trivialize, or marginalize the existence of a Palestinian peopleon the land prior to the arrival of Zionist Jews" (p. 61).The new "indigenized" Jews are perceived as modern Westerners who

are the direct descendants of Biblical Hebrews. The geography schoolbooks studied here offer no information about the region or about Arab-Palestinian life, be it agriculture, social settings, rural, or urban changes, during the 2000 years of Jewish *absence* but they do mention Jewish yearning for the lost homeland. For instance, in *TMC*, next to a map of the Mediterranean countries, we find this text:

If this map had been drawn 100 years ago there would not have been a special colour for the Jews because most Jews lived in other countries (the Jews had been in exile for 2000 years). The Land of Israel is the land of the Jews. During the many years the Jews were away from

their country […] they yearned to come back to it and resettle it.[…] In their hearts they kept saying 'If I forget thee Oh Jerusalem may my right hand forget its cunning' (Psalms 137:5). When the Jewish people came back and the state of Israel was founded, Jerusalem, our capital, became once again the most important Jewish centre of the Jewish people. (p. 54) Thus, 2000 years of civilization are reduced to nine words in brackets, while the story of the yearning for the mythicized homeland takes up more than eight lines of the geographic text. Geography studies are meant first and foremost to teach how to *know and love our country*, and hail the Zionist achievements in agriculture (taming the desert, diverting rivers, and drying swamps), forestry (restoring the glory of biblical forests while erasing the traces of Arab villages), and construction. Israeli education transmits the idea that the Jews took the Land back from the

Arabs in order to rectify the damage they had done to it during *our absence*.

These goals, which marked the first half of the 20th century, when geography was renamed *Homeland Studies*, are still prominent in the much more scientific geography textbooks today (Bar-Gal, 1993a, 2003). Bar-Gal (2000) asserts that the new modern books are but a colourful camouflage of the age-old curricula that "emphasized the nationalist goals as the principal goal" (p. 169).

Consequently there is a peculiar mix of genres, modes, and messages, both verbal and visual, in Israeli geography schoolbooks. The discourse of geography schoolbooks is often composed of political, historical, and scientific discourses, reinforced by biblical verses, patriotic songs, and heroic poetry. Visually this mix includes maps that have very little to do with reality, ideologically drawn graphs and images. These various verbal and visual components are designed to immortalize Jewish dominance through its presentation as legitimate from time

immemorial. This legitimation draws its authority mainly from the Bible, by reiterating the divine promise to grant unto the children of Israel the entire area "From the river Prath to the uttermost sea" (Deuteronomy 11:24). As political geographer Yiftachel (2006) argues, religion serves secular education in Israel in forming a collective narrative that assists with "rupturing the borders and legitimating the teaching about the divine land." (p. 121)

An edifying example is found in *TMC*, a geography schoolbook for the 5th grade (Vaadya, Ulman, & Mimon, 1994, p. 60). In the chapter "One Sea with many names," one finds, next to the map of "Israel," which includes the Palestinian occupied territories and Gaza (Figure 1), only biblical phrases that introduce the various biblical names of the Mediterranean while reiterating the divine promise. These verses are the answer to the opening question of the chapter: "The Mediterranean sea is already mentioned in the bible. Is it also called the Mediterranean in the book of books?" (p. ??) The wind-rose drawn on the land (unlike the wind-rose drawn on the sea) bears the biblical terms

for North-South-East-and West: *Yama-Kedma-Tzafona-Negba*, another hint that this country has been Hebrew since time immemorial. These names, which also constitute the title of the map, are part of the verse, "And thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south" (Genesis 28:14). The verse itself appears next to the map, in a column **Figure 1**. *"*One sea with many names" (*TMC*, p.11) of biblical quotes that all include the divine promise in greater detail: Exodus 23:31, "And I will set thy bounds from the sea of Suf (= The Red Sea) even to the sea of the Pelishtim (= The southern shores N.P.E), and from the desert to the river." Deuteronomy 11:24, "Every Place whereon the sole of your foot shall tread shall be yours[…]. From the river, the river Prath (=Syria+Iraq N.P.E) to the uttermost sea shall be your border," and Joshua 1:4, "From the wilderness and this Lebanon as far as the great sea … towards the going down of the sun, shall be your border." However, it is only the verse regarding the *spreading* that is interpreted, within brackets, into Modern Hebrew: "(The interpretation of the verse: In future your country will expand to the west, and to the east, to the north and to the south)."

The column of biblical verses is the first to be read, given the Hebrew reading path (from right to left). The verses are connected to the map by straight horizontal vectors that signify a strong connection that may be that of a narrative or cause and effect (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 1996). The map, being on the *new* (left) side of the page, is thus presented as the realization of the divine promises – the modern fulfillment of the ancient prophesies. Since genres can be defined by their function (Van Leeuwen, 2005a), one may define this whole page generically as *legitimation*, for it legitimates the occupation of Palestinian lands relying on the highest authority for the Jews –the Bible. The answer to the hypothetical question, "why doesn't the map show the internationally recognized borders?" is, *because the Bible says so.* The insertion of biblical verses into the scientific text endows the text with the sanctity of the Bible and its divine truth, and gives the Bible and the divine promises a scientific real-time validity.

Use of Racist Discourse

Representation of Palestinians

Morgan (2003), a social and cultural geographer, notes that since "images are means of persuasion to hold certain beliefs and values", the crucial questions in geography are: "Who consumes it? What do they make of it?" (p. 254-255). These questions relate to Van Leeuwen's (2000) questions regarding visual presentations (p. 92):

1. What are the kinds of people and things depicted in the image and how do we recognize them as such?

2 What ideas and values do we associate with these depicted people, places or things, and what is it that allows us to do so?

These questions, which may be asked about any visual sign, are crucial to teaching since "much of the message of the multimodal text comes across before a word of text has been read" (Van Leeuwen, 1992, p. 36). As Lemke (1998) explains, "all literacy is multimedia literacy" (p.284) and "Meanings in multimedia are not fixed and additive (the word meaning plus the picture meaning), but multiplicative (word meaning modified by image context, image meaning modified by textual context), making a whole far greater than the simple sum of its parts" (p. 283). As we shall see, in Israeli geography

schoolbooks the exclusion of Palestinians, and their representation as impersonalized elements – *problems* and *threats*, is obvious before a word of the written text is read.

Jews Vs. Non-Jews

Racist discourse always deals with dichotomies (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001). Israeli political, social, and educational discourses divide – verbally and visually – the Israeli population into Jews and non-Jews. For example in *SIS*, there is a map titled: "Rural habitation in Israel: Blue: Jewish villages, Red: non-Jewish villages" (Rap & Shilony-Tzvieli, 2002, p. 55). Verbally, defining people as a non-entity (that is, *non-Jews*) serves to impersonalize, segregate, and exclude them. Impersonalisation paves the way to "dominating the minority groups, excluding them from social activities and even destroying and murdering them" (Van Dijk, **YEAR?** cited in Reisigl & Wodak 2001, p. 28.). The non-Jews, regardless of their origin and faith, are sometimes called by the generic hyperonym: *Arabs*6. This is an example of what Van Leeuwen (1996) terms: *genericisation* – usually realized by "a generic name in the plural without the article" (p. 46). For example, in *IMS (*Fine, Segev, & Lavi, 2002):

The Arab Population: Within this group there are several religious groups and several ethnic groups: Muslims, Christians, Druze, Bedouins and Circassians. **But since most of them are Arab they shall be referred to henceforth as Arabs**. (p. 12) [Emphasis added] The only information the reader receives about these *Arabs* is negative. All the books present the Palestinian citizens or *Israel's Arabs* as a backward *sector* and exclude them from all reports about social, cultural, and economic life. In *PIS*, a graph depicting average marital age for women as one of the characteristics of development, manages to locate Israel as the last bar in a line of "Developed Countries" thanks to a minuscule footnote: "The Israeli data refer only to the Jewish population" (Rap & Fine, 1996, p. 76). Other books, such as *GLI*, treat Israel's Arabs as intruders who must be kept from "invading state lands" in the Galilee7, for they threaten to "create a non-Jewish sequence which would separate these areas from the state of Israel" (Aharony & Sagi, 2002, p. 240).

The Cartography of Exclusion

The territory no longer precedes the map, nor survives it. It is the map that precedes the territory[...] that engenders the territory. (Baudrillard, 1983, p. 2) Maps can naturalize exclusion more than any other device. As Henrikson (**YEAR?,** cited in Baudrillard, 1983) argues, "it is through the lens of a map […] that we see, know, and even create the larger world" (p. 52). Henrikson further argues that "Cartography like politics is a 'teleological discourse', reifying power, reinforcing the status quo, and freezing social interaction within charted lines." Therefore, "The map has always been the perfect representation of the state." (pp. 58-59, 60). Bar-Gal (1993a) explains that Israeli curriculum planners have never resigned to man-made borders that seem to them an "accidental consequence of cease fire commands which paralyzed military momentum" (p. 125), nor have they given up teaching about the greater, *promised* Land of Israel, which is presented in schoolbooks as "a whole geographic entity" (p. 125). This geographic entity is presented in physical maps adorning school corridors, ministries, and banks. It comprises Israel, parts of Lebanon, Palestine, most of Jordan (called *the Eastern Land of Israel*) and portions of Syria and Egypt, and creates the idea of *natural* boundaries for the newly-formed Israeli nation state. Israeli maps present, therefore, not "the 'State of Israel' which has achieved international legitimation [but] the 'Land of Israel' which has divine legitimation."(Bar-Gal, 1993b, p. 430). As Bar-Gal (1996) asserts,

The educational system continues to present the map as a miniature model of reality, and less often emphasizes that this map is a distorted model, which sometimes can "lie," and contain items that are completely different from reality. (p. 69)

None of the books is called "The Geography of the State of Israel." The titles are usually *Israel* or *The Land of Israel*, which entails the inclusion, in all maps, of territories beyond the state's official borders, including the occupied areas that were seized during the wars but whose legal status does not make them a part of the state.

IMS is the only book of those considered here that declares from the outset it would teach about the State of Israel. However, its maps include, as an integral part of the state, the Palestinian territories that are outside Israel's official borders without however marking any Arab city inside Israel (such as Nazareth, Acre, or Um El-Fahem). On the first map: "Israel and its neighbours 2002" (Figure 2), the areas controlled by the Palestinian authorities (areas A) are

encircled with a very thin broken line, which usually expresses temporariness. Other Palestinian areas (B,C), which are under military occupation and have never been annexed to Israel, are nevertheless depicted as part of the state. Similarly, on page 23, a map of universities includes the tiniest Jewish university-extensions that were erected in the illegal settlements of Ariel, Alon Shvut, or Elkana, but excludes all major Palestinian universities in the same areas, such as BirZeit, Al-Kuds, and Bethlehem university, although the latter are much bigger and better known all over the world. Two other maps present the Palestinian territories as what Henrikson (1994) terms *geographic* or *toponomyc silences,* that is, as colorless spots within the state of Israel.

Geographic silences are usually created by the removal or alteration of place names – the renamed locations of conquered people or minority groups – [which] create "toponomyc silences" namely "blank spaces, silences of uniformity, of standardization or deliberate exclusion, willful ignorance or even actual repression. (p. 59) On the map depicting the distribution of "Arab population in Israel 2002" *(IMS,* p.16) Palestinian regions are colourless and defined as "Areas for which there are no data." that is to say, as areas within the state of Israel where there is *no population.* On the map depicting the distribution of employment (*IMS*, p. 33), there is a colourful graph depicting the Israelis who work in the occupied Palestinian territories but no data about Palestinian employees. They are labeled in the verbal text "foreigners" or "host workers":

Part of the foreign workers is Palestinians who come from areas controlled by the Palestinian Authority. They are employed in unprofessional jobs and their wages are lower than those of the Israeli citizens who work in the same jobs … This is characteristic of all developed countries. (*IMS,* p. 32) Their being employed in "unprofessional jobs" is the only information

Israeli schoolbooks give about the sort of work Palestinians do. Treating the Palestinians as foreigners points to an odd geographical perception: The Palestinian territories – except for area A – are presented as part of Israel and yet the inhabitants of these same territories are foreigners. However, the readers **Figure 2**. Israel and its neighbors 2000 (*IMS*, p.7) may not be aware of this peculiarity because the occupied territories are not marked as Palestinian areas. As Henrikson explains, Maps are powerful and persuasive sometimes explicitly and nearly always implicitly. Every map is someone's way of getting you to look at the world his own way. They do it by conveying they have no such interest. They are convincing because the interests they serve are masked. (Henrikson, 1994, p. 58-59) The *toponomyc silences* regarding the presentation of Palestinian areas are the visual expression of the Zionist slogan "A land

without people for a people without land," which has always justified the policy of occupation and colonization. This is most apparent in the *IMS* map of Jerusalem, "The historic capital of the Jewish people" (pp. 174-175), titled "Jerusalem as capital – government, culture, administration and national sites," wherein no Palestinian cultural sites or administrative buildings are depicted in the eastern side of the city, which is inhabited almost exclusively by Palestinians. This map convinces the viewer that Eastern Jerusalem is an empty place where the only important sites are Temple Mount and the Wailing Wall, marked as "national sites."

Cartographic Bad Practice

GLI is the most blatant, in both its verbal and in its visual representations. As demonstrated vividly on the map "Israel following the Oslo Accords" (Figure 3), international laws and decisions are presented as inapplicable in this text book. Across the West Bank, one sees white rectangles bearing the inscription that *Samaria* and *Judea* (Hebrew names of The West Bank) are "in a process of dynamic changes" (right rectangle), but the "Gaza strip will remain under Israeli control" (left rectangle). The bottom rectangle on the right-hand side of the page explains, "The areas accorded to the Palestinian authorities were not marked on the maps in this book because they have not yet acquired the status of international borders." However, Jewish colonies in the West Bank and the Golan Heights, whose annexation has not yet acquired international status either, are marked as part of the state, and the two soldiers erupting from the map's frame with rifles pointed toward Syria and Lebanon, reassure readers that Israel has not come to terms with, and will not abide by, man-made borders. This kind of map is what Oxford, Dorling, and Harris (2003), define as *cartographic bad practice*: "It is bad practice to clutter the map with unnecessary information or chart-junk, namely, decoration that may draw attention away from the important information" (p. 154). The "important information" in this case should be, as the title promises, the internationally agreed borders and the areas returned to the Palestinian **Figure 3***.* Israel following the Oslo Agreements (*GLI*, p. 17) Authority in consequence of the Oslo accords. Oxford, Dorling, and Harris (2003, p. 154) mention the main elements that need to be included in a map: A title that explains the major theme being mapped, region and data. A Legend with a clear explanation of what each symbol represents, with the text to the right of each symbol. The source of the data: where the data were obtained, when they were collected and by whom. Labels that would indicate features of interest. Except for the title – which is also misleading – none of the above elements are included in this map. No reference is given as to the source of the data and the map clearly includes unnecessary elements unlikely to appear in any atlas. The conclusion must be that this map is not meant to teach the students about cartography or international borders, but rather to transmit a very clear message regarding the inapplicability of international decisions in Israel. As Bar-Gal (1993a) explains, "The borders of Israel as presented on the map represent the right-wing ideological perception which refuses to see the area of the West Bank and Gaza as territory under a different sovereignty. (p. 125)

Mental Maps - Centre and Peripheralness

"Mental maps are a critical variable – occasionally the decisive factor – in the making of public policy" (Henrikson, 1994, p. 50). Mental maps are ideological constructs that may have little to do with geographical evidence. They reflect individual or societal perceptions or reflections of the world. For instance, in European maps, Europe is the centre of the world. The drawing of maps is highly influenced by mental maps or by the political ideologies the state is interested in diffusing. Thus, in spite of Israel's small frame, maps manage to push the Palestinian citizens of Israel to the margins of

consciousness and social reality, as it is well expressed in the following statement from *GLI.*: Factors that inhibit the development of the Arab village: […] Arab villages are remote from the centre, the roads to them are difficult and they have remained outside of the process of change and development, they are hardly exposed to modern life and there are difficulties in connecting them to the power and water networks. (p. 197) None of these "remote" villages is depicted on any map, although they all are situated within the *narrow waistline* of Israel, which at its widest part is 50km wide (a 30-minute drive) and, at its narrowest part, is equal to the distance between Manhattan and JFK airport – 15 km., a 9-minute drive – as emphasized in Israeli maps issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs8. However, Jewish *Mitzpim*9 (out-posts), built on hilltops overlooking those "remote" or non-existent villages, and Jewish colonies situated beyond the official borders of Israel, are presented in all schoolbooks as examples of a high standard of living, not as remote, marginal, deprived settlements. Arabs are marginalized in Israeli schoolbooks as they are excluded from Israeli cultural discourse and social life (see Yiftachel, 2006; Yona, 2005) which are kept *Westernized* or *Eurocentric*. For example, in a history book for grades 8-9, *From Conservatism to Progress* (Eldar & Yafe, 1998), we learn, "In the years 1881-1882 thousands of people arrived at Jaffa port: from Russia, from Rumania, from the Balkan and even from far-away Yemen" (p. 269). Needless to say, Yemen is closer to Jaffa port than Russia, but on the "mental map" of the book's authors and of the numerous committees and counselors that authorized it, the centre is still Eastern Europe, the spiritual centre of Zionism and the origin of the dominant social group in Israel. As Henrikson (1994) remarks, "One of the unfortunate consequences of colonialism and the condition it engendered, […] is a feeling that the centre is elsewhere" (p. 55-56). Regarding the influence of mental maps, Bar-Gal (1993b) argues that, Israeli citizens of the present acquired political beliefs in the past from which each has built their 'mental map'; these maps will influence their decisions at the ballot box on the question of the future borders of the state. (p. 421)

Shifting the Centre

Maps have both a synoptic quality (show what is happening in an area), and a hypnotic quality – a suggestive effect. *Cartohypnosis* (a term coined by Boggs, 1947) is the subtle persuasiveness of maps that "causes people to accept unconsciously and uncritically the ideas that are suggested to them by maps" (Henrikson, 1994, p. 50).

Kress and Van Leeuwen argue that "the centre is not always identical with the focus of the map […]. For something to be presented as centre means that it is presented as the nucleus of the information to which all other elements are subservient" (Van Leeuwen & Kress, 1996, pp. 30, 90). The shift of attention to the non-central focus is made possible by the use of colour, size, and perspective. In *TMC*, a map titled: "Expand your knowledge: Jews, Christians and Muslims around the Mediterranean" (Figure 4), has, right above it, two lines of orientation: "Many nations dwell around the Mediterranean: Jews, Arabs, Italians, Greek, Spanish and others." The "others" are the Tunisians, the Moroccans, the Algerians, and the Turks, all included in the generic name *Arabs,* represented by two huge, dark-pink *Muslim* blocks surrounding tiny *Jewish* Israel. A light-pink unnamed block of *Christians* is also depicted. The

strong *Jewish* hue of tiny Israel – dark purple – and the fact that none of the other blocks is named, render Israel the most salient feature of the map and its focus, the first item to attract the eye. Arnheim (1988, cited in Henrikson, 1994) argues that studying maps actually can make the viewer feel "the underlying spatial forces of the map structure as 'pushes and pulls' in his own nervous system" (p. 58), for shape and colour in maps have an animating effect. In

reading maps, the first to meet the eye are the expressive qualities of the map carried by stimulus data such as colour. Monmonier (1996) notes in his book, *How to Lie with Maps,* that "Color is a cartographic quagmire" (p. 163), and that "[…] simultaneous contrast will make the lighter colour seem lighter and the dark colour seem darker" (p. 172).

The legend of the *TMC* map indicates that the colours depict the *majority* in each block and the editorial text under this map specifies: "On the map, at the eastern side of the Mediterranean, there is a prominent spot of colour which **Figure 4**. Jews, Christians and Muslims around the Mediterranean (*TMC*, p. 53) represents the Jews living in our state – the state of Israel." However, in the area named Israel, which covers all the occupied Palestinian territories including the Gaza Strip, the combined population numbers about 5.5 million Jews and 5.5 million Palestinians who are not accounted for. In the Muslim blocks there are neither Jews nor Christians and there are no Jews in the Christian block. But in Cyprus a third of the country is painted *Muslim,* and the Balkans contain some uneven *Muslim* stripes of various sizes, which are not accounted for in the legend. Neither the stripes nor the third of Cyprus represent majorities but they reinforce the effect of Muslim encroachment. Van Leeuwen (1992, p. 51) observes that since maps are analytical, the relations they show are not dynamic but static. This map conveys static relations of power or threat in the Middle East, by means of colour10.

Once again, the elements that need to be included in a map are partly missing. By contrast, the map contains additional elements not accounted for in the legend. To summarize, in all the maps presented in this chapter, "Persuasion is foregrounded and instruction and exposition backgrounded" (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 1996, p. 90).

Ideological Photographs

Van Leeuwen (2001) argues that photographs, even documentary ones, may have symbolic meaning and may be analyzed not only semiotically but also iconographically and iconologically. Such an analysis would seek to find out what the photograph represents within a certain context of culture or situation, and to link it with "themes, concepts or conventional meaning" (Woodrow, 2003), in order to provide the *why* behind the representations analyzed (Van Leeuwen, 2001, p. 116). The analysis would reveal "the basic attitudes of a nation, a period, a class, a religious and philosophical persuasion – […] condensed into one work." (Panofsky, **YEAR?**, cited in Woodrow, 2003, p??). The Palestinian citizens of Israel are never shown as modern, productive, individual human beings, but as stereotypes characterized by what Barthes (1977) termed (p. 24) the *object-signs* of their archetype: stereotypical *Arabs* and primitive farmers shown from a distance, with no reference to time, which makes them eternal and iconic. The only representations of Palestinians in the occupied territories, in the very few cases when they are represented at all, are face-covered terrorists or *refugees* shown from a very long distance, situated in non-places. Hence, Palestinians are represented "as people whose life does not and will not touch upon ours" (Van Leeuwen 1992, p. 45) except as phenomena, or rather as *problems* and threats: (*Asiatic*) backwardness, terrorism, and the refugee *problem,* which stains Israel's image in the eyes of the world (Bar-Navi, 1998).

One example is found in a *PIS* sub-chapter called: "Case study 4: Many refugees in the world are running for their lives" (p. 150). This chapter is analytically structured: it shows many sub-kinds of what is classified as "refugees." A map shows concentrations of refugees in 1992, a million of whom, it states, are in the region of Israel11. Altogether there are seven photographs: three close-shots of Jewish refugees from 1945 and 1956,

one close-up of Israeli soldier-doctors tending to a Rwandan baby, one long-shot aerial photo of Rwandan refugees, one long-shot aerial photo of Somali refugees, one long-shot of Haitians, and one very-long-shot12 of an empty shanty town defined as "Jabalia refugee camp in the Gaza region." All the refugees except for the Palestinians are presented as human beings "running for their lives," though all of them except for the Jewish ones are shown from a very long distance, as phenomena, rather than as individuals. However, their troubles are detailed in the text and their routes are depicted on maps that contain all necessary facts: size of the country, composition of

the population, etc. The only refugees not depicted "running for their lives" are the million refugees in the Israeli region, whose vicissitudes are neither described in the text nor depicted on any map. The only representation of these refugees is the aerial photograph of the refugee camp of Jabalia. Van Leeuwen (1992) writes about such aerial photographs:

It is the angle of the omnipotent observer, placed high above the madding crowd or to use an even stronger image: the angle of the pilot who flies too high to be able to see the people on whom he is dropping his bombs […] it is the kind of knowledge which education is still primarily concerned to reproduce. (p. 49) The caption of the aerial photograph of Jabalia reads "One of the big refugee camps, whose inhabitants live in over-crowdedness and poverty (*PIS*, p. 153). This is the only caption that doesn't specify who the inhabitants are and how they became refugees. Poverty and over-crowdedness are presented in terms of existentialization – as given conditions, or rather, as a timeless circumstance that "simply exists" (Van Leeuwen, 2008, p. 67), a situation into which those inhabitants happened to fall or to be born, detached from any cause or human agency. The editorial text above the Jabalia photograph explains: The population in the refugee camps is growing fast and the conditions of life are very hard – the rate of unemployment is high, the houses are crowded and poor and the standard of health services, education and hygiene, is low. (*PIS*, p. 153)

This account is given without any specification. "The population is growing fast," resembles reports about an epidemic, such as the increase of mosquitoes or rats in places where the standard of hygiene is low. On the back side of the page, as counterpart or negative of the Jabalia photograph, is a photograph of "Jewish refugees on their way to Israel" (p. 154) during the 1950's, showing Kurdish Jews crowded in an airplane. Kress and Van Leeuwen (1995) maintain that "Connections are realized as vectors […] on double spread or two sides of a page or through pages" (p. 34). In *PIS*, the text above the photograph confirms the connection between the two sides of the page: Contrary to the Arab refugees, of whom many still live in refugee camps and their problem has not been solved [by the Arab countries] – the problem of Jewish refugees from Islamic countries has long been solved […].The state of Israel has invested a lot of effort in the absorption of these refugees. (p. 154)

Impersonalisation through Racist Cartoons

In *GLI,* Palestinians are only represented in racist icons and cartoons, such as the classical Arab with a moustache, wearing a kafiyah, and followed by a camel. Van Leeuwen (1992) summarizes the motivation for cartoon-like presentations:

Cartoons are general without being abstract. Represent people as types rather than as tokens. All Turks have moustaches and all Arabs have camels. This reality is replacing the reality of naturalism and individualism. (p. 56)

The iconic *Arab* in the cartoons (Figure 5) wears inflated pants and pointed shoes, neither of which is ever seen in Israel or Palestine. It is a sort of an icon of an icon, imported into Israeli schoolbook from European illustrations of books such as *The Arabian Nights*, which receives its features not from the *model* itself, but from the producer's model (Groupe µ.1992, p. 132) and represents an imagined *Arab* in a context where real Arabs live and work. It is presented to Jewish Israeli students who live next door to their Arab cocitizens but may go through life without ever meeting them face to face. The main text teaches us that.

The Arab society is traditional and objects to changes by its nature, reluctant to adopt novelties […] Modernization seems dangerous to them […] they are unwilling to give anything up for the general good. (*GLI*, p. 303)

The oval frame of the caricature forms an enclosure which is "a closed system which taken as a whole behaves as a center of energy [and] fences off [its image] from the environment […] Its function as an enclosure is most uncompromisingly expressed when its shape is circular" (Arnheim, 1988, pp. 56, 62). In this icon, the Arab is separated from the modern house in an irreversible way. The camel – the object-sign of the primitive nomad, is partly in the frame but it is turning its behind to the modern house, which obviously cannot contain it.

This icon, repeated throughout the book in variations (with or without a crouching woman, with or without a pack of children, riding the camel or leading it) whenever *Arabs* are discussed, is always placed outside the frame. On a map that depicts "the Geographic distribution of Arab villages and cities in Israel" (Aharony & Sagi, 2002, p.145), two figures of *Arabs* are placed outside Israel, on the other side of the river Jordan, clearly separated from their residential areas as if relocated across the border, in the kingdom of Jordan, where Israel has always tried to transfer them. The border or the river, as the oval frame, segregates these people and places them in an entirely different domain. Such means "limit interaction, create obstacles and may be removed only by those who hold the key" (Van Leeuwen 2005b, p. 16).

The icons of the *Arab* accompany all the maps, the graphs and the verbal texts that discuss *Arabs*. Thus they fulfill the function of illustration, or elaboration (Van Leeuwen, 2005b, p. 230). They specify visually the characteristics of *Arabs*, showing what *Arabs* look like. But since no map, graph or pyramid shows Arab doctors or lawyers, businessmen, academics, artists, or industrialists, this illustration restricts the term *Arab* to clownlooking primitive farmers and nomads, who are non-existent in either Israel or in Palestine today.

Figure 5. "The Arabs refuse to live in high buildings and insist on living in One-storey garden cottages" (*GLI*, p. 303). Contrary to the Arab population map, which excludes the Arabs from the land, the Jewish population map shows figures that are clearly inside the frame. On this *GLI* map, which is at the *new-ideal* spot (top-left) of a page entitled "Immigration to Israel as an influential demographic factor" (Aharony & Sagi, 2002, p. 136), the airplane bringing in the Jewish immigrants obscures parts of Syria, the flag of Israel is draped across the country, covering the whole of Palestine (Gaza strip and the West Bank) and the Jewish immigrants march directly into the occupied Palestinian territories. At the bottom of the image one sees a contract of citizenship, which Jewish newcomers sign upon arrival.

These two maps visualize the fact that while the indigenous population is pushed beyond the border, Jews from other countries are brought in to replace them and populate their lands. The iconic Arab and his iconic wife also appear in a population-

pyramid that divides the Israeli population into "Jews and others" versus "Arabs" (p. 149). While the Arabs are represented by the above-mentioned cartoons, the Jews-and-others look like *normal* Westerns, with no particular object-signs. Here the differentiation is not only between *them* and *us* but rather between *them* and *us and all the non-them*. The book does not provide any explanation as to who these others are, and the conclusion must be that some others who are not Jewish deserve to be included in the Jewish group, as long as they are not Arabs.

Semiotic Representation

The Meta-narrative of Development

This section discusses *classification images* (Van Leeuwen, 1992; Morgan, 2003), which are used to convey development and under-development. Classification is an instrument of ordering the world and of control (Hodge & Kress, 1993, p. 63). One classification that freezes power relations in Israel is *Jews versus non-Jews* and another, related to it, is the categorization of *developed versus under-developed* societies. Such classifications are, using Allport's terms (1958, p. 171), "Monopolistic, undifferentiated, two-valued and rigid categorizations" that are usually irreversible. Israeli geography textbooks teach that "an historical event, the resurrection

of the Jewish nation, had an impact on the landscape" (Bar-Gal, 1993a, p. 60). This *impact* is often termed *development* or *progress*, manifest in Zionist achievements such as the taming of the desert, afforestation, massive construction and the diversion of rivers. Although these projects are, as Yiftachel (2006) notes, "wrapped in a discourse of development, modernity, and democracy, the very material reality is unmistakable, entailing minority dispossession and

exclusion" (p. 38). Palestinian (and Druze and Bedouin) citizens are included in this meta-narrative of development as an underdeveloped, non-Westernized sectors that Israel is *developing* just like the landscape (Bar-Gal, 1994, p. 231). But Israeli schoolbooks attribute *underdevelopment* to the *Arab* way of life which is *traditional* and *clannish,* rather than to the Israeli development projects that exclude and impoverish them13.

The sharp distinction between developed and undeveloped societies goes against current thinking in Developmental Geography: Meta-narratives, such as 'development', are to be mistrusted [and] 'development' should be questioned. The world with its varieties cannot be understood using only a small number of concepts, the people who get to choose which concepts tend to come from wealthy areas and they describe the world according to their own vision of how it should be and call these concepts universal. (Page 2003, p. 98) Page maintains that, "If development is to be regulated it needs to be scrutinized," and suggests to "analyze discursive tactics employed by the advocates of development…" stating that "current geographical work sets out to disturb the simplicity of development propaganda in order to deepen our understanding of different places[…]. Development Geography [has] dispensed with the view that anything can be justified as long as it is labeled 'progressive'" (p. 101).

One of the most common representations of under-development is the *Oxfam image* (Hicks, 1980, p. 13) of the primitive farmer with his primitive plough, connoting nothing but *backwardness* (Van Leeuwen, 1992, p. 56). *PIS* presents a quadrangle of photographs, titled "From traditional to modern life in the non-Jewish population"

(Figure. 6). On the right (the *Given* 14 part of the page reserved for the past, the known and uncontested) we see "traditional

agriculture in the Galilee" and a *traditional* village. On the left side (reserved for *New* information) we see their counterparts: "Modern construction in the suburbs of the Arab town Um El Fahem," and a modern machine-cultivated field (at the *New-Ideal* spot). The blurred figure of the farmer in the *traditional* field is seen from a great distance and in profile, namely "impersonally as a type rather than as individual." (Van Leeuwen & Selander 1995, p. 46). He

hasn't any ethnic object-signs, such as a kafiyah or *Arab* dress, but a khaki shirt, oversized khaki trousers, and a khaki woolen cap, which are the usual Israeli hand-downs to poor neighbours. Disadvantage and dependence upon Jewish good will have become what Ogbu (1986, p. 96-97, quoted in Cazden, 2002) defined as "secondary cultural characteristics" of this population and stand for *Arabness* or rather for *non-Jewishness*; "Secondary cultural characteristics are […] those different cultural features that came into existence **Figure 6.** From traditional to modern life in the non-Jewish Population. *Top right:* Traditional agriculture in the Galilee. *Bottom right:* Traditional construction in the Arab village Dir-Hana in the lower Galilee. *Top left:* Modern agriculture in Taybe, an Arab village on the coastal plain. *Bottom left:* Modern construction in the suburbs of the Arab city Um-El-Fahem. (*PIS*, p. 110) after two populations have come into contact, especially in contact involving the subordination of one group to another." The farmer goes from left to right, receding away from, and turning his back on the "modern" machine-made field on his left, which is located at the *New- Ideal* part (top left) of the quadrangle, above a caption: "Modern agriculture in Taybeh, an Arab village in the coastal plain." Thus, backwardness, which resides in Arab-populated Galilee, gives way to modernity the closer one gets to the Jewish centre.

The houses of the "traditional Arab village in Galilee," located at the bottom-right (*Real-Given*) spot, have flat roofs designed to collect rain water. The colour of their walls is that of the land that surrounds them. The houses are connected to each other and face a common centre. By contrast, the "Modern construction in the suburbs of the Arab town Um El Fahem," at the *New-Real* location (bottom left), consists of scattered individual western-looking houses

topped with precipitous red tiled roofs – designed for snowy weather – on an uncultivated slope of a rocky hill, with no roads leading from one house to another. Progress therefore means the passage from community life to individual habitation and from Mid-Eastern functional construction, shapes, and colours to Western ones.

The Power of Colour as a Semiotic Resource of Meaning

Colour is a semiotic resource like any other: regular, with signs that are motivated in their constitution by the interests of the makers and not at all arbitrary or anarchic. (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2002, p. 345) Colour has three dimensions: hue, value - which refers to the colour's

lightness or darkness - and saturation (chroma), which refers to the colour's intensity or brilliance (Monmonier, 1996, p. 164). Van Leeuwen and Selander (1995, p. 506) note that, "Greater sharpness and colour saturation makes the represented object more real" (p. 506).

Aerial photographs are good examples of the manipulative use of distance and colour. Although both Jewish and Arab villages are usually represented from above, aerial

photographs of Jewish settlements manage to acquire a post-card look, showing individual houses, fields, and landscape that we can almost touch (Van Leeuwen, 1992), while Arab settlements are represented from a much longer shot, as blue-prints. Israeli settlements, even those located in the Negev desert, are always depicted in western saturated colours: Whitewashed houses with precipitous red roofs, lush green vegetation and cultivated flowers. This, according to Zionist-Israeli ideology, connotes the *impact* of Jewish return, which *made the wilderness bloom*.

Colours, just like verbal language, may represent ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings. Ideationally, "Colour can denote specific people, places and things as well as classes of people, places and things, and more general ideas." (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 2002, p. 347). In Israeli geography textbooks, *Jewish* colours connote progress, a high standard of living or Western imported culture, whereas *Arab* natural colours connote Mid-Eastern non-development, (Bar-Gal, 2000) hence non-Jewishness. Interpersonally, "the use of colour acts on people and manipulates them. Colour states a status and a mood" (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 1996, p. 349). Monmonier (1996) argues that "[…] because of the embedded emotions or culturally conditioned attitudes some colours carry a subtle added meaning that could affect our interpretation […] or our feelings towards the elements portrayed on the map" (p.170). This observation can also be applied to photographs. The colours of Arab villages – faded yellow, brown, grey and olive green - connote in Israeli consciousness threat and alienation (Bar-Gal, 2000). As Monmoniers remarks, "a range of greens and blues is generally preferable to a range of yellow and yellowish green" (p.170). Textually, or in terms of *mode*, "colour and the coordination of colours can create cohesion." (Kress & Van Leeuwen, 1996, p. 349). In terms of cohesion, the contrast between the two colour schemes – the *Arab* natural colours vs. the *Jewish* manufactured ones, stand in contrast or opposition to one another, representing the power relations between the two cultures. Jewish-Western domination over Eastern-Arab landscape is what Israeli education presents as development. As Bar-Gal (2000, p. 172) maintains, the presentation of places in geography textbooks are made in accordance with the perspectives of their authors.

Conclusion

The view that no sign is created in isolation or in a disinterested fashion and that no sign is *neutral* or independent of ideology is shared by geographers and social-semioticians alike. Israeli schoolbooks make use of scientific visuals, which are presented as unbiased, for the inculcation of political ideology and discriminatory ideas. The mendacious maps and demeaning images, embedded in the ethnocentric discourse, determine students' perception of their country and of their neighbours.

The books do not present the critical nature of scientific discourse but rather use geography to enhance Israeli ethno-nationalism and "ethno-regionalism," which "denotes both a geographic reality and a political process" (Yiftachel 2006, p. 166). In this process, the presence of Palestinians is erased from the landscape and from the country's lifeworld, which is "these unregulated spheres of sociality [which] provide a repository of shared meanings and understandings […], the background against which communicative action takes place." (Finlayson, 2005, p. 52).

Geography schoolbooks teach Israeli students to see themselves as masters of the Land of Israel/Palestine, to control both its population and its space, and to do whatever necessary to increase Jewish domination and its *development*.

This way of representing others, found in European schoolbooks regarding "the Third World" and immigrants as well (Van Leeuwen, 1992), educates students to hostility and contempt towards their immediate neighbours and environment, and does not prepare them for a peaceful co-existence in the multi-cultural society in which they live.

Author Note: This study was completed at the Institute of Education, London University, and was sponsored partly by the Leverhulme Trust and partly by the Mofet Institute for Educational Research in Israel.

Notes

1. The term *Elite Racism* is discussed in Reisigl & Wodak 2001, p. 28.

2. Textbooks of Independent Orthodox and state-religious streams were not included.

3. Israeli schoolbooks are trade books and teachers may choose which book to use. However, they all need to be authorized by the Ministry of Education or at least be compatible with the national curriculum.

4. This was verified by reports from bookstores regarding the most popular textbooks and by personal reports of teachers.

5. All rights reserved to the following publishing houses: The Centre for Educational Technology (*People in Space, Settlements in Space,* and *Israel–Man and Space*); Lilach Publishers (*The Geography of the Land of Israel*); Maalot Publishers (*The Mediterranean Countries*).

6. Van Leeuwen (2001) describes a similar attitude of the Americans treating all the *others* who were dominated by them as *blacks*.

7. *State lands* is the legal term for lands confiscated from Palestinians and Bedouins in the Galilee, the Negev, and the Occupied Territories.

8. The caption of the map issued by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs reminds the viewer that "Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban, used to describe the border or cease-fire lines as 'Auschwitz boundaries', in order to illustrate the dangers inherent in their continued use." http:/www.mfa.gov.il/MFA/ facts about Israel/Israel in maps#threats&topography. Jan. 1, 2004.

9. The out-posts or *Mitzpim* are small ex-urban settlements, established during the late 1970s and early 1980s in the Galilee, ranging between 30 to 1,000 households, scattered among the Arab villages (Yiftachel, 2006, p. 33).

10. *How to Lie with Maps* (Monmonier, 1996) shows a similar map, issued by the Jewish National Fund in Canada in 1973, when Israel was twice its present size as it was still occupying the Sinai Peninsula. In this map, Israel is a white spot squeezed between two dark Muslim blocks, and the title proclaims: "Visual proof of Arab lies about Israel's 'aggression'" (p. 95).

11. One million Palestinian refugees is not an accurate figure, but the figure given by the book. Israel admits there are 3 million, UNRWA claims there are 3.5 million, and the Palestinians claim there are 5 million refugees, 1.5 million in Gaza Strip.

12. These terms are taken from Van Leeuwen (1992, p. 45), who used the terminology of television and film.

13. Yiftachel (2006, pp. 133, 166) explains that, "a most striking feature of Arab geography has been its forced stability and containment. Palestinian Arab areas have

not changed from 1948, marking a stable Arab region." Although "the Arabs make up 20% of the population they have only 3.5% of the land […].Over a half of land owners were expropriated by the state after 1948 and more than 500 Jewish settlements were built on these lands[…]. Since its establishment the state has built over 700 Jewish localities and 0 Arab localities." The Palestinian citizens lost both personal property and collective territorial assets and interests because nearly all their land has been proclaimed state land. "Although the Arab population had grown six fold by 2006, the land under its control had halved. This situation creates virtual ghettoisation of Arabs."

14. Kress and Van Leeuwen (1996, 1995) explain that the polarization of left and right, top and bottom has ideological meaning. In English, the left side would mean the *Given* or agreed-upon part of the message while the right side would include the New information; in Hebrew, the *Given*, known and uncontested information would be on the right and the *New* of the left. However, in all representations the bottom part of the page is reserved for the *Real* or down-to-earth information while the top part is reserved for that which is presented as *Ideal* or abstract.

References

Aharony. Y. & Sagi T. (2002). *The geography of the land of Israel: A Geography textbook for grades 11-12*. Tel-Aviv: Lilach Pub.

Allport, G. W. (1958). *The nature of prejudice.* New-York: Doubleday Anchor.

Arnheim, R. A. (1988). *The Power of the Centre: A study of composition in the visual arts.* Berkeley. University of California Press.

Bar-Gal, Y. (1993a). *Moledet and geography in a hundred years of Zionist Education.* Tel-Aviv: Am Oved Publishers.

Bar-Gal, Y. (1993b). Boundaries as a topic in geographic education: The case of Israel, *Political Geography, 12*(5), 421-435.

Bar-Gal, Y. (1996). Ideological Propaganda in Maps and Geographical Education " in J. van der Schee & H. Trimp, *Innovation in Geographical Education, Netherlands Geographical studies*, IGU, Commission on Geographical Education, Hague, pp. 67-79.

Bar-Gal, Y. (2000). Values and ideologies in place descriptions: The Israeli Case. In *Erdkunde, archive for scientific geography, 54*, 168-176.

Bar-Gal, Y. (2003). *Geographic politics and geographic education: A Talk.* Conference of the Geographic Society, Bar-Illan University, Tel-Aviv.

Bar-Gal, Y. (2004). Unity–Transformation–Unity–Dissolution: Metamorphoses in the Country's andscape. in Ayal, A., *Our Landscape: Notes on Landscape Painting in Israel*, Haifa. Art gallery, Haifa University, 29-33.

Bar-Navi, E. (1998). *The 20th century- A History of the people of Israel in the last generations, for grades 10-12.* Tel-Aviv: Sifrei Tel Aviv Pub.

Barthes, R. (1977). *Image, Music, Text.* London: Fontana.

Baudrillard, J. (1983). Simulations. USA. Semiotext(e).

Bernstein, B. (1996). Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory,Research, Critique. London: Taylor and Francis Publishers.

Boggs, S. W. (1947). Cartohypnosis, Scientific Monthly, 64, USA. The Science Press 469-476.

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The language of teaching and learning.* Portsmouth, NH. Heineman.

Coffin, - (1997).

Eldar, T. & Yafe, L. (1998). From Conservatism to Progress - A History Textbook for grade 8. Tel-Aviv: The Ministry of Education and Maalot Publishers

Fine, T., Segev, M. & Lavi, R. (2002). Israel–The man and the space – Selected chapters in geography. Tel-Aviv. The Centre for Educational Technologies

Finlayson, J.G. (2005). *Habermas–a Short Introduction.* Oxdord. Oxford University Press.

Firer, R. (2004) 'The presentation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Israeli history and civics textbooks'. In: Firer, R. and Adwan, S. *The Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Israeli history and civics textbooks of both nations.*

Hannover. Georg-Eckert-Institute fur internationale Schulbuchforschung. Verlag Hahnsche Buchhandlung.

Genette, G. (1982). *Palimpseste: La littérature au second degré.* Paris: Editions du Seuil.

Groupe µ. (1992). *Traité du Signe visuel: Pour une rhétorique de l'image.* Paris. Editions de Seuil.

Henrikson, A. K. (1994). The power and politics of maps. In: *Reordering the World: Geopolitical perspective on the 21st century.* G.J. Demko and W.B.Wood Eds. San Francisco, Westview Press, 50-70.

Hodge, R. & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology:* London; Routledge.

Hicks, -.(1980).

Kress; G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age.* London, Routledge.

Kress, G. & Van Leeuwen, T. (1995). Critical Layout Analysis. In *International Schulbuch Forschung 17*, 25-43. Braunschweig . Zeitschrift des George- Eckert-Instituts.

Kress, G. & Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design.* London. Routledge.

Kress, G. & Van Leeuwen, T. (2002). Colour as a semiotic mode: notes for a grammar of colour. In: *Visual Communication. 1*, 343 -369. London and New-York. Sage Publications.

Lemke, J. (1998). Metamedia Literacy: Transforming Meanings and Media, In D. Reinking, L. Labbo, M. McKenna, & R. Kiefer (Eds.), *Handbook of Literacy and Technology: Transformations in a Post-Typographic World.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. 283-301.

Monmonier, M. (1996). *How to Lie With Maps.* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Morgan, J. (2003). Investigating Images, in *The Student's Companion to Geography* (second edition). Ma. USA. Blackwell Pub. pp. 253-260.

Ogbu (1986)

Oxford, S, Dorling, D., & Harris, R. (2003). Cartography and visualization. In *The Student's Companion to Geography* (second edition). Blackwell Pub. Ma. USA. pp. 151-157.

Page, B. (2003). Critical Geography and the study of Development. Showers of Blessings? In *The student's companion to geography*, (second edition). Blackwell Pub. Ma. USA.pp. 97-103.

Rap, E. & Fine, T. 1996/1998. *People in space A Geography textbook for 9th grade.* Tel-Aviv: The Centre for Educational Technologies Pub.(PIS)

Rap, E. & Shilony-Tzvieli, (1998). *Settlements in space: Chapters in the Geography of settlements in the world.* Tel-Aviv: The Centre for Educational Technologies Pub.

Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination rhetorics of racism and antisemitism.* London New York: Routledge.

Vaadya, D., Ulman, H., & Mimoni, Z. (1994). *The Mediterranean Countries for 5th grade.* Tel Aviv. Maalot Publishers.

Van Leuuwen, T. (1992). The schoolbook as a multimodal text, *International Schulbuch Forschung, 14*(1), 35-58. Frankfurt: Diesterweg.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In: C.R. Caldas- Coulthard, & M. Coulthard, Eds. *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis.* London, Routledge.

Van Leuuwen, T. (2001). Semiotics and Iconography. In: VL, Th. and Jewitt, C. Eds. 2001: *Handbook of Visual Analysis.* London and New-York. Sage Publications. pp. 92-119.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2005a). Multimodality, Genre and Design. In: Norris, S. and Jones, R.H., *Discourse in Action. London.* Routledge, pp. 73-95.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2005b). *Introducing social semiotics.* London. Routledge.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2007). Legitimation in Discourse and Communication. In: *Discourse and Communication, 1*(1), 91–112. London. Sage Publications.

Van Leeuwen, T. (2008). *Discourse and practice. New tools for critical discourse analysis.* Oxford Studies in Sociolinguistics. Oxford. Oxford University Press

Van Leeuwen & Selander (1995).

Yiftachel, O. (2006). *Ethnocracy: Land and identity politics in Israel/Palestine.* Philadelphia: Penn University Press.

Yona, Y. (2005) *In Virtue of Difference: The Multicultural Project in Israel.* Israel. The Van-Leer Institute in Jerusalem and Ha-kibbutz Ha-Meuhad Publishers.