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Welcome and Introduction

We would like to welcome you to Belfast. Along with Jerusalem, Belfast is one of the two major research sites of the ongoing Conflict in Cities and Contested State Project of which this conference is a part. For the last four years a team of researchers in Cambridge, Exeter and Belfast have studied a range of European and Middle Eastern cities that are sites of historic and contemporary conflict over the control, boundaries and even the existence of the states in which they are located. In contrast to Jerusalem and many of the other cities studied by the Project, Belfast currently offers positive evidence of how a city can move on, however painfully, from deep-rooted and durable divisions and antagonisms. At the same time, the city’s history of recurring conflict and the continuing obstacles to peace are reminders that such progress cannot be taken for granted.

This Urban Conflicts Conference provides opportunities to develop dialogue and collaboration with a broad spectrum of researchers on urban conflicts, including, but not confined to, narrowly defined ethno-national conflicts. Our aims are to disseminate the research from the Conflict in Cities Project to international experts working in the field and to engage with policy communities, community activists and practitioners who have extensive knowledge and experience of urban conflicts. The Conference is also designed to provide participants with an opportunity to observe the legacy of conflict at Belfast street-level in those localities most affected by the Northern Ireland ‘Troubles’.

Dissemination
Conflict in Cities research is being disseminated in three ways during the conference. Firstly, 13 team members are giving presentations spread throughout the three days of the conference. Secondly, the Project team at Cambridge has coordinated an exhibition entitled ‘Capturing Urban Conflicts’ to highlight the strong visual dimension of the research project and its multi-disciplinary composition - involving architecture, political science, geography, sociology, anthropology and urban studies. Thirdly, the Project’s website: http://www.conflictincities.org/ provides a comprehensive account of the activities, research and publications of the Project to date.

Dialogue
While the Project focuses on ethno-nationally divided cities in contested states, a sub-theme in the wider literature on urban conflicts, ethno-national and religious conflict is not hermetically sealed from other conflicts driven by geopolitical priorities, terrorism, poverty, environmental crises and the organised criminality of a range of pro- and anti-state groups. Moreover, the growing urbanization of the world’s population has highlighted the precariousness, vulnerability and resilience of cities in the new global order. Key questions therefore include how cities and everyday urban life are used and abused in the prosecution and containment of wider national conflicts and whether cities retain the potential for achieving self-sustaining moderation and the constructive channelling or resolution of conflict.

The conference will provide an opportunity to explore how ethno-national conflict, the central concern of the Project Team, shades into these other urban conflicts and divisions, both violent and non-violent. It will be a forum for dialogue about the changing relationship between cities, organised violence and processes of state formation and dis-integration. The keynote speech by the distinguished urban scholar, Professor Saskia Sassen, will help frame the discussion offering insights into the nature of asymmetric war in cities. Finally, the conference offers delegates opportunities to engage with policy makers and practitioners in two Policy Panels sponsored by the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council and the World Bank respectively.

We hope you enjoy the conference and your visit to Belfast.

Conference Organisers
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Conflict in Cities and the Contested State: Everyday Life and the Possibilities for Transformation of Conflict in Belfast, Jerusalem and Other Divided Cities

‘Conflict in Cities and the Contested State’ is a five-year research (2007-2012) project funded by the Economic and Social Research Council of the United Kingdom (ESRC grant number: RES-060-25-0015). It focuses on divided cities as key sites in territorial conflicts over state and national identities, cultures and borders. The research objectives are to analyse how divided cities in Europe and the Middle East have been shaped by ethnic, religious and national conflicts, and, conversely, how such cities can absorb, resist and potentially play a role in transforming the territorial conflicts, which pervade and surround them. The project seeks to understand divided cities as arenas of intensified ethno-national conflicts, particularly with respect to the role that architecture and the urban fabric play as a setting and background for everyday activities and events. Phenomena related to creating, maintaining, crossing, transcending, and possibly ignoring ethnic and territorial borders, both physical and symbolic, are central to the study. The main research sites are Belfast and Jerusalem, two very distinctive cities - one firmly embedded in the West and one central to the Middle East and both at different stages of national conflict and peace building.

A team of researchers from three UK universities, Cambridge, Exeter and Queen’s Belfast, are leading this multi-disciplinary initiative that includes: architecture, urban studies, politics, geography and sociology. Teams of researchers are carrying out work in situ in Belfast and Jerusalem. Nine PhD students are attached to the programme and, in conjunction with an international network of academics and practitioners, are working on the divided cities of Beirut, Belfast, Berlin, Brussels, Mostar, Nicosia, Ramallah, Tripoli (Lebanon) and Kirkuk.

Within this overall project framework a contextual and comparative approach is being developed to explore wider issues of urban conflict and possibilities for resolution. The research on Belfast and Jerusalem is organised in a series of relatively self-contained modules, which allow a degree of flexibility for using different disciplinary approaches and methodologies as appropriate to each city and topic area. However, the modules share the same project objectives and themes and those in one city have a number of closely related counterparts in the other.
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Conference Outline

Thursday 19 May

8.45 am  Registration

Conflict in Cities Exhibition: ‘Capturing Urban Conflicts’
(Open During Conference Hours)

Poster Sessions

9.30 – 11.00  Parallel Sessions
Session A:  Governing Urban Public Space
Session B:  Commemoration, Celebration and Contestation in the City
Session C:  Visualising Divided Cities
Session D:  Violence, Managing and Governing Divisions

11.00 – 11.30  Coffee/Tea Break

11.30 – 1.00  Parallel Sessions
Session A:  Religion and Sacred Space in the City
Session B:  Dealing with Legacies of Conflict and Building Relationships
Session C:  History, Conflict and Change in the City
Session D:  Remembering, Reimaging, Reclaiming

1.00 – 2.00  Lunch

2.00 – 3.30  Parallel Sessions
Session A:  Contested Cities and Contested States
Session B:  Urban Conflicts – Challenges and Management
Session C:  Remembering and Representing the Past
Session D:  Territorialism and Segregation

3.30 – 4.00  Coffee/Tea Break

4.00 – 5.30  Policy Panel: Policies and Progress on Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland Cities
Sponsored and organised by Northern Ireland Community Relations Council (CRC)

6.00  Introduction to the Conflict in Cities Project

8.00  Conference Dinner
Friday 20 May

9.00 – 5.00  **Conflict in Cities Exhibition: ‘Capturing Urban Conflicts’**
(Open During Conference Hours)

9.00 – 10.30  **Parallel Sessions**
Session A: Historical Transitions and Reshaping Urban Space
Session B: Culture and Identity
Session C: Civil Society and International Agencies in Urban Conflicts
Session D: Designing, Mapping and Reimaging the Conflict City

10.30 – 11.00  **Coffee/Tea Break**

11.00 – 12.30  **Parallel Sessions**
Session A: Governing Divided Cities
Session B: Borders and Walls – Between the City and the State
Session C: Segregation and Socio-Economic Divisions
Session D: Art, Public Space and the Right to the City

12.30 – 1.30  **Lunch**

1.30 – 3.00  **Parallel Sessions**
Session A: Nation State and City
Session B: Using Public Space – Battles over Sharing
Session C: Urban Conflicts on Film
Session D: Conflict Management and Transformation

3.00 – 3.15  **Coffee/Tea Break**

3.15 – 6.15  **Bus Tour of Belfast organised by ex-combatants**

6.00 – 6.30  **Tour of City Hall, Belfast**

6.30 – 7.30  **Reception Belfast City Hall. Welcome by the Lord Mayor of Belfast**
Saturday 21 May

9.00 – 4.00  Conflict in Cities Exhibition: ‘Capturing Urban Conflicts’
            (Open During Conference Hours)

9.00 – 10.30  Parallel Sessions
Session A:  Cities, Citizenship and Resistance
Session B:  From Desegregation to Sharing
Session C:  Spaces of Inclusion and Exclusion
Session D:  Cities and Borders in Conflict

10.30 – 11.00  Coffee/Tea Break

11.00 – 12.30  Parallel Sessions
Session A:  Teenagers in the Divided City
Session B:  Cities Between the ‘Civic’ and the ‘Uncivil’
Session C:  Conflicts in Cities Visualised
Session D:  Urban Planning and Peace-Building

12.30 – 1.30  Lunch

1.30 – 3.00  Policy Panel sponsored by World Bank Development
            Report – Cities, Conflict and Development

3.00 – 4.00  Concluding Session
Full Conference Programme

Note: Parallel Sessions will each include 3 paper presentations of 20 minutes duration plus 30 minutes for discussion.

Venues:
- 6 College Park (6CP), Sociology
- David Bates Building
- Peter Froggatt Centre
- 2 College Park (2CP), Sociology

Exhibition: Conflict in Cities Exhibition: Capturing Urban Conflicts (Open during Conference Hours), Room G07, 6CP

Poster Sessions, Reception, 6CP:

- Montserrat Fargas, School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Queen’s University Belfast
- Belfast Children Drawing Their Own
- Conclusions: A City’s Past and Present

- Shawn M. Reming Jr., Institute of Irish Studies, School of History and Anthropology, Queen’s University of Belfast
- Sharing the Past in a Divided City: Can the Ulster Museum Function as Shared Space?

- Stephanie Smith, School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Queen’s University Belfast
- The Relevance of Key Players in Belfast’s Contact Programmes

Thursday, 19 May

8.45 am

Registration, Room G07, 6CP

Conflict in Cities Exhibition: ‘Capturing Urban Conflicts’, Room G07, 6CP (Open During Conference Hours)

Poster Sessions, Lobby, 6CP
### 9.30 – 11.00

#### Parallel Sessions

**Session A: Governing Urban Public Space**  
Chair: Karl O’Connor, Exeter University, Room 1.37, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Salhany</td>
<td>The Government of Parades in Northern Ireland: From Policing ‘Public Order’ to Governing ‘Community Relations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine Dennis</td>
<td>Work in Progress? Belfast - Local Government Discourse and the Transition from Divided to Shared City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary-Kathryn L. Rallings</td>
<td>Negotiating ‘Shared’ Space in Belfast: Parades, Perceptions and Public Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session B: Commemoration, Celebration and Contestation in the City**  
Chair: Madeleine Leonard, Queen’s University, Room OG.005, David Bates Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kris Brown</td>
<td>The Battles of St. Matthew’s 1970 – 2010: Ritual, Narrative and Territory in the Divided City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thérèse Cullen</td>
<td>The Pub and the Pulpit: Contesting St. Patrick’s Day in Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mick Dumper</td>
<td>Ideology and Religion in a Divided City: Zionism, Christianity and the Politics of Exclusivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.00 – 11.30  
**Coffee/Tea Break**

**Session C: Visualising Divided Cities**  
Chair: Giulia Carabelli, Queen’s University, Room 1.35, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siún Carden</td>
<td>From Segregated Neighbourhood to Cultural Quarter: Re-imagining the Falls Road, Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristina Carnevali</td>
<td>Derry/Londonderry and the Memoriscapes of the City: Past in Conflict with the Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bree Hocking</td>
<td>Art on the Frontlines: Civic Identity, Shared Space and the Re-imagined Battle Zone in ‘Post-Conflict’ Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session D: Violence, Managing and Governing Divisions**  
Chair: Katy Hayward, Queen’s University Belfast, Room G26, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shaul Cohen</td>
<td>The Geography and Choreography of Ritualized Urban Violence in Jerusalem and Derry/Londonderry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Byrne</td>
<td>Belfast’s Peacewalls: Actors and Agendas within the Emerging Policy Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goran Janev</td>
<td>‘Skopje 2014’ and Macedonia’s Ethnocracy or How to Divide a City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session A: Religion and Sacred Space in the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 1.00</td>
<td>Matthew Wood: Conflict Obscured: Public Religion in the Global City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.00 – 2.00 Lunch
2.00 – 3.30  Parallel Sessions

**Session A: Contested Cities and Contested States**  
Chair: Wendy Pullan, University of Cambridge  
Room G26, 6CP

- **Niall Ó Dochartaigh**: Cities Inside-Out: The Externalization of Cities in Conflict
- **Menachem Klein**: The Shift in Jerusalem from Border Discourse to Ethnic Conflict

**Session B: Urban Conflicts – Challenges and Management**  
Chair: Michelle Butler, Queen’s University Belfast, Room 1.37, 6CP

- **Ruth McAlister**: Transitional Challenges for Loyalist Paramilitaries in ‘Post’ Conflict Belfast
- **Katy Hayward and Milena Komarova**: Conflict Management in Belfast: Between Reform and Performance
- **Niamh Hourigan**: Feuds as Urban Conflicts: A Sociological Investigation of Inter-Family Feuding in Limerick City

3.30 – 4.00  Coffee/Tea Break

**Session C: Remembering and Representing the Past**  
Chair: Katy Radford, Institute for Conflict Research, Belfast, Room 1.35, 6CP

- **Sara McDowell**: ‘The Battle for Jerusalem’: Political Archaeology and Memory in the City of David
- **David Kendall, Abbas Nokhasteh and Moustafa Traore**: Paris 19: Mobility, Memory and Migration
- **Nadia Capuzzo Derkovic**: War Destructions and Public Memories. How Cultural and Artistic Forms Deal with the Past in Bosnia-Herzegovina

**Session D: Territorialism and Segregation**  
Chair: Brendan Murtagh, Queen’s University Belfast, Room OG.005, David Bates Building

- **Bediz Yilmaz**: Spatial Segregation in a Turkish Mediterranean City
- **Rudi Janssens**: Language, Political Conflicts and the Principle of Territorialism in Brussels
4.00 – 5.30  **Policy Panel Discussion:** Policies and Progress on Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland Cities. Sponsored and organised by Northern Ireland Community Relations Council (CRC). Room OG.007 Peter Froggatt Centre

Introduced by James Anderson, Queen’s University Belfast

**Panel Participants:**
Chair: Tony McCusker, CRC.
Michael Culbert, Director, Coiste na n-larchimi
Billy Hutchinson, Community Worker, Mount Vernon
Roisin McDonough, Chief Executive Arts Council of Northern Ireland
Mary McKee, Strategic Investment Board, Northern Ireland
Peter McNaney, Chief Executive Belfast City Council
Duncan Morrow, Chief Executive Northern Ireland Community Relations Council

6.00  **Conference Welcome:** Prof. Peter Gregson, Vice Chancellor Queen’s University Belfast, Room OG.007, Peter Froggatt Centre

6.10  **Wendy Pullan**, *The Conflict in Cities and Contested State Project – An Introduction*

6.15  **Keynote Address:** Professor Saskia Sassen, Columbia University: Urban Space: Enabling the Powerless, Room Introduced by Liam O’Dowd, Queen’s University Belfast

8.00  **Conference Dinner**, Wellington Park Hotel, Malone Road Belfast

9.00 – 5.00  **Conflict in Cities Exhibition:** ‘Capturing Urban Conflicts’
9.00 –10.30

**Parallel Sessions**

**Session A: Historical Transitions and Reshaping Urban Space**
Chair: Wendy Pullan, University of Cambridge, Room G26, 6CP

- Haim Yacobi: Symbolic De-colonization or Survival Mechanism: Re-visiting a Colonial Neighbourhood in East Jerusalem
- Dena Qaddumi: Challenging Dominant Narratives: Revealing the Core of the Conflict through Tel Aviv – Jaffa
- Obadiah Samuel: Contested Cities in Northern Nigeria: A Reflection on the City of Jos

**Session B: Culture and Identity**
Chair: Linda Rootamm, Queen’s University Belfast, Room 1.37, 6CP

- Hanna Baumann: Post-Communist Iconoclasms: Repression and Identity in the Urban Landscape of East Berlin
- Merita Zekovic: Cultural Mapping: Belfast and Sarajevo
- Neil Galway: Who Controls the Past? An Investigation into the Role of Heritage Interventions in Post-conflict Nation Narration in Former Yugoslavia

10.30 – 11.00  **Coffee/Tea Break**

**Session C: Civil Society and International Agencies in Urban Conflicts**
Chair: Mick Dumper, Exeter University, Room 1.35, 6CP

- Nadezhda Stoyanova: EU’s Conflict Management Capability: Reflection on Belfast, Skopje and Nicosia
- Sean Brennan: Conflict Management and Conflict Transformation in Cities and Peace-building by International Agencies and Civil Society Organisations
- Jessica Anderson: The Relevance of International Peacebuilding to Mobility and Displacement: Responses to Xenophobic Violence in South Africa

**Session D: Designing, Mapping and Reimaging the Conflict City**
Chair: Konstantin Kastrissianakis, University of Cambridge, Room OG.005, David Bates Building

- Alona Martinez-Perez, Gabriella Esposito De Vita and Claudia Trillo: ‘Architecture of Dialogue’ for the Belfast Interfaces
- Senada Demirović Habibija: ‘Natural’ or ‘Shared’ Spaces in the City
- Mark Hackett, Declan Hill and Ken Sterrett: Mapping and Repairing the Broken City: Belfast’s Disjointed and Fragmented Urban Structure
### 11.00 – 12.30  **Parallel Sessions**

#### Session A: Governing Divided Cities
Chair: Frank Gaffikin, Queen’s University Belfast, Room G26, 6CP

- **Scott Bollens**  
  Urban Governance in Divided Countries: Six Case Studies

- **Jonathan Rokem**  
  Re-visiting the Divided Cities Discourse – Comparative Study of Urban Division in Stockholm, Berlin and Jerusalem

- **Olivier Legrand**  
  Urban Sovereignty in Highly Contested Space – Learning from Nicosia and Jerusalem

#### Session B: Borders and Walls – Between the City and the State
Chair: Dominic Bryan, Queen’s University Belfast, Room 1.37, 6CP

- **Wasfi Kailani**  
  Boundary Dynamics of the Jerusalem Walls and Checkpoints: Between the Holy and the Mundane

- **Britt Baillie**  
  Staking Claim: Monuments and the Making (and Breaking?) of a Border Matrix in Vukovar

- **Roz Goldie**  
  Ethno-National Borders and Walls – The Signature Sites of Belfast?

#### Session C: Segregation and Socio-Economic Divisions
Chair: Ian Shuttleworth, Queen’s University Belfast, Room OG.005, David Bates Building

- **Johan Andersson and Gill Valentine**  
  Urban Conflict in an Era of Public Spending Cuts: Reflections on Intergroup Relations in the North of England

- **Neli Demireva and Anthony Heath**  
  Segregation and Stereotypes in the Context of the British Neighbourhood

- **Samer Bagaean and Ola Uduku**  
  Urban Gating as the Inevitable Outcome of Urban Conflict

#### Session D: Art, Public Space and the Right to the City
Chair: Max Gwiazda, University of Cambridge, Room 1.35, 6CP

- **Idit Nathan**  
  Seam and Separation Lines and Structures – On Artworks’ ‘Profanation’ of the Divide in Jerusalem

- **Giulia Carabelli and Mela Žuljević**  
  (Re)collecting Mostar: Mapping Public Space to Generate Memory Collections

- **Zoran Poposki**  
  The Right to the City: Reclaiming Public Spaces by Art and Activism

---

**Full Conference Programme**
### Parallel Sessions

#### Session A: Nation State and City
Chair: James Anderson, Queen’s University Belfast, Room G26, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fred Boal</td>
<td>Framing Belfast: From Colonialism to Ethnonationalism and Beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morris</td>
<td>Structures and Cultures in the History of Stability and Conflict: Belfast and Montreal, 1800 – 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siniša Malešević</td>
<td>Nation-States without Cities: Nationalism, War and State Formation in the 19th Century Balkans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Session B: Using Public Space – Battles over Sharing
Chair: Yair Wallach, University of Cambridge, Room 1.37, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Makas</td>
<td>Mostar’s Central Zone: Battles over Shared Space in a Divided City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Cunningham</td>
<td>Regulating Public Space - The Legality of Sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Smyth and Martina McKnight</td>
<td>Normative Conflict and Creative Action: Juggling Cultural and Political Identities in Belfast’s Inner City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Session C: Urban Conflicts on Film
Chair: Tom Wilson, Binghamton University, Room OG.005, David Bates Building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elayne McCabe</td>
<td>Kasheer – A documentary on art, identity and violence in Kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declan Keeney</td>
<td>We Are Not Afraid - A documentary journey in response to the Belfast – Sarajevo Initiative, Queen’s University Belfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Session D: Conflict Management and Transformation
Chair: Mick Dumper, Exeter University, Room 1.35, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rami Nasrallah</td>
<td>East Jerusalem: From a Metropolitan Centre to a Shrinking City, Is it a Reversible Process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roland Gjoni</td>
<td>Mitrovica: The Future of a Divided City in a Contested State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rassem Khamaisi</td>
<td>Barriers to Achieving the Right to Plan and Socio-Cultural Urban Conflict in Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3.00 – 3.15  **Coffee/Tea Break**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.15 – 6.15</td>
<td>Bus Tour of Belfast Organised by Ex-Combatants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 – 6.30</td>
<td>Tour of the City Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.30 – 7.30</td>
<td>Reception: Belfast City Hall. Welcome by the Lord Mayor of Belfast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 4.00</td>
<td>Conflict in Cities Exhibition: ‘Capturing Urban Conflicts’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Parallel Sessions

**Session A: Cities, Citizenship and Resistance**  
Chair: Allan Cochrane, Open University, Room 1.37, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Craig Larkin</td>
<td>Resistance, Resilience or Resignation? Palestinian Jerusalemite Responses to the Separation Barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martijn Duineveld and Kristof van Assche</td>
<td>The Life and Death of Citizenship and Resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael O’Broin</td>
<td>Citizenship after conflict, citizenship after politics: shared space and technologies of citizenship in contemporary Belfast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session B: From Desegregation to Sharing**  
Chair: Milena Komarova, Queen’s University Belfast, Room 1.35, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Murtagh and Elaine Bennett</td>
<td>Desegregation and Post-Conflict Urban Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Hamber</td>
<td>Divided in Theory, Divided in Practice: The Challenge of Defining Shared Space in Northern Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yair Wallach</td>
<td>‘Shared Space’ in Divided Cities – Does it Exist? What Does it Mean?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session C: Spaces of Inclusion and Exclusion**  
Chair: Monika Halkort, Queen’s University Belfast, Meeting Room, 2CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federica Gatta</td>
<td>De-scripture of Liminal Spaces in Nicosia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giorgio Talocci</td>
<td>A Semiotics of Urban Voids and Their Resistance. The Case of Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasser Yassin</td>
<td>‘Banal’ vs. ‘Exclusionary’ Spaces: How Young Beirutis Perceive and Use the Spaces of their ‘Contested’ City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Session D: Cities and Borders in Conflict**  
Chair: Tom Wilson, Binghamton University, Room G26, 6CP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Büscher</td>
<td>Dynamics of Conflict, Contestation and Belonging in the Congolese-Rwandan Urban Borderland. The Case of the City of Goma (D.R. Congo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimberley Collins</td>
<td>Life in the U.S.–Mexican Border Region: Residents’ Perceptions of the Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liam O’Dowd</td>
<td>Cities, Frontiers and Contested States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.30 – 11.00  **Coffee/Tea Break**
Parallel Sessions

11.00 – 12.30

Session A: Teenagers in the Divided City
Chair: Craig Larkin, Exeter University, Room 1.35, 6CP

Paula Devine and Dirk Schubotz
Here and There: Experiences and Attitudes to Segregation Among Urban Teenagers in Northern Ireland

Andrew Percy
Teenagers' Exposure to Community Violence in Post-Conflict Northern Ireland

Madeleine Leonard and Martina McKnight
Permanent or Temporary Barriers? Young People’s Perceptions of Peace Walls in Belfast

Session B: Cities Between the ‘Civic’ and the ‘Uncivil’
Chair: Katy Hayward, Queen’s University Belfast, Meeting Room, 2CP

Mary Corcoran
Rurs in Urbs: Investigating the Civic and Social Potential of Urban Agricultural Initiatives

Sonia Paone and Agostino Petrillo
Frontlines in the City: Via Padova in Milan Between Militarisation and Ghettoisation of Migrants

Tommaso Vitale

Session C: Conflicts in Cities Visualised
Chair: Britt Baillie, University of Cambridge, Room 1.37, 6CP

Naomi Chi
Visualising Borders: Museum Exhibition at the Hokkaido University

Lefkos Kyriacou and Maximilian Gwiazda
Visualising Policy? The Case of Divided Jerusalem

Luke Kelleher
Visualising the Conflict: Immersion in the Landscape of Victims and Commemoration in Northern Ireland

Session D: Urban Planning and Peace-Building
Chair: James Anderson, Queen’s University Belfast, Room G26, 6CP

Frank Gaffikin, Ken Sterrett and David Perry
Re-thinking Space and Identity for Planning within Contested Cities

Ian Shuttleworth and James Anderson
Demographic Change Through Conflict: Belfast from the 1960s to the Present

Michael Safier
Causes, Objectives and Interventions in Urban Conflict; The Cosmopolitan Contribution to Urban Peace-Building

12.30 – 1.30

Lunch
1.30 – 3.00

**Policy Panel Discussion:** *Cities, Conflict and Development*, sponsored by World Bank Development Report, Room G26, 6CP

Introduced by Mick Dumper, Exeter University

**Panel Participants:**
Chair: Nigel Roberts, World Bank
Chris Cramer, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
Sean Fox, London School of Economics
Avila Kilmurray, Community Foundation for Northern Ireland
Alexandre Marc, World Bank
Jim Roddy, City Centre Initiative, Derry

3.00 – 4.00

**Concluding Session,**
Room G26, 6CP
Chair: Liam O’Dowd, Queen’s University Belfast
Wendy Pullan, University of Cambridge
James Anderson, Queen’s University Belfast
Mick Dumper, Exeter University
Keynote Address: Saskia Sassen, Robert S. Lynd Professor of Sociology and Co-chair Committee on Global Thought, Columbia University

Urban Space: Enabling the Powerless

Saskia Sassen’s research and writing focuses on globalization (including social, economic and political dimensions), immigration, global cities (including cities and terrorism), the new networked technologies and changes within the liberal state that result from current transnational conditions. In her research she has focused on the unexpected and the counterintuitive as a way to cut through established “truths.”

Her three major books have each sought to demolish a key established “truth.” Thus in her first book, The Mobility of Labor and Capital (Cambridge University Press 1988), she showed how foreign investment in less developed countries can actually raise the likelihood of emigration; this went against established notions that such investment would retain potential emigrants. In her second book The Global City (Princeton University Press 1991; 2nd ed. 2002) she showed how the global economy, far from being placeless, has and needs very specific territorial insertions, and that this need is sharpest in the case of highly globalized and electronic sectors such as finance; again this went against established notions at the time that the global economy transcended territory and its associated regulatory umbrellas. In her most recent book, Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages (Princeton University Press 2006), she shows that the foundational transformations afoot today take place largely inside core and thick national environments; this allows her to explain that some of the changes inside liberal states, most evident in the USA but also increasingly in other countries, are not distortions or anomalies but are the result of these foundational transformations inside the state apparatus. She shows, therefore, how this foundational transformation consists not only of globalizing dynamics but also of denationalizing dynamics: we are seeing the formation of multiple often highly specialised assemblages of bits of territory, authority and rights that were once ensconced in national framings. Today these assemblages traverse global and national settings, thereby denationalizing what was historically constructed as national.

In 2007 she published A Sociology of Globalization (Norton), and has just completed a five-year project for UNESCO on sustainable human settlement for which she set up a network of researchers and activists in over 30 countries; it is published as one of the volumes of the Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (Oxford, UK: EOLSS Publishers) [http://www.eolss.net ]. She edited Deciphering the Global: Its Spaces, Scales, and Subjects (Routledge 2006) a collection of her doctoral students’ work. She co-edited Digital Formations: New Architectures for Global Order (Princeton University Press 2005), based on a multi-year project sponsored by the SSRC through its Information Technology and International Cooperation Committee which she chaired. Among other projects, she was involved with the 2006 Venice Biennale of Architecture which for the first time in its history focused on cities, and she wrote a lead essay for the Catalogue. There are new fully updated editions of two of her older books, Cities in a World Economy (3rd. ed. Sage/Pine Forge 2006), and The Global City (2nd.ed. Princeton University Press 2001). Her books are translated into sixteen languages. She serves on several editorial boards and is an advisor to several international bodies. She is a Member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and a member of the National Academy of Sciences Panel on Cities. She has received a variety of awards and prizes, most recently, a Doctor honoris causa from Delft University (Netherlands), the first Distinguished Graduate School Alumnus Award of the University of Notre Dame and was one of the four winners of the first University of Chicago Future Mentor Award covering all doctoral programs. She has written for The Guardian, The New York Times, Le Monde Diplomatique, the International Herald Tribune, Newsweek International, Vanguardia, Clarin, the Financial Times, among others.

Saskia Sassen is also a Centennial Visiting Professor at the London School of Economics.
Policy Panels and Bus Tour

One of the major objectives of the ‘Conflict in Cities and the Contested State’ project has been to engage with a variety of policy makers and practitioners at local, national and international levels. These include state officials, think-tanks, politicians, civil society organisations, community activists and international NGOs. Reflecting this approach the conference incorporates two Policy Panels.

Policy Panel (1): Northern Ireland Community Relations Council

Thursday 19 May
Theme: Policies and Progress in Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland Cities

On Day 1 of the Conference, the first plenary session will be a Policy Panel organised and sponsored by the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council (CRC) www.community-relations.org.uk. The CRC is an independent company and registered charity set up in 1990 to promote better community relations between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland and equally to promote recognition of cultural diversity.

Contributors to the CRC panel will include:

Tony McCusker, Panel chair and Chair of Northern Ireland Community Relations Council

Michael Culbert, Director, Coiste na n-Iarchimí (the network for Republican ex-prisoners)

Billy Hutchinson, Community Worker, Mount Vernon, North Belfast and formerly Progressive Unionist Party representative in Belfast City Council and Northern Ireland Assembly

Roisin McDonough, Chief Executive, Arts Council of Northern Ireland

Mary McKee, Strategic Investment Board, Northern Ireland and Director of Social Regeneration on the Maze Long Kesh Programme Delivery Unit

Peter McNaney, Chief Executive of Belfast City Council

Duncan Morrow, Chief Executive of Northern Ireland Community Relations Council
Policy Panel (2) sponsored by the World Bank

Saturday 21 May
Theme: Cities, Conflict and Development

On Day 3 of the Conference the Second Policy Panel is sponsored by the World Bank, more specifically, the World Development Report 2011 on Conflict, Security and Development. Drawing upon a wide-ranging group of participants familiar with urban violence all over the world, the discussion will focus on the relationship between conflict, cities and development.

Contributors to the World Bank Policy Panel will include:

Nigel Roberts (Chair) is co-director of the World Development Report 2011, Conflict and Development. He has worked in international development for most of the last 40 years, spending much of this time in the field. Between 1968 and 1978 he worked for various development NGOs, in particular VSO (in Thailand), the Britain-Nepal Medical Trust and Save the Children Fund (in Nepal), and as a journalist (in Hong Kong). Nigel joined the World Bank in 1981 as an agricultural economist. Before co-directing the WDR team he was for almost 20 years a field-based Bank Country Manager and then Country Director for the Bank (in Nepal, Ethiopia, West Bank and Gaza, Sydney/Pacific).

Chris Cramer is Professor, and Head of the Department, of Development Studies at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. He has extensive experience of researching war and peace in Africa, urban violence, and post-conflict reconstruction. His most recent book is Civil War is Not a Stupid Thing: Accounting for Violence in Developing Countries (Hurst, 2006).

Sean Fox has worked as an adviser on urban poverty and development issues for CARE International, Oxfam GB and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Currently a Research Fellow in International Development at the LSE, Sean is a member of the Cities and Fragile States Group and is co-author with Jo Beall of Cities and Development (Routledge, 2009).

Avila Kilmurray is Director of the Community Foundation for Northern Ireland (previously the Northern Ireland Voluntary Trust). The Foundation is an independent grant making NGO with 5 priority areas: peacebuilding, social inclusion, active citizenship, community infrastructure, and social justice. With offices in Belfast and Derry, the Community Foundation remains focused on Northern Ireland, but it has also been involved in numerous international initiatives, particularly in areas emerging from conflict. Avila has worked in voluntary and community sector in Northern Ireland since 1975.

Alexandre Marc is the Lead Specialist at the World Bank on Conflict, Crime and Violence in the Social Development Department. He has worked on Africa, the Middle East, Europe and Central Asia. Alexandre has published extensively on the design of social programmes and poverty issues. Most recently, he co-led the World Bank team that produced Violence in the City: Understanding and Supporting Community Responses to Urban Violence (2010).

Jim Roddy is currently Chief Executive of the City Centre Initiative in Derry, a limited company supported by the public and private sector. It initiates, designs and manages projects designed to promote the commercial vitality and viability of the city centre. Jim is also a board member of the Holywell Consultancy, a social economy company aimed at supporting and developing communities in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland.
Conference Bus Tour

The Conference programme also includes a bus tour of Belfast localities most affected by the conflict. The tour is jointly managed by Republican and Loyalist ex-combatants and will give conference participants a street-level view of the legacies of the ‘Northern Ireland Troubles’ in the areas where they had greatest impact.
Conflict in Cities and the Contested State Exhibition: Capturing Urban Conflicts

Venue: Room G07, 6CP
Hours: Conference Hours

Visual and material aspects of cities are often overlooked in verbally and textually oriented research. This exhibition captures some of these qualities in a series of maps and photographs of cities in Europe and the Middle East that are being studied by ‘Conflict in Cities and the Contested State’.

Working in a comparative manner, maps of contested cities have been drafted at the same scale and using similar graphic treatment. In doing so, our aim is to reveal borders and divisions, flash points and places of interaction, patterns of conflict and areas of confusion. The aim is not so much to draw a definitive version of the conflicts, but to portray ambiguities and movement, the state of flux and obscurity that is characteristic of many of these topographies. The maps are being developed in the Department of Architecture at the University of Cambridge and are the result of collaborative work with students and researchers at Cambridge, Queen’s University Belfast and Exeter University.

Along with the maps, photo-essays have been composed by project investigators, researchers and students that draw on the photographic archive of Conflict in Cities. The collection contains thousands of photographs taken by members of the project since 2003. Each photo-essay tells a story about everyday life and conflict that has been discovered through research on the cities in the course of the project.

This visual research is ongoing and comments and suggestions will be appreciated. After the conference, the photo-essays and maps will be launched on the project website: www.conflictincities.org.

Conflict in Cities, School of Geography, Archaeology and Palaeoecology, Queen’s University Belfast

**Historical Change and Difference in State/City Relations: Contextualising ‘Divided Cities’ in ‘Contested States’**

A project on ‘Conflict in cities and the contested state... Belfast, Jerusalem and other divided cities’ raises a variety of questions about state/city relations. How did historical change in these relations help create ‘ethno-nationally divided cities in the first place, as traditional empires gave way to national states? How did the entities constituting the relationship change - different types of states and systems of states on the one hand, cities of different types on the other? How have the changes in state-city relations varied in different parts of the world - such as Western Europe and the Middle East - and how in particular might the relations differ for ‘divided cities’ compared to cities in general? To develop a framework for addressing these questions - rather than promising immediate answers - this paper periodises state/city relations since the era of the city-state, and outlines the general historical role of cities in shaping the form of state and nation. It discusses the transformation of state/city relations by two broad, roughly simultaneous and linked transitions: to national states with the spread of nationalism as a dominant political ideology following the French Revolution; and to industrial capitalism following the Industrial Revolution in late 18th and early 19th century Britain. Here the more obvious changes included the general shift in political identities from smaller territorial entities including cities up to the national state level; the increased ideological and material capacities of states; the growth of industrial cities and general urbanisation. But there were also less obvious effects bearing directly on state/city relations, including a partial separation of economic and political forms of power and an increase in the relative importance of the former. For systems of states this facilitated a seemingly contradictory combination of economic globalisation and political sovereignty, with ‘informal’ empires now replacing traditional ones as a key context of ‘divided cities’. The partial separation of ‘economics’ and ‘politics’ also brought an institutional ‘division of labour’ reflected in city and state respectively (with a tendency for each to be studied in not-so-splendid isolation), and it amounted to a partial depoliticisation of cities securely embedded in national states. However, ‘divided cities’ in ‘contested states’ have partly bucked this trend, in many respects remaining highly politicised. Furthermore, the two transitions have been less ‘complete’ in the Middle East than in Western Europe. They may even have been partly reversed, arguably to the extent of constituting qualitatively different state/city relations.
Peacebuilding actors in South Africa are often international organizations, or supported by international funding and trained in the use of international toolkits, methods, and approaches to peacebuilding. Domestic actors apply these approaches to issues such as anti-xenophobia interventions even though the toolkits are not ideally relevant to the realities of displacement in South Africa: they are not designed with urban spaces in mind. More narrowly, significant obstacles to the utilization of these toolkits, methods, and approaches pertain to mobility: Displaced men and women are often highly mobile and difficult to access with a limited sense of “community” or desire to participate in mainstream livelihood opportunities and daily life.

This paper will first address how the domestic landscape recasts the peacebuilding toolkit in its practical encounters with South Africa’s civil society. This understanding of South African civil society is based on six months of fieldwork with a range of domestic, governmental and international agencies conducting peacebuilding activities in Gauteng province, South Africa, in partnership with an Oxfam/European Commission study on social cohesion. This field work includes interviews conducted with peacebuilding organizations, as well as focus group discussions, mapping exercises and community leadership interviews in six case study location in Gauteng province.

In light of South Africa’s recent experiences with xenophobic violence, and the subsequent civil society response of peacebuilding interventions, it represents a unique case study to explore how current peacebuilding literature and tools address “localness” and domestic actors. In this vein, the paper will describe how concepts of “localness”, community, and participation and ownership manifest themselves in the South African experience with displacement. Then, South African realities are analyzed and contrasted against the understanding of these concepts in international peacebuilding literature. Finally, the paper describes the “friction” between concepts and reality, and the implications of this friction on anti-xenophobia interventions in South Africa.

Tsing’s concept of “friction” helps to explain how these assumptions relate to the realities of mobility and displacement in South Africa. (“Friction” is a metaphor that can be summarized as the creation of new and inter-subjective realities when international forces and local realities interact. [Tsing 2004]). Tsing’s “friction” construct is helpful for understanding how displacement in South Africa can create new, awkward realities that do not fit into tidy policy or program categories, and how these categories take on different meanings in civil society interventions. This paper concludes by discussing “the possibilities of friction”: Civil society can acknowledge and harness friction to inform more relevant tools and literature that address mobility and experiences with displacement, or not (Tsing 2004, 18). Friction between international concepts and domestic South African realities will persist regardless, but “the effects of encounters across difference can be compromising or empowering” (Tsing 2004, 6). This paper ultimately calls into question the relevance of international approaches to peacebuilding in the South African context and encourages a context-specific discourse that acknowledges the realities of mobility and displacement in civil society responses.
Johan Andersson and Gill Valentine

School of Geography, University of Leeds
Urban Conflict in an Era of Public Spending Cuts: Reflections on Intergroup Relations in the North of England

Much of the urban literature on inter-group conflict has focused on the inner-city neighbourhood as its key analytical scale, often drawing on theories that stress symbolic and material competition for resources and territory. In this paper we illustrate how this emphasis became paradigmatic during the so called ‘urban crisis’ when job losses and a shrinking tax-base in manufacturing cities, resulted in neighbourhood decline and social tensions. In the UK, heavily industrialised areas such as the North of England suffered high unemployment, but gradually, over the last decades, manufacturing job losses have been partly replaced through the diversification of local economies and a growing public sector. However, against the current backdrop of unprecedented public spending cuts and a radical overhaul of housing policy, the paper revisits earlier work on inner-city conflict to speculate on where group tensions may emerge in years to come. With current government proposals advocating a marketization of council rents and cuts in housing benefits, ethnic and socio-economic residential patterns are likely to be transformed in the medium and longer term. We draw specifically from ongoing research in Leeds – a Northern city that experienced economic decline and ‘race riots’ in the 1980s, but which more recently is considered to have undergone an ‘urban renaissance’ – to illuminate the shifting meaning of the ‘inner city’ and to query the extent to which the traditional analytical emphasis on the neighbourhood can adequately capture the complex dynamics of contemporary intergroup relations.

Frederick Boal

School of Geography, Archaeology and Palaeoecology, Queen’s University Belfast
Framing Belfast: From Colonialism to Ethnonationalism and Beyond

This paper has two clearly interrelated parts. The first part discusses the general process of ‘framing’, whereby we attempt to make sense of particular situations. To employ the terminology of the American historian William Cronon, we tell stories. We configure the events of the past into causal sequences – stories – that order and simplify the events to give them new meanings. When we do this, we cannot avoid a covert exercise of power, whereby we sanction some voices while silencing others. Thus all engaged in the study of conflict in cities need to seek to be as transparent as possible about how and why we frame our interpretations the way we do. I suggest that this health warning applies to all the papers being presented at the Urban Conflict conference.

That said, in the second part of the paper I proceed to offer one such framing for Belfast. This is a shifting frame that moves from colonialism through immigration to ethnonationalism. These are not discrete categories, but flow into each other, thereby helping shape what follows. In this framing two underlying themes are ever-present – territorial behaviour and frontier environments.

The paper concludes by offering a reframing that attempts to point the way towards releasing Belfast from the iron grip of ethnonationalism.
Samer Bagaeen and Ola Uduku

School of Environment and Technology, University of Brighton
School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, Edinburgh College of Art

Urban Gating as the Inevitable Outcome of Urban Conflict

The gated community has evolved to become a ubiquitous part of urban life. As we scour the literature, we are left in no doubt about the reasons for the privatisation of public space, and the fortification of the urban realm: fear. That said, we also find evidence to suggest that the phenomenon can be linked to historic patterns of enclosure found globally; that gated communities is not a unitary phenomenon; at macro level they tend to reflect increasing social polarisation and segregation, at micro level they tend to be shaped by historical circumstances, local cultural meanings and local planning and political institutions. A key question this paper asks therefore is, are urban conflicts resulting from fear of the other, and consequently, by association, is urban gating inevitable?

The paradigm shift from the familiar notion of self-contained ‘gated community’ to a more generic notion of urban gating was recently outlined by Saskia Sassen (in Bagaeen and Uduku, 2010) who argues that gated communities, as these have been built and conceived of in large urban areas over the last 20 years, are but one of a range of instances of urban gating, one phase in a long history across time and space. This paper explores the diverse nature of urban gating. In traditional Middle Eastern cities, it was laws and local customs that shaped the built environment over the years to take on board desires for safety and security and, sometimes, the need to be different. In the modern Middle East, political conflict appears to be such a driver. In Latin America, class politics, urban growth and conflict have had a defining influence on city formation and, subsequently, the formulation of gated enclaves where, in the main, gates are introduced to make places safer and to address a fear of crime. The paper then reconsiders the privatisation of public space and in the process opens up the question of the inevitability of gated communities at a time when its meaning has become fixed and narrow building on our recent work published by Earthscan (2010). Here, we examine the long history of gated settlements, from walled hamlets to what is thought of as today’s American gated community, UK examples and the new transformations of the gated concept in rapidly urbanising settings in Asia and Latin America.
When communist regimes fell one by one at the end of the Cold War, citizens across Eastern Europe expressed their anger about years of repression by taking revenge on the statues representing their former leaders. Between 1989 and 1993, many cities in the former East Bloc, including Warsaw, Bratislava, Tirana, Riga, Bucharest, Budapest, and Moscow, saw the destruction of monuments representing communist leaders in expressions of general outrage. Remarkably, there were no such instances of iconoclasm from below in the former German Democratic Republic (GDR). Instead, following the reunification of Germany, West German decision makers asserted their new authority over the East of the city by removing communist monuments built during the time of the city’s division from the urban landscape, often amid popular protest by East Berlin citizens’ groups.

I interpret the destruction of public monuments in Berlin following the reunification of Germany in 1990 as constituting an “iconoclasm from above.” The removal of East German structures and alterations of street names deemed to be totalitarian was used by politicians to mark regime change; it was not an articulation of popular outrage at the symbols of the bygone system of oppression. By removing these structures without regarding their altered significance in a new socio-political context, decision makers attempted to repress important aspects of the city’s spatial palimpsest, in which a multitude of historical layers exist at once and old historical strata inadvertently shine through and inform the new. This iconoclastic repression served the purpose of creating a homogenous urban landscape, which would tell a ruptureless historical narrative, conveniently omitting the state that had shaped the lives of East Berliners for the past 40 years. By disenfranchising the large part of Germany’s population that had a personal relationship with these structures, this politically driven iconoclasm caused an antagonistic reaction among Easterners against the official policies and harmed the reunification process. Those in power missed the chance to work through Germany’s problematic past and deal with totalitarian structures in a critical, yet non-repressive manner, as is illustrated by the case studies of removed monuments and buildings I draw upon.

This paper argues that the identity politics in the reunifying German state played a pivotal role in the struggles over removal, demolition, or preservation of socialist monuments in the re-emerging German capital. In turn, the expansive public debates about the future of East German icons shaped the processes of constructing a new identity for reunified Germany. In revisiting the political circumstances and intellectual debates surrounding the destruction of monuments in Berlin during the 1990s, the paper also addresses the more general need to negotiate public space and monuments in contested cities in an inclusive manner. Several alternative models of interrogating and dealing with the obsolete monuments of the GDR are put forward, offering possibilities for utilising urban public space in order to work through the past and build common identity in other post-division cities.
Britt Baillie

Conflict in Cities, Coordinator of the Cambridge Heritage Research Group, Department of Architecture, University of Cambridge

Staking Claim: Monuments and the Making (And Breaking?) of a Border Matrix in Vukovar

This paper will examine the function of cultural heritage in Vukovar, a city where Serbs and Croats live nose to nose, yet separately. Here, the Danube border that divides Croatia from Serbia, is augmented by a range of visible and invisible boundaries carved into the cityscape. Monuments—physical manifestations of power and totems of collective identity—serve as key nodes in this border matrix. Although seemingly taciturn, monuments are not static entities, but are rather constantly in flux—as shifting values and meanings are attached to or detached from them. In Vukovar, cultural heritage acts not as a product, but rather a process through which ethno-national conflicts are played out.

In the ethnically mixed city of Vukovar, the destruction of cultural heritage was used as a means of claiming territory and ridding the city of the unwanted ‘Other’. Simultaneously, this destruction altered the city’s existing cultural heritage, resulting in the advent of a new form of monument: the ruin. This paper will explore the creation of new monuments and the re-imagining of Vukovar’s existing cultural heritage since the three-month siege of the city in 1991. In Vukovar, violence has not been expunged from the landscape, but has rather metamorphosed into monumental form. Here, ‘reconstruction’ was a part of what Adrian Forty calls ‘countericonoclasm … remaking something in order to forget what its absence signified.’ Yet, (partially) rebuilt Vukovar is not a pure facsimile of the pre-war city. The city’s unwanted pasts continue to undergo processes of erasure, incorporation into the dominant narrative, and ‘neutralisation’. This paper will conclude by examining the role of the counter-practices of the minority Serb community some of which further entrench ethnic divisions and others which seek to transgress this reified divide.
Scott Bollens

School of Social Ecology, Department of Planning, Policy and Design, University of California
_Urban Governance in Divided Countries: Six Case Studies_

This paper provides a comparative analysis of different political/institutional approaches to managing multicultural cities in divided societies. It analyzes six urban areas—Brussels, Johannesburg, Belfast, Beirut, Sarajevo, and Jerusalem—where group identity matters substantially and where leaders have been faced with the challenge of accommodating the unique needs of each salient group while seeking to build and protect a citywide public interest. The article identifies cases where ethnically shared governance has worked relatively well in ameliorating overt group conflict and appears to be politically sustainable. It also describes cases where attempts at locally shared governance have had more limited, even negative, outcomes. I distinguish factors facilitative of effective local governance and those that constrain the capacity of locally shared governance.

I study cases of severe group-based urban polarization across a diversity of regional locations—including European, Middle Eastern, and African. I picked for in-depth study the cities of Johannesburg, Belfast, Sarajevo, and Jerusalem because each is a key focal point in a contested national setting; in three of the cases—Johannesburg, Belfast, and Sarajevo—the governance parameters at local levels have also been in active processes of transition after national peace agreements. Research on these four cities comes from the author’s multi-year study of the role of urbanism in contested cities. The two other cases—Brussels and Beirut—were selected due to the robustness of group identity on their political agendas; findings for these two cities are based on secondary published sources rather than primary interview data.

The case studies indicate that power sharing has worked successfully in some cities but not others, that such efforts are frequently fragile, and there is an evolutionary nature to governance reform even in the “best case” examples. Further, the use of metropolitan structures appears beneficial in governing multicultural urban areas in several of the case studies and may be possibly useful in a more general sense. In addition, the capacity of local governance to contribute to inter-group tolerance can be hamstrung by national political settlements. In the end, I argue the true test of locally shared governance may not rest solely in the quality of its institutional design, but in its ability to execute urban policies and strategies that facilitate on-the-ground mutual tolerance and co-existence. Seen in this light, political negotiations that restructure local political power represent a first, but by no means sufficient, step toward the effective management of multicultural cities in divided countries.
The Democratizing Governance in Transition (DGIT) project is an ambitious conflict transformation programme aimed at improving relations between marginalised interface communities, politicians and policymakers in post-ceasefire environments. The project aims to sustain the regeneration of sectarian interface areas by tackling manifestations of poor public service delivery, often fuelled by competition between Nationalists and Unionists for limited resources. With funding provided by the Special European Union Programmes Body (SEUPB), two civil society organisations, INTERCOMM Ireland and Groundwork NI, designed the DGIT project to test three core theories in conflict resolution: Burton’s Theory on Human Needs, Galtung’s Theory of Structural Violence and Lederach’s Theory on Conflict Transformation. DGIT will test these theories to see how conflict management and transformation learning can be practically implemented to sustain post-ceasefire agreements and move to a post-conflict environment.
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Kris Brown
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The Battles of St. Matthew’s 1970-2010: Ritual, Narrative and Territory in the Divided City

Commemorative performance and ritual relating both to political violence and the projection of victimhood are not merely epiphenomenal expressions in the creation of identity in the divided city. These narratives serve to mobilise memory as a political resource within the transitional framework of a peace process, reflecting not only an aspect of the ‘meta conflict’, the conflict about the origins and meaning of the ‘Troubles’, but also a process of recalibrating identities to suit a changed setting. The paper will provide an examination of the projection of victim-hood, heroism and narratives of conflict in post ‘Troubles’ commemoration using the activity of memory entrepreneurs in their commemoration of the ‘Battle of St Matthew’s’ as a case study. This 1970 event was one of a series of gun battles and civil disturbances in the early years of the ‘Troubles’ in Belfast but has assumed an importance as a communal and political touchstone not only for interface communities in east Belfast but also for wider Republicanism and Loyalism. The paper will seek to analyse the rolling together of local urban history, contemporary experience, notions of neighbourhood, and political identity into the projection of communal ‘self’ and depiction of adversarial ‘other’. It will also examine how these processes may be used as a means not simply of battling over history and spotlighting injury and injustice past and present, but also legitimising policy or ideological shifts by local political elites, whilst further bonding the social capital of grass roots activism during a time of considerable change.

The memory of victimhood, martyrdom or heroism may impel further militant commitment; but crucially the use of the memory of communal struggle by protagonists, may not only serve to prolong discord, but instead provide a transformative utility in periods of post conflict transition, one which subtly reshapes political positions. I hope to provide an analysis of the role of the commemoration of political violence as legitimisation both of past extra legal activity, and support for contemporary political transition, and in so doing, describe and conceptualise the form and purposes of commemorative practice in the divided society of Northern Ireland. Difficulties in representing contested histories in the divided city, not only between but within communities, and possibilities of circumventing selective amnesia and rescuing untold stories will also be discussed.

This research is based on field observation of Republican and Loyalist commemorative activity, studies of their rich memorial material culture and documentation, and selected interviews with Republicans and Loyalists engaged in commemorative activity. The paper will be accompanied by power point slides showing the ritual activity and visual culture associated with these forms of memory work.
Dominic Bryan

Institute of Irish Studies, School of History and Anthropology, Queen’s University Belfast

People Don’t Like Flags: The Demarcation of Public Space in Northern Ireland

The Peace Process in Northern Ireland and the 1998 Multi-Party Agreement was an attempt, using a broadly consociational model, to manage the political relationships between the Catholic/Nationalist Protestant/Unionist political communities. However, in a society with significant residential divisions the management of public space has remained highly contentious. Disputes over parades and flags remain common-place and a wide range of policies and legislation have been introduced in an attempt to mitigate the conflict.

The use of flags in Northern Ireland is connected to the legitimate expression of identities but also to the demarcation of territory through fear and intimidation. The economic consequences which arise out of the existence of these divisions, and the consequent inequalities that are sustained through them have made the territorial divisions in Northern Ireland a legitimate focus for government policy.

This paper explores the management of these inter-group relationships through symbols. Using attitudes surveys, mapping and ethnographic fieldwork the research examines the displaying of large numbers of flags and other emblems in public spaces in Northern Ireland. It will present the results of five years work examining whether there have been significant changes in the demarcation of space, particularly with regards urban spaces, and look at the effectiveness of a range of policy measures and legislation. The paper concludes that there has been little change in the these practices since 2006 and that Government policies have been largely ineffectual.

Orna Brennan

School of Politics, International Studies & Philosophy, Queen’s University Belfast

A Critical Theory of Social Capital in Contested Urban Space; the Case of North Belfast

This paper will explore how a critical theory of social capital may be formulated and applied to the contested urban space of North Belfast. It proceeds from the premise that social capital discourses are a fundamental feature of official policy directing ‘peace-building’ practically, and more specifically, ‘conflict transformation’ initiatives, in the area. This paper will develop on existing social capital literature which is mainly conceptualized around areas where no inherent inter-communal conflict exists, and illuminates alternative conceptualisations of social capital, as well as the effects of the utilization of its associated discourses influencing ‘peace-building’ practice. The current and prevailing discourses of social capital official policy influencing ‘peace-building’ in North Belfast are frequently seen to employ Robert Putnam’s definition. Thus, it is necessary to deconstruct these and formulate a more critical analysis of the theory and how they practically impact on the communities at the Interfaces. This culminates in the evocation of what I term ‘a critical theory of social capital’. I discuss the implications of a focus on Putnam’s conceptualization of ‘bonding’ and ‘bridging’ capital and ultimately their impact upon inter-communal and intergroup dynamics in the post-conflict setting. This leads onto a discussion of the impact of these aspects of social capital on the development or inhibition of trust, and how this relates to sectarianism in the context of ‘peace-building’ in the contested space of Interface areas of North Belfast.
Located on the Congolese-Rwandan border in the North Kivu province, the city of Goma, geographically as well as politically, occupies a central position in the ongoing armed conflict between the Congolese army and different armed rebel groups. Although not openly being an interstate conflict, the Rwandan links of the two main rebel movements FDLR (Forces Démocratiques de Libération du Rwanda, Hutu rebel movement originally founded by Rwandan Interhamwe forces after their refuge in the D.R.Congo) and the former CNDP (Congrès National pour la Défense du Peuple, rebel movement originally led by Laurent Nkunda claiming the protection of the Congolese Tutsi population) give this conflict a transborder character, leaving a profound imprint on the relationships between the local ethnic communities. Historically, the city of Goma has always been a political and socio-economic borderland, a site of overlap and exchange, a mingling of Congolese and Rwandans and a mix of different ethnic groups. In contrast to other urban centres in the region, Goma has never been the theatre of violent clashes between the different armed groups. However, dynamics of violent conflict strongly influence the daily urban life in a much more subtle way, through processes of identity and belonging. During moments of intensified armed conflict, one observes a sudden emergence of discourses on autochtnity and citizenship, distinguishing between in and out, identifying insiders from outsiders, Congolese from Rwandans. Increasing anti-Banyarwanda (Literally meaning ‘those coming from Rwanda’) discourse and sentiments are not only translated in verbal and often physical aggression, they are also considerably disturbing daily economic activities that strongly depend on informal transborder trade involving both Congolese and Rwandan traders.

This paper argues that dynamics of military contestation over this strategically located city go along with local dynamics of political and socio-economic contestation over the urban space. This contestation is ethnically translated and evolves around questions of belonging to, emplacement in and rights over the city. Through its analysis, the paper will mainly focus on the period between August 2007 and 2009 when the Tutsi rebel movement CNDP of Laurent Nkunda threatened several times to take control over Goma. Scientific data for this paper stems from several ethnographic fieldwork periods performed in Goma between 2007 and 2010 in the context of a PhD research project on dynamics of violent conflict and urban transformation.
Jonathan Byrne
School of Social Policy, University of Ulster
Belfast’s Peace Walls: Actors and Agendas within the Emerging Policy Discourse

From the onset of the Northern Ireland conflict in 1969 the British government in response to civil disorder, communal and paramilitary violence, pursued a policy of division and spatial segregation through the construction of walls and security barricades. Paradoxically, these infamous physical lines of demarcation came to be referred to as peace walls. These walls have become one of the most iconic emblems of Belfast and of the Troubles. There are currently forty-two peace walls dominating the geographical landscape of working class communities in Belfast. Under political devolution and the subsequent establishment of the Ministry for Policing and Justice, Northern Ireland politicians for the very first time have found themselves with the policy responsibility for the peace walls.

Recently a new discourse has emerged surrounding the legacy of the walls and what they represent within a city which is regenerating, transforming and aspiring to be seen as a 'shared city'. The primary goal of this paper is to explore the relationships between the key stakeholders in this discourse and draw out the numerous different agendas that exist which are influencing the policy decisions that surround the future of the peace walls. How the issue of peace walls is defined within a government and non-government context will also be considered along with the different policy options and alternatives that are available.

Nadia Capuzzo Derkovic
Department of Sociology, University of Geneva
War Destructions and Public Memories. How Cultural and Artistic Forms Deal with the Past in Bosnia-Herzegovina

In recent history, we have witnessed the dramatic destruction of monuments and cultural heritage around the world. In armed conflict, historical and cultural heritage become a privileged target due to its identity value. To attack in a deliberate way a cultural symbol is to attack directly the identity and sense of belonging of a population. The uses and misuses of the past reveal the tensions within the system of spatial and temporal markers of identity. The aim of this paper will be to discuss how cultural heritage and artistic and cultural forms can either contribute to the establishment of a shared public memory, or strengthen the feeling of belonging to a particular group. Since the end of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the siege of Sarajevo, dealing with the past can be defined as anarchic. On the state level, no consensus has been found around collective mnemonic narratives. This issue is essentially dealt with on the municipal level. In cities and villages many monuments have been erected to commemorate human losses during the war. In most cases, these memorials tend to crystallize divisions among communities in the public space. The paper will emphasize the essential role cultural heritage and artistic and cultural forms play in dealing with past issues and reconciliation process. The role of public memories in constructing national identities will also be discussed through examples of artistic forms performing memory of the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the siege of Sarajevo.
Jim Campbell

School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Queen’s University Belfast

An Evaluation of a Teaching Programme to Enable Social Work Students to Deal with the Needs of Victims and Survivors of the Conflict in Northern Ireland

Social workers and their agencies have faced many challenges during the 40 years of the Northern Irish conflict. The use of silence and denial and a retreat to technocratic interventions have typified the social work response to effects of political conflict (Smyth and Campbell, 1986; Pinkerton and Campbell, 1992; Campbell and McCrystal, 2005).

The paper summarises the findings of an evaluation of a European Union funded project carried out in the School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Queens University Belfast over three years, and in partnership with a large NGO (WAVE). The project was informed and stimulated by the reforms in social work education that occurred in Northern Ireland in the past few years. This has encouraged social work educators to develop curricula that more openly recognise how Northern Ireland’s history of conflict has impacted on the lives of individuals, groups and communities. This in turn has presented opportunities for innovative methods of engagement in the broader context of service user involvement in social work education.

Of particular note in the context of the paper was the involvement of victims and survivors of the conflict in the planning, delivery and evaluation of this project. Part 1 presents the findings from surveys of four cohorts of BSW students (n=c200) across a four year period (2006-10). These include both groups of two year relevant graduate and post-A level three year students. Part 2 presents the findings from semi-structured interviews with university staff and service users, who provided the training programme. Part 3 of the paper concludes with a presentation of findings from a survey of practice teachers (n=30) who provide supervision for some of these students during their learning opportunities.

A number of themes emerge from the evaluation including: an unexpected enthusiasm amongst the student cohorts for more proactive approaches to dealing with the needs of victims and survivors of the conflict in Northern Ireland; some concerns by qualified practitioners about the difficulty in embracing peace-building approaches in their agencies; and the powerful impact of the voice of victims and survivors on students and social work educators.

Although some of the issues raised during the life of the project are peculiar to the conflict in Northern Ireland, the authors will conclude with a strong argument that some of the lessons learned from this evaluation are transferable to other contexts, particular to societies who need to deal with the legacies of political conflict, and social work educators, service users and students can play a role in conflict resolution and peace-building.
Giulia Carabelli and Mela Žuljević

Conflict in Cities, School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Queen’s University Belfast
Abart / Youth Cultural Centre “Abrasevic”, Mostar
(Re) collecting Mostar: Mapping Public Space to Generate Memory Collections

As a fact, Mostar has been a divided city for the last decade and there are no indicators of change in the near future. The division was brought about by the 1990’s war in Yugoslavia and, since then, a street in the centre of the city called the “Bulevar” has functioned as the borderline between the Bosnian-Croat and the Bosniac communities. It is important to mention that despite the absence of a physical barrier, the city is clearly divided in terms of everyday life. Whilst there have been attempts to rehabilitate shared spaces, the two communities still live next to each other without interactions. Consensus has so far been reached only in matters regarding the strengthening of urban polarization, discarding any possibility of rehabilitating public spaces.

Although there are no data available regarding the effective usage of public spaces in the city, it is widely acknowledged that the accessibility and openness of these spaces is determined on an ethnic basis. This fact led us to think about a way to engage the population in the discussion about the lost public spaces in the city and to bring public attention to the issue. Since November 2010, Abart Art Production has been sponsored by UNDP-MDG to develop the (re)collecting Mostar project. This paper aims to present and critically discuss the results of the first two phases of the project (mapping phases).

The paper focuses on three main points. Firstly, we will expand on the condition and understandings of public space in Mostar in order to give background analysis. Secondly, we will dig in the produced maps to unfold the reasons why we thought that mapping could represent the best strategy in order to conduct this research project. To map public space provides information regarding location, usage and the main issues related to these spaces. The database constitutes the starting point for an accurate analysis of the urban environment and the basic material to open up the discussion with target groups about ways in which polarization affects public spaces, the role of public spaces in a divided urban environment and ways in which both communities could benefit from the rehabilitation of public spaces. The last part of the paper will critically discuss the art works that have been produced on the basis of the material gathered in the mapping process. In fact, after having collected the necessary data about the situation with public space in Mostar, artists have been asked to produce art works and site specific interventions able to foster a dialogue with the population of Mostar about the relevance and status of public spaces in the city.

The paper will present a wide range of material; maps, photographs, video clips and extracts from interviews conducted among the participants of the project.
Siún Carden

School of History and Anthropology, Queen’s University Belfast
From Segregated Neighbourhood to Cultural Quarter: Re-imagining the Falls Road, Belfast

Potential visitors and investors are informed that Belfast, ‘once a city of two halves’, is now ‘a city of seven quarters’ (www.planetbelfast.com/about). This paper considers the ‘quartering’ process that post-conflict Belfast has undergone, focusing on the Gaeltacht Quarter as a site where the irony of creating distinctively themed spaces as a strategy to re-integrate the divided city is especially apparent.

The re-branding of areas of Belfast as vibrant, touristic ‘Quarters’ reflects a model of place-making that has seen city spaces across the developed world packaged as venues for the experience of cultural distinctiveness as recreation. However, in the context of Belfast, this necessarily coexists with the territorial and antagonistic conceptions of place and culture that have been much analysed in relation to divided cities. The themes and locations of most of Belfast’s new quarters are notable for their distance from the flashpoints of local history. Sited in predominantly commercial or uninhabited areas, and focusing nostalgically on a pre-Troubles past or aspirationally on a carefree post-Troubles consumption, projects like ‘Titanic Quarter’ and ‘Cathedral Quarter’ have as little as possible to do with Belfast’s most internationally famous characteristic, its longstanding ethno-national division.

In contrast, the Gaeltacht Quarter is located along the Falls Road, and themed around the Irish language. It is the first of the Quarters to undertake the re-imagining of a large working-class residential area, and this part of Catholic west Belfast has been used as an icon of Irish republicanism in Northern Ireland in countless news reports since the mid-twentieth century. The identification of the Irish language as a theme also means that this Quarter resonates differently from the others, engaging more directly with the uncomfortable issue of national identity than ‘Market Quarter’, or ‘Linen Quarter’, for example. While the entire quartering process in Belfast has been conceptualised as an way of moving beyond the ‘city of two halves’, the Gaeltacht Quarter deals with a part of the city which corresponds strongly with one pole of that binary division, and which has developed a sense of separation from the city as a whole. If the Quarters are a strategy to heal the divided city, then, the reincorporation of the Falls Road is more pressing than that of the city’s shopping centres, and much more challenging.

The task of packaging the Irish language on the Falls Road as an inclusive, exciting but benign spectacle is a difficult one, and this paper looks at some of the strategies that place-making professionals have adopted in their attempts to reconcile the internationally popular idea of cultural distinctiveness as leisure activity with the local perception of ethno-sectarian difference as threat. Arguing that the irresolved tensions about boundaries, exclusion and commodification that are visible in such concrete forms within the Gaeltacht Quarter are encountered to varying degrees by many place-making initiatives, I suggest that contemporary re-imaginings of conflict-damaged cities offer interesting ways to think about the transformative aims and complex outcomes of urban re-branding exercises.
Cristina Carnevali
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Derry/Londonderry and the Memoryscapes of the City: Past in Conflict with the Future

The Battle of the Bogside and the Bloody Sunday in the late ‘60s and early ‘70s are the two main events that shaped the identity of Derry/Londonderry city and the republican area of the Bogside, in recent history. The history of the conflict and the memory of the traumatic events, have left a deep and concrete mark in the urban space: the Bogside murals, Free Derry Corner, Glenfada Park area and the tricolor footpaths have become “memory artifacts” and fundamental components in the creation of ‘cultural landscapes’ or ‘memoryscapes’ as defined by Mark Nuttal. Following data gathered concerning the relation between trauma and memory in the victims of Bloody Sunday, it emerges how the trauma was strongly linked to the spaces and places where the events occurred, and how it was continuously rekindled by the strong presence of the “memory artifacts” in the victims’ everyday life. After the publication of the Saville Inquiry and the public apologies of the Prime Minister Cameron to the victims of Bloody Sunday that symbolically marked a new beginning for the city of Derry, issues arise concerning the legitimacy of elements in the public space that might not allow the Bogside community and all the city to effectively move on from the past. Thinking about the conceptual elements stated so far, the conference paper will focus on the issues that would arise by the presence of these “memory artifacts” in the public space, at this particular historical moment of transformation and transition to the future for the new ‘UK City of Culture, City of Peace 2013’: to what extent the concrete presence of the traumatic past could prevent the new beginning of the next era for the city of Derry/Londonderry, freezing it in the continuous reenactment of the trauma? Could the ‘relics of the past’ be maintained in the “historical tourism” project, trasmitted in a renewed images of the city’s past? The memory of a traumatic past could never be forgotten but could the trauma be to some extent overcome, possibly giving a new image to a city striving for the future and a new place to the memory of the past?

Naomi Chi

Slavic Research Centre, Hokkaido University

Visualizing Borders: Museum Exhibition at the Hokkaido University

The objective of the paper is to introduce a collection of DVDs that are being compiled for the current project being undertaken at the Hokkaido University Museum in collaboration with the Global COE Programme (grant-in-aid) “Reshaping Japan’s Border Studies” at the Slavic Research Centre. The first exhibition “Journey through the Eurasian Borders” explores the dynamics of the belt areas of borderland regions that traverse Eurasia. The exhibition that will be introduced in this paper is the second one “Unknown Tales of the Northern Borders” which documents the history of the Northern Territories (or Hoppo Ryodo in Japanese) that are currently being contested by Japan and Russia. These are the first two of the 5 part series planned as part of our research and education programmes to demonstrate “borders in representation” and “visualizing borders” through the audio visual material composed by our programme. Through these exhibitions, it is our hope that people can go on a “virtual journey” through these regions and to contribute to the exploration of new potentials of the border region.
Warfare can spread through urban spaces according to strategically significant locations or by the circumstances of battle, but what happens in protracted conflicts in divided cities? Rather than a random pattern of violence, over time specific spaces and particular places become the site of ongoing clashes, and are recognized for their risk by some, and for their opportunity by others. While most of an urban area may become “normalized,” these focal parts of a city are marked by chronic or episodic violence that becomes a known aspect of their character. Even in rigidly divided cities, there can be points along the seam that are far more troublesome than others. That was true in Jerusalem and Berlin during their years of formal division, and it remains true in cities like Belfast and Derry/Londonderry (and Jerusalem) today. Violence can be concentrated in particular zones, indicated by the preponderance of attacks associated with Belfast’s “peace walls” or similar communal interfaces in other conflicts, they may be associated with specific iconic locations, or they may crystallize in seemingly inconsequential places according to the practicalities of generating or maintaining a presence in a particular location.

In this paper I draw upon my research in Derry/Londonderry and Jerusalem to analyze the opportunity that the ritualization of violence affords antagonists, and the role that geography plays in sustaining points of violence in protracted ethno-territorial conflicts. Most people make an effort to avoid areas that are prone to hostilities, and the establishment of routines allows people to know where—and often when—violence will occur. These routines also create an opportunity, and at times almost an invitation, for others to participate in low intensity conflict that can endure over days, years, even decades. In these locations violence can be choreographed and scripted, forming a set piece in which both (or more) sides arrive with expectations about what will occur and even a set of tacit norms that affect the nature and intensity of the interactions. To illustrate how such choreographies emerge and what their ramifications are for the communities involved I will focus on events around the Apprentice Boys parades in Derry/Londonderry and “spontaneous” protests on the road near the Shu’afat refugee camp in Jerusalem. The first of these cases revolves around what is effectively sacred space, and relates to some of the most iconic places and moments in contested Northern Ireland. The second case illustrates the way that meaning can be imparted to an essentially peripheral space, elevating it in the iconography of some of the camp residents.

Ultimately the paper considers the way that violence can simultaneously be functional and dysfunctional in the complex political and social geographies of divided cities.
Kimberly Collins

Department of Public Administration, California State University, San Bernardino

Life in the U.S.-Mexican Border Region: Residents’ Perceptions of the Place

The U.S.-Mexican borderland is a dynamic region, politically, economically, and socially. It is an attractive area for many because of these dynamics, creating rapid population growth especially on the Mexican side. This growth along with the development of the region is the basis for many of the local conflicts in the region. Challenges of water rights, power plant development, poor urban infrastructure and polluted waterways, migrant trafficking and related public security issues, national security concerns in the United States, the Mexican drug war have all led to tension in the region, particularly between the national governments.

It is important to note though that the border is not a homogenous region and each of the city pairs have different characteristics based in the local history, geography, economic development, and interaction with the people on the other side. The individual communities are shared places among residents of the United States and Mexico. The sister cities are linked through its people, even though national policies separate them. The federal policy is therefore only one side of the relationship. What actually occurs with the residents is a greater part of the relationship. It is here that trust and cooperation have a greater chance of being strengthened. Without this, the binational region is set to be further divided by the federal governments’ policies and issues of distrust that surround them. Within this context, this paper will answer the following questions: What are the perceptions of those living in the region of their community? What do they think of the other side? Do the perceptions change depending on the person’s place of birth (migration)? Do those who were born in the region have a more negative or positive viewpoint of their city? What about the sister city? These questions will be explored using data collected in four binational cities pairs along the U.S.-Mexican border, which was part of a larger study on quality of life in the region. Over 4,000 surveys were conducted providing insight into the following border communities: Tijuana-San Diego; Mexicali-Calexico; San Luis Rio Colorado-San Luis; Juárez-El Paso.
### Mary Corcoran

**Department of Sociology, National University of Ireland Maynooth**  

Interest in urban agriculture has predominantly focused on its contribution to sustainability in cities of the developing world (Mougeot, 2005, 2006). There is however a long European history of allotment gardening borne out of citizens efforts to bring nature into the city (Meller, 2005). A number of factors, including the rezoning of land for residential and commercial use and the growing privatization of everyday life, led to a decline in allotment gardens in the second half of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, the idea of urban agriculture continues to be part of the fabric of European urban life. In cities like Dublin and Berlin, the demand for allotments currently far outstrips supply.

Kaul et al. (2005) define public goods as outside the marketplace and as accruing benefits arising from their non-rivalry in consumption and non-excludability. Secondly, their benefits are universal in terms of being accessible to all population groups, and they do not foreclose options for future generations. Urban agricultural initiatives such as allotments or community gardens can be seen as a public good- in terms of the resource that is offered (publicly provided and serviced land), shared meaning (production and consumption largely outside the market) and behavioural expectations (working alone or together with others diligently benefits all and contributes to the common good).

Researching urban agricultural initiatives from within a sociologically grounded framework moves us beyond a simple urban/rural duality and provides a bottom-up perspective on contemporary urban life. In this paper I focus on the potential contributions that allotment gardening can make to skills development, knowledge transfer and ‘civic integration’ (Vertovec, 2003: 3). Furthermore, the paper argues that urban agricultural sites in the contemporary European city constitute a significant ‘space of potential’ within the public realm (Lownsborough and Beundeman, 2007).

### Thérèse Cullen

**Queen’s University Belfast**  
*The Pub and the Pulpit: Contesting St. Patrick’s Day in Belfast*

St. Patrick’s Day has become an annual global celebration. There is no other national day with such broad global participation and marketing. Participants come from all backgrounds looking to be ‘Irish for the day’. Celebrations on the day are centred on consumption, re-branding, carnival, nationalism and identity. There seems to be more attraction to the pub than the pulpit. Ironically, at the heart of the day is a Christian icon.

The vast research by scholars on St Patrick’s Day has paid little attention to the religious element of the parades and how that ground has shifted in recent decades. In an effort to make the parades more inclusive, the churches have been marginalized from participating in the parades. In Belfast, these difficulties are further compounded by struggle for ownership of the parade. In a city torn apart by religious righteousness, the attempt to impose a common religious symbol treads on dangerous water.

Despite the ongoing battle over the symbol of St Patrick and the celebrations of the day, this paper argues that the parade can serve as a platform for inclusivity rather than exclusion. This can be done delicately by creating a ‘neutral space’ where all communities can feel welcome, and by creating a hybrid of symbols that constitute both British and Irish identities. Indeed, future parades may be led by a Union Jack and a Tricolour or the Cross of St Patrick and the Harp and could prove useful in this effort.

This paper will demonstrate the complications of competing for ownership of the day’s celebrations and how those tensions are evident in Belfast’s annual parade. I will consider these issues within the context of St. Patrick’s Day in Belfast, exploring the perspectives of local churches on the current status, character and interpretation of these celebrations in relation to policies, which shape public parades and cultural events. The paper will seek to identify and investigate the different meanings given to St. Patrick’s Day celebrations by local religious and civic groups in Belfast. Ultimately, the following question will be answered: What exactly is being celebrated?
Senada Demirović Habibija

Faculty of Architecture, University of Sarajevo

‘Natural’ or ‘Shared’ Spaces in the City - Mostar

One of the most beautiful cities of ex Yugoslavia, the city of Mostar was always described over many centuries as a city of light and gatherings; a place where different people with different political, economical and all other interests find a place to stay and to give an input in its development. Since the Ottoman period Mostar was already familiar with the notion of open space. We can say that that open space was more divided into open space as a public in the public part of the city known as ‘carsija’, and semi-open space as frontal courtyard in the housing complexes called ‘mahallas’. With the Austro-Hungarian government Mostar got new open spaces, more public and we already recognize them in the context of what we see today as open spaces and its social role in the urban development of the city. This progress in the context of the city development, especially related to the meaning of open spaces, was visible up to the 1990s when war started in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The period from 1992-1995 was a huge depression for the city of Mostar and its urban structure.

Some of the open spaces were ‘frontlines’ during the war and unfortunately not big progress was made even in the post war reconstruction. Instead, to make those places friendlier some of those spaces are still reminders of division. It is not a question that they should be retreated as open spots for ‘reconciliation’ but more in the context of urban redevelopment they should become points of new happenings, new development, giving them the meaning that contemporary idea of city development should give.

Neli Demireva and Anthony Heath

Department of Sociology, Oxford University

Segregation and Stereotypes in the Context of the British Neighbourhood

In his article “E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century” (2007), the American political scientist, Robert Putnam, claimed that social capital in the form of trustworthiness is lower in areas, which are more ethnically diverse. The body of research on this issue, however, portrays conflicting tendencies. Importantly, studies based on British data such as Laurence and Heath (2008) and Letki (2008) have raised the question whether it is income inequality rather than diversity that serves to estrange people. A huge body of research exists claiming that racial factors may overlay class factors creating a dual-feature segregation that intensifies poverty and constrains outward opportunity (Massey and Denton, 1992) and perhaps even modifies the existent social norms (Friedrichs and Blasius 2003) at community level.

Using new data from national survey in England and Wales funded by the Leverhulme Trust, we examine both the attitudes of the majority and minority groups towards residential segregation. Similarly to Farley et al. (1994) we construct stereotype and discomfort indices which measure at what point of ethnic mix the respondents will feel desire to leave the neighbourhood. Unlike previous research, we focus on the attitudes of not only the White group but also on other prominent minority populations in Britain such as Black Caribbeans and South Asians. Moreover, we include measures of the level of diversity that the respondent experiences at neighbourhood level and in school and work settings.

Overall, this paper will show evidence of the mediating effect of contact in the relationship between diversity, trust, the reduction of prejudice and the formation of stereotypes in neighbourhood settings. The role of religion and, in particular, the juxtaposition between Christian and Muslim communities will also be explored.
Creating “shared” or “integrated” neighbourhoods might seem as desirable a concept as motherhood and apple pie. However, a question arises as to what happens when shared or integrated public spaces can only be achieved by actively discriminating against those in greatest need. The situation becomes even more problematic, when, as in the case of North Belfast, such discriminatory practices may amount to a breach of existing equality laws. This paper will examine these debates within the context of the regeneration of the former Girdwood Barracks/Crumlin Road Gaol site in North Belfast to better understand the relationship between equality legislation, urban regeneration policy, and efforts to create desegregated public space.

One aspect of the peace process in Northern Ireland that has received hitherto very little attention is the vacant land that the devolved administration of the region was gifted following the closure of a number of British army bases. In some cases, such as the former Girdwood Barracks site in North Belfast, the land in question straddles what might euphemistically be called the peace line between Catholic and Protestant areas. The situation in North Belfast is further complicated by the fact that the Catholic community in the area is young, expanding, and is in need of additional social housing. The demographic profile of the Protestant community in the region is somewhat different however, being generally older. While there are serious levels of deprivation within the local Protestant community, social housing is not a priority to the same extent as that within the Catholic community.

A key question therefore facing policy makers is whether the vacant land created by the exit of the British army should be used to meet the housing needs of the Catholic community - something which residents in the local Protestant community object to. A number of commentators have argued for the need for the land to be of use to both communities as part of a wider programme of desegregation and sharing. Such an approach however might in effect amount to a quota on the number of Catholics who would be able to live in this contested space. Other proposals have suggested that private apartment buildings are the way forward, given that such private developments tend to be more mixed in terms of Catholic and Protestant owner occupiers. Such an approach however, would in effect disregard the needs of working class communities in the area particularly those in need of social housing. Moreover, one might question the sustainability of a strategy for integration based solely on addressing the interests of the middle classes. It is also worth noting that under the Fair Employment and Treatment Order 1998, discrimination in the provision of goods and services on grounds of religion is unlawful. In this context, it is difficult to see how any policy based on sharing, which would necessarily limit, or exclude the number of Catholics who would be able to live in this area would be lawful.
Lorraine Dennis

Good Relations Unit, Belfast City Council

Work in Progress? Belfast - Local Government Discourse and the Transition from Divided to Shared City

The guided tour for this conference will examine some of the ‘peace walls’ and ‘shared spaces’ of Belfast, presenting a brief insight into the realities of a city on its own journey of transition from division to shared city. The city snapshot will provide visual context for this paper, which will explore the dynamics of conflict transformation, the often overlooked role of local government and why Belfast is a ‘work in progress’.

The Northern Ireland conflict is well documented with the empirical and theoretical debate continuing on the era euphemistically labelled the ‘Troubles’. This paper does not seek to contribute to analysis of the conflict which dominated everyday life for over 30 years from the late 1960s to the peace process of the 1990s. What the paper will offer is a synopsis of the role of local government in steering conflict transformation in Belfast.

Belfast, like the rest of Northern Ireland, is a deeply divided society still coming to terms with the legacy of a conflict marked by intercommunal violence, death and injury, economic stagnation and social division. As the capital city Belfast has witnessed some of the worst atrocities of the conflict and is noted for its significant residential segregation, volatile interface areas, duplication of services and public disorder over contentious issues such as parades and flag-flying. A significant proportion of its citizens inhabit quite separate worlds, associated with religious affiliation and political orientation, and these differences have resulted in a society based on mistrust, intolerance and suspicion of ‘the other’.

This complex geography of nine electoral areas is represented by 51 councillors with the current political make-up of the council 14 Sinn Fein, 13 Democratic Unionist Party, nine Ulster Unionist Party, eight SDLP, four Alliance, two Progressive Union Party and one Independent member. The elections in May 2011 may change this breakdown. Through the work of committees, our councillors oversee the work of the council. All committee decisions need to be ratified by the full council except where committees have been granted delegated authority to make decisions.

Through this remarkable democratic, balanced local government Belfast City Council has delivered actions which have made, and continue to make a significant contribution to a stable, tolerant, fair and pluralist city, where individuality is respected and diversity is celebrated, in an inclusive manner. Through a demonstrated commitment to the principles of equity, diversity and interdependence the Council aims to mainstream these ideals into all our activities - our policies, our structures and our procedures.

Through evidence the paper will document the journey through democracy to maximise conflict transformation. The input from key funders, the Office of the First and deputy First Member and PEACE III will be summarised, demonstrating the clear additionality and complementarity of conflict management through local government. The paper concludes by outlining how Belfast City Council is the only organisation which can sustain the conflict transformation of the city.
Martijn Duineveld and Kristof van Assche

Socio-spatial Analysis Group, Wageningen University
Community Studies Department, Minnesota State Universities
The Life and Death of Citizenship and Resistance

Drawing on Machiavelli, Foucault, Scott, Flyvbjerg and resistance scholars within cultural and political geography, we develop a conceptual framework of resistance, for analysing the power technologies utilized in the silencing, subjugation, marginalisation of public voices in contested places. We illustrate this framework by means of a detailed examination of power technologies deployed to deal with public opposition to a proposed modernist building in historic Groningen.

The building, named the Groninger Forum (GF), is an initiative of the local government. It is consistently presented by the local government as a contribution to the liveliness of the inner city and a boost to economic development. The GF will mainly host public services, such as the movie theatre, the public library, the city archives and a debating centre. Although a majority of the citizens opposes the plans, and ironically refers to it as a ‘palace of culture’, their opposition has been silenced and the plans are being implemented. This process will be explained by means of a reconstruction of the social and political context of decision-making, and a detailed analysis of the planning process.

Since World War II, the political system and the cultural elite of the city of Groningen are strongly entwined within a powerful social democratic network in which the local town planners could operate more or less autonomously. Within this network some shared ideas on urbanism dominated since the late seventies, most profoundly the idea of a compact, lively and dynamic inner city. The town planners share the strong belief that their expertise is a prerequisite for good and successful town planning. The demand for citizen participation, which re-emerged in the late nineties and the quest for democratic legitimacy, is perceived by these town planners as frustrating. At the same time, more and more citizens distrust the social democratic local government, the closed circuit of town planners and their claims on expertise.

It is within this context that we can delineate several power technologies in the planning process that preceded the construction of the GF:

1. The political proponents of the Forum Building negotiated with the political opposition and managed to form a coalition, turning them into allies. This affected the power and possibilities of public resistance, since previously these political parties were highly instrumental in the articulation and coordination of public resistance against local governmental initiatives.

2. The proponents used carefully designed citizen representation, referenda and elections pragmatically and rhetorically to achieve their goals. By keeping plans vague, they managed to minimise opposition and to take the angle out of a participatory planning process used to increase legitimacy.

3. A project organisation was created, in charge of the architectural, economic and logistic programming for the building; that organization was placed outside the system of politics and administration. Henceforth, the pseudo-autonomous entity was used as a pseudo-neutral propaganda tool, a depoliticized voice in favour of the project.

4. The irreversibility of the project, real and imagined, was actively managed and communicated.

We re-articulate these findings in our resistance framework and argue that these and related power technologies perform success in planning by means of silencing opposition. Since the possibilities and constraints to resist or oppose governmental plans is highly dependent on the political and social networks, we argue that only an amoral, second order observation of resistance/power practices in contested places can both scrutinize power technologies in the socio-spatial context from which they arise and make explicit the democrat deficit of urban planning practices.
Conflict in Cities, Department of Politics, University of Exeter
Ideology and Religion in a Divided City: Zionism, Christianity and the Politics of Exclusivity

The attempt to impose Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem since 1967 can be seen as operating on two levels. The first level has been characterized by the state acquisition of property in East Jerusalem, the introduction of the Israeli legal system, policing and other security measures and, finally, the imposition of basic services by an Israeli Municipality. A second level can be detected in the form of attempting to court the leadership of the various sections of the Palestinian and non-Jewish communities into accepting Israeli rule. This paper will examine the success of this second level of policies towards Christian communities of Jerusalem between 1967 and 2000. It will argue that between 1967 and the beginning of the second Palestinian intifada in 2000, relations between Israel and the established Christian communities in Jerusalem deteriorated to the extent that most Christian leaders were prepared to contemplate operating under Palestinian sovereignty rather than to remain under Israeli control. This shift revealed the failure of mainstream Zionism to accommodate a pluralist framework for the city. The article will also argue that the St John’s Hospice Incident in 1990 was the pivotal moment in the church’s movement towards disaffection with the Israeli regime, and that the Incident exemplifies the exclusionary vision of a Jewish-dominated Jerusalem held by Zionist politicians and officials in power in Israel. The paper will then make some preliminary observations regarding developments since 2000. In particular it will examine why despite the continuation of such exclusivist policies, the Christian churches now present an ambiguous and fragmented response.

School of Planning, Architecture and Civil Engineering, Queen’s University Belfast
Urban Policy and Planning Faculty, University of Illinois, Chicago
Re-thinking Space and Identity for Planning within Contested Cities

Most of humankind increasingly will be in urban settlements and be obliged to engage with more pluralist socio-ethnic difference. This has led to policy concern about how to promote cohesion amid diversity even in places like the Netherlands that were once held as models of tolerant cosmopolitanism. In turn, this is related to the flourishing of identity politics. Understanding identity formation is an important part of urban conflict analysis. Anheier and Raj Isar (2007, 5) note that ‘we are in a time of intense ‘culturalism’, as cultural difference is consciously mobilized in a politics of recognition and representation...’ In this regard, the current prominence attached to the issue of ‘identity’ in the social construction of the urban demands that its configuration is linked to a relational concept of urban space. Accordingly, the focus of this paper is on the connection between identity and territory, and the implication of this inter-penetration for planning in contested space. As such, it also explores other related concepts such as cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism, and the connection between cohesion and inclusion. These central discourses in urban conflict are examined in a globalised context, distinguishing between those cities facing ethno-nationalist disputes around sovereignty and those facing more standard pluralist contest around religion, ethnicity, and class.
De-scripture of Liminal Spaces in Nicosia

This paper concerns the interpretation through mapping and texts of the ‘buffer zone’ that divides the island of Cyprus as the visible outcome of an unsolved conflict.

The research has been developed inside the walled historical centre of the capital, Nicosia, focusing on the built environment and its interaction with the practices going on throughout its border. Starting from the theoretical assumption that concepts such as exception, fragmentation and liminality are the predominant characteristics of the contemporary city, Nicosia is presented as a case study which embodies these features in an extreme form. The work approaches the physical structure of the border and the practices which are hosted within its ‘depth’, developing three main levels of representation. The city of Nicosia has been divided since 1960, after the outbreak (at the end of the British colonialism) of the conflict between the two predominant ethnic groups, Turkish and Greek-Cypriots. From 1974 a neutral ‘buffer zone’ controlled by UN officially draws the separation line. The circular Venetian walls of the historic centre are crossed by this ‘dead zone’ made of streets and buildings which compose the “wall” of the division. Though, looking closely, we discover a complex stratigraphy of spaces where, next to military zones, practices of corrosion and colonisation of the border take place. Those in-between spaces and practices are conceived, as a potential and as a privileged instrument of observation for understanding mutations and perspectives of the conflict and of the city itself. This potential spread out from the liminal quality of these spaces which represent both a return to the original chaos, and a hope for a new dialogue.

The first level of analysis has the objective to fulfill a complete vision of the functioning of the ‘buffer zone’ limit complex and of the historic centre of Nicosia actual transformation trends. The outcome is a thorough photographic survey of the two sides of the border and a series of interpretative maps, schemes and texts.

The second one sets up a glossary of spaces of suspension chosen along the two borders, and tries to understand their potential related to their close relation with the limit through maps and texts made out by observation and ethnographic inquiry.

The third one is based on the revelation of the project that can be already ‘written inside’ the places. The different forms of liminality described in the second level, are transposed in a series of atopic projects conceived, not as answers, but rather as open questions on new possible geographies and parallels visions of the approached themes.

The goal of the research is to show how, even in such a context full of states of exception, the potential of liminality could be revealed. Following Agamben’s definitions, what will be lightened is the availability of this kind of spaces to the profanation and their capability to be a “counter-device which returns to the human what the sacrifice had divided and separated” (Agamben, G., “Che cos’è un dispositivo?”, Nottetempo, Roma, 2006).
School of Planning, Architecture and Civil Engineering, Queen’s University Belfast

Who Controls the Past? An Investigation Into the Role of Heritage Interventions in Post-conflict Nation Narration in Former Yugoslavia

In ‘The Book of Laughter and Forgetting’, Milan Kundera stated famously that “The struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting” (1996: p4). What roles do memory and forgetting have to play in moves toward reconciliation, was V. S. Naipaul correct when he wrote that heritage gets transmitted only in “dead countries, or secure and by-passed ones – where men can cherish the past and think of passing on furniture and china to their heirs [places like Sweden and Canada] .... Everywhere else.... the past can only cause pain”? (cited in Lowenthal, D. 1998: p.23) This paper will analyse how through interventions in their urban fabric, nations narrate their histories by reconstructing, conserving, neglecting and destroying their built heritage.

It will illustrate how in post-conflict, multi-ethnic states the built environment becomes a contact zone where different pasts and events are constantly being (re-)negotiated. Heritage case studies from post-conflict, recently independent nation-states in the former Yugoslavia will be discussed in an attempt to understand the interrelationship between political power and the chimeric concepts of heritage, memory and identity. In order to contextualise the competing narratives informing current intervention decisions the paper will chronicle how religious heritage, as the physical manifestation of differing identities, was subject to urbicide as ethno-nationalist desires were writ large on Yugoslav cityscapes.

Heritage interventions and non-interventions in Bosnia & Herzegovina (BiH) at Mostar, Stolac, Jajce and Banja Luka will be cited to critically evaluate the role that reconstruction and restoration projects can play in post-conflict normalisation and reconciliation in multi-ethnic states. The paper will then discuss whether the national- and international-emphasis on reconstructing and restoring religious heritage in post-war BiH has aided reconciliation or emphasised difference in a nation-state subject to three competing narratives of the past.

ARK, School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social Work, Queen’s University Belfast

Here and There: Experiences and Attitudes to Segregation Among Urban Teenagers in Northern Ireland

Despite living in more peaceful times than their parents, many teenagers in Northern Ireland live with high levels of educational and residential segregation. Nevertheless, community relations policy in Northern Ireland, as well as the Programme for Government, has tended to take a ‘one size fits all’ approach in relation to geography. Following this trend, research has focused on differences between Catholics and Protestants, but rarely has taken into account whether respondents live in urban or rural areas.

The aim of this paper is to redress this deficit, and highlight differences and/or similarities between young people living in urban areas compared with those living in more rural locations. The paper will be based on data pooled from several years of the Young Life and Times (YLT) survey, which has recorded the views and experiences of 16 year olds living in Northern Ireland since 2003. We will explore variation in attitudes to, and experiences of, integration and segregation between young people living in urban areas and those living in rural areas. In addition, we will investigate whether there is heterogeneity among the urban respondents.
Kosovo declared independence on 17 February 2008 after the fifteen rounds of the internationally mediated final status talks between Serbs and Albanians led by UN Special Envoy Marti Ahtisaari failed to produce a negotiated settlement. Kosovo’s Assembly adopted a new Constitution on 15 June 2008. The new Kosovo Constitution attempts to eliminate the bitter ethnic tensions between the Albanian and Serb speaking population by creating a system of shared rule at the central level and self rule at local level through highly decentralized new local government units for the K-Serb community. Now Kosovo has been recognized by 70 nations but the quest for UN membership is going to be a long process. Although 2/3 (estimated number of Kosovo Serbs is 130,000) of the Kosovo Serbs are integrated in the legislative, executive and judicial institutions of Kosovo, the integration of about 1/3 of K-Serbs (50,000) are concentrated in the municipalities of Leposavic, Zubin Potok, Zvecan, and the mainly urban northern part of the Mitrovica municipality where K-Serbs constitute an overwhelming majority is proving to be a daunting task for the new state.

The bridge over the Ibar River dividing Mitrovica has become a constant flashpoint and a symbol of ethnic divisions. Since the end of the Kosovo War in 1999, North Mitrovica has remained separated from its southern part along the line provided by the river Ibar. The inability of the Kosovo government to integrate the northern municipalities in the constitutional system of Kosovo combined with Serbia’s strong opposition to recognize Kosovo are making the unification of the city of Mitrovica a real test of ethnic reconciliation and viability of Kosovo’s statehood.

This paper will describe the background of the ethnic distrust which are lingering regardless the cessation of hostilities in 1999. It will shortly explain the relationships between the two main ethnic groups Albanian and Serbian as well as the role of the international community and Republic of Serbia as countervailing forces in the inter-ethnic reconciliation. The main part will cover post conflict developments in the divided city of Mitrovica. Finally, some suggestions will be given into the real prospects of uniting the city of Mitrovica and opening the way for recognition of Kosovo’s contested statehood by Serbia and the international community.
Roz Goldie
Independent Researcher
Ethno-National Borders and Walls – The Signature Sites of Belfast?

In ‘post-conflict’ Northern Ireland, and particularly in Belfast, visible borders still distinguish the geo-political landscape and, where territory-marking ends, invisible borders continue to define ethno-national ownership of place. Aspirations to ‘shared space’ are just that since sectarian interfaces in working class neighbourhoods are sites of contestation. This paper focuses on developing practice in a decade of managing conflict at or near interfaces, and suggests possible advances in this field.

An interface is a visible and recognised site which, in Belfast, will have ‘peace walls’ or physical barriers to access. These places have extremely high levels of multiple deprivation and residential segregation, are visible by territory-marking with flags and symbolism, are the sites of parades-related disputes and suffer locality-specific violence; which community activists ascribe largely to youth-led, thrill-seeking behaviour. “It’s sectarianism but not as we know it!” (Belfast community activist)

People living at the interface, experience high levels of poverty, unemployment and multiple deprivation, low levels of educational achievement and employment skills, restricted freedom of movement and limited public transport options, and suffer high levels of fear and mistrust in times of communal tension. At interfaces borders, barriers and walls do not function to protect property as they do in affluent areas with gated housing.

The social and political impacts of territoraility in Belfast’s urban interfaces have been well documented (Jarman, Bryan et al, Byrne and others); including reduced access to medical treatment and health facilities. Recent research has charted both the politics and ideology of ex-prisoners engaged in community activism (Shirlow et al) and the successful development of inter-community based practice in managing disputes and violence at interfaces (Goldie and Ruddy). Practice shows both border-maintenance, some allege by ‘gatekeepers’ and of border-crossing, where activists tackle the ‘chill factor’, fear, distrust and non-use of urban space.

Although developments in social enterprise are lauded by community activists, others doubt that this is a panacea for the ills of the interface. “It is hard enough to build social enterprises, why we think they would work in the hardest contexts needs to be questioned.” (Planning expert)

While physical barriers prevent the connectivity necessary to freedom of movement, parades-related disputes, violence, poverty and educational disadvantage compound the problem. And while some advocate ‘shared space’ (in government and local government policy and strategy) interpretations of the term are seriously contested. Certainly the socio-economic difficulties require more than traditional community relations responses. A forthcoming review of urban policy (for DSD) may provide specific recommendations on how urban policy and related spatial planning interventions can address segregation, address ‘interface’ issues in particular through Community Planning and the urban regeneration framework. It is vital the interfaces are integral to the mainstream strategic development agenda – and not regarded as intransient community relations problems or challenges for policing.
Mark Hackett, Declan Hill and Ken Sterrett

Forum for Alternative Belfast

Mapping and Repairing the Broken city: Belfast’s Disjointed and Fragmented Urban Structure

This paper explores the notion of urban structure and its role in facilitating and encouraging a shared and connected city. More particularly it reworks concepts by Jacobs (1993), Lynch (1960), Bentley (1985) and Gelh (2008) to provide an understanding of how good urban structure underpinned by a new sense of civic responsibility can address issues such as territorial insularity, privatized space and socio-spatial division. The empirical focus is central Belfast and the arterial routes that radiate from the city centre.

As the ‘peace process’ stumbles on in Northern Ireland attention is now turning to the role that the built environment can have in helping to heal a city divided by ethno-religious spaces and increasingly by socio-spatial severances. Concepts of urban structure and built form are normally understood in mainstream architectural and urban design literature as having universal application. This paper tests these theories in the context of a contested city and also examines how the ‘peculiar’ governance practices in Northern Ireland have bureaucratized spatial planning and urban design processes.

Brandon Hamber
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Divided in Theory, Divided in Practice: The Challenge of Defining Shared Space in Northern Ireland

‘Shared space’ is a concept often referred to in Northern Ireland and an objective of numerous initiatives that are attempting to transform the use of particularly cities and towns that are deeply divided as a result of the political conflict. However, a review of the literature and key policy documents concerned with ‘shared spaces’ in Northern Ireland reveals that there is a lack of consensus about how ‘shared space’ is defined or what such initiatives are aiming to do. Broadly speaking, definitions range between those understanding shared spaces as places that embody and foster basic levels of tolerance and respect (co-existence), to those that see co-existence as a first step towards a deeper notion of the concept of sharing that actively encourages interaction, new relationships and possibilities, potentially even impacting upon the identity of those that interact in such spaces. The term is also routinely used to refer to city centre space, but can concern all spaces were social interaction takes place such as residential areas be they urban or rural. In addition, ‘shared space’ is often used with reference to geographical space and physical public space which is never static demographically speaking. Arguably shared space could also be a temporal expression as much as a physical one. Definitions and notions of sharing also differ between political groups in Northern Ireland. These brief points highlight that there is a clear need to define the concept, or at very least devise a common terminology in the Northern Ireland context. To this end, the paper will proposes a multifaceted continuum-driven working definition of ‘shared space’ which is aimed at assisting policymakers in Northern Ireland to define the goals of ‘shared space’ initiatives, but also develop a more process and experiential orientated way of understanding ‘shared space’.
Conflict in Cities, School of Sociology, Social Policy and Social work, Queen’s University Belfast
Conflict Management in Belfast: Between Reform and Performance

This paper draws upon new and original qualitative research in Belfast city, particularly ‘interface’ areas in North Belfast, to analyse the nature of conflict management in this contested space. We take as our specific theme the question of how conflict between communities is ‘reformed’ and ‘performed’ in this part of the city, with a particular focus on contested events (such as Orange parades). Drawing upon Lederach’s multi-level model of conflict transformation, we examine the particular role of three types of actors in ‘reforming’ and ‘performing’ conflict: participants in contested events, local community activists, and police officers.

Of particular interest is the matter of how the dynamics of reform and performance of conflict connect with each other: the reform of conflicting relationships should ultimately change for the better the performance of conflicting identities. The ‘success’ of conflict management, it could be argued, would be to enable the visible expression of conflict to be neither suppressed nor violent but peaceably managed with consent.

Our preliminary conclusion is that the reform of conflict in the area is currently most evident at the level of community activists and policing, and this is made manifest in their changing role vis-a-vis the ‘performance’ of conflict. Correspondingly, the lack of deep reform in the conflicted relationships (and context for improving such relationships) at the ‘grassroots’ is evident in the ‘performance’ of conflict in contested events. We use photographic evidence from the area and oral evidence from interviews, focus groups and ‘walking tours’ with relevant actors to elaborate our argument.

Feuds as Urban Conflicts: A Sociological Investigation of Inter-Family Feuding in Limerick City

Inter-family feuds in Limerick city have been the subject of widespread national and inter-national media attention. Yet, sociological understandings of contemporary ‘gangland feuding’ in urban contexts are relatively under-developed. This gap is surprising as two of the founding fathers of Sociology, Max Weber and Émile Durkheim wrote about the reasons for feuding. This paper takes these classical understanding of feuding as a starting point for providing a sociological analysis of contemporary gangland feuds in Limerick. The research presented in the paper is based on a three year ethnography study conducted in Limerick city between 2007 and 2010. The study also draws on a second data set which examines feuding within the Irish Traveller community in order to develop comparisons between ‘gangland’ and Irish Traveller feuding models. The paper focuses on a number of key themes including the significance of the extended family networks within disadvantaged community and the role of the discourse of ‘family honour’ in perpetuating feuds. The paper also examines evolving forms of violence which have emerged with the increasing levels of gun usage within feuding and the impact of feud-related trauma on families and communities in the city. It is argued that feuding represents a distinct criminal justice and community level problem to drugs related criminality in Limerick city. The continuing prevalence of these feuds requires the development of a range of targeted policy responses in terms of policing, child protection and urban regeneration.
“All art is a revolt against man’s fate,” wrote the French intellectual André Malraux. Today, more than a decade after the peace agreement which brought an end to Northern Ireland’s ‘Troubles’, officials appear to have embraced Malraux’s notion. The country is currently in the midst of a significant re-imaging campaign, with an array of civic public art initiatives touted as a transformative tool that can contribute to increased shared space and inclusiveness. Accordingly, this paper explores the symbolic and social metamorphosis of two urban sites of conflict through large-scale public artworks aimed at shaping, respectively, the civic identities of Belfast and Derry/Londonderry.

At the Broadway Roundabout, the major southern gateway into Belfast, the city council in conjunction with regional agencies has commissioned a £486,000 sculpture to mark the city’s regeneration and emergence from conflict. Titled “Rise”, the massive, 123-foot geodesic work is intended to evoke new beginnings and in part reflect a conception of Belfast as a global centre for investment and tourism. At the same time, officials envisage that the soon-to-be constructed sculpture will turn the roundabout, an interface where rioters attacked police officers just this past July, into a meeting place and genuine civic space.

In Derry, a major regeneration plan is seeking to enlarge shared space through the redevelopment of the contentious Ebrington Barracks, where British Army operations on Bloody Sunday were coordinated. This initiative includes the proposed installation of an £800,000 contemporary artwork known as “Mute Meadow”. Consisting of dozens of steel columns running along the parade ground and down to the banks of the River Foyle, the piece is specifically designed to avoid saying anything at all. Still, it’s hoped the work will highlight Derry’s wider global links and forward-looking orientation, while simultaneously serving as an invitation to the city’s divided communities to explore a new space.

Each case study offers a lens through which the processes behind the re-branding of two distinct Northern Irish urban areas and sites of conflict will be compared and contrasted. Based on interviews with key stakeholders, this paper assesses each artwork as a medium of social agency and potential conflict management tool. Through an examination of the global and local network of political and economic forces shaping the artworks’ production, new constructions of civic identities for the post-conflict, post-nationalist city emerge.
Goran Janev

Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity

‘Skopje 2014’ and Macedonia’s Ethnocracy or How to Divide a City

Almost two decades in the making the Macedonian ethnocracy is finally taking its full shape and is expressing itself in the form of the “Skopje 2014” project for rebuilding the central part of the capital. The symbolic reconstruction of the capital managed to finally turn the alleged divided city into one that really is separated along ethnic lines. Macedonia stands on multiple cleavage lines, linguistic, religious, ethnic and historically at the fault lines of empires, political systems, and the changing international order and state formation. Regardless of the regime, previously, Macedonian citizens had maintained high levels of mutual respect and tolerance. Recently, the political system based on communitarian principles recognizes, in practice, ethnopolitical parties’ leading role. Seated in government, central and local, these parties rush to symbolically mark their respective ethnic territory. The ruling party, at first very timidly and later bombastically, presented the plans for the new look of the capital. By year 2014 they will create, install and build over 50 monuments of historical figures and over a dozen buildings in neo-baroque, neoclassical, eclectic, historicist style. The building is ongoing, relentlessly, in spite of the numerous, loud and persistent opposition.

In this paper I follow the parallel development of the ethnocratic regime in Macedonia and the growing resistance to it. The project “Skopje 2014” has been crucial for the catalysis of these processes. On the one hand it materializes the ethnopolitical system while on the other it provokes reactions against it. Moreover the announcement of the Project “Skopje 2014” invigorated or introduced for the first time properly, the debate on multiculturalism in this country of great ethnic, religious, and linguistic mixture. It is striking that the opposition grew from without not within the system of ethnopolitical parties that managed to monopolize the public sphere and are marching towards the monopolization of the public space. We certainly still find the sites of resistance to the homogenizing discourse in the contact zones in the city like the Old Bazaar although it has been proclaimed a border zone for the better part of Macedonia’s independence during the process of establishing ethnocracy. By linking the public sphere and the public space via the concept of the public, I seek an understanding of the sites and forms of resistance to the process of ethnic homogenization and consequential differentiation.
Rudi Janssens

Faculty of Philosophy, Free University of Brussels (VUB) and Centre for Information, Documentation and Research (BRIO), Brussels

Language, Political Conflicts and the Principle of Territorialism in Brussels.

Since its independence, Belgian society and politics are fractured by deep political cleavages. One of the most ferocious political conflicts has to do with language (policies), especially concerning the “divided”/“multilingual” Belgian capital Brussels. Recent societal and governmental transitions (the impact of migrations and globalisation on the one hand and the transforming of Belgium into a federal State on the other hand) have increased both the complexity and relevance of this issue.

The first part of this paper deals with language in relation to knowledge as a tool of power (Foucault, 1991). We will focus on the differences and problems between a census-based and territory-based language policy. After an introduction into the basics of the Belgian language policy, we assess the sociological linguistic reality in Brussels today. Since 1961, official language censuses are forbidden by law and only scientific research on the use of languages (Janssens, 2007) can provide nuanced information on this complex issue. This topic is especially relevant because the “mapping” of these data was used in relation to the political-linguistic strives mentioned earlier. In earlier studies scholars have referred correctly to the “... discrepancy between a complex social reality and the way in which the political elite interprets this reality and builds its own strategy on it” (Witte & Baetens Beardsmore, 1987, 48). We will analyse the methods involved as well as their benefits and drawbacks. Furthermore, we assess the attitudes and perceptions of the Brussels population vis-à-vis the language and (ethnic) identity issues (Olzak, 1992) in this cosmopolitan world city.

The second part of this paper comes to grips with the evolution of the Brussels political system. As an exponent of a pacification democracy (Lijphart, 1984), Belgium used amongst other things elite negotiated compromises in order to manage and reduce political conflicts. How was the language issue reflected in the political structures and practices of Brussels, the crucial pivot of the Belgian system? Hereby we will assess both the functions and dysfunctions (difficulties and thresholds) of the complex model that was developed (Vaesen, 2008). How did changing notions of territoriality - related to questions regarding migration, language and identity - affect the governance of this city region? How do the existing political structures and practices relate to the sociological reality?
Jerusalem walls and checkpoints have created a variety of reciprocal reactions and perceptions between Jews and Arabs. This paper presents some Arab-Jewish views, focusing on the researcher’s self-image, observations, and experiences in different Jerusalemite border-zone spaces. Enforced walls and checkpoints between both sides posits one of the aims of violence attempting to halt the emergence of normal everyday interaction between the two hostile nations. Nevertheless, the reality of mundane life shows differences in the interaction and reciprocal imagery between the ruling and the ruled. The variation in Jewish-Arab mutual stereotypes refers to the distinction between the ideologies of individuals attached to collective ethnic and political identities, the contrasting nature of daily contact between neighbors (border zones) and the difference in time and space.

Jerusalem is considered a clear border-zone area with many ethnic, national, religious and military borderlines. It also witnesses many “border-times,” making people’s views of each other uncertain and fluid. While I use ‘border-zone’ to demonstrate to space boundaries, I use the term ‘border-time,’ referring to the conjuncture periods before and after a political or violent event (e.g., Palestinian bombing or Israel military attack), that may homogenize Jewish-Arab views and attitudes, and decrease the level of variation.

The visibility and invisibility of the lines between Arab-Jewish crossroads and walls of Jerusalem would never show systematic or settled relationships between Jews and Arabs, and thus, its residents would never present purely positive or purely negative mutual perceptions towards each other until the two communities are completely separated. The complete separation is created by the newly created massive Separation Wall. In addition to the three sources of variation mentioned above, these varying perceptions refer to the spheres and experiences of individual and collective Jewish-Arab coexistence or encounter. The anthropological research could reveal some of the individual experiences, which show that the Jerusalem boundary system is very dynamic in spite of the obvious religious and national divisions.

This paper is (based on the researcher’s fieldwork experience among both Arabs and Jews inside and around the Old City of Jerusalem since the beginning of Intifadatu al-Aqṣa, which broke out on September 28, 2000. The paper is based on the researcher’s Ph.D. dissertation submitted to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in June 2007. PhD dissertation is entitled, “Identities in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem: American Orthodox Jews between the Holy and the Mundane,” supervised by Professor Harvey Goldberg and Dr. Yitzhak Reiter.
Declan Keeney

Film Studies, Queen’s University Belfast
‘We Are Not Afraid’: A documentary journey in response to the Belfast Sarajevo Initiative.

The Siege of Sarajevo is the longest siege of a capital city in the history of modern warfare. It began on the 5th of April, 1992 and officially ended on the 29th of February 1996. UNICEF reported that “of the estimated 65,000 to 80,000 children in the city: at least 40 per cent had been directly shot at by snipers; 51 per cent had seen someone killed; 39 per cent had seen one or more family members killed; 19 per cent had witnessed a massacre; 48 per cent had their home occupied by someone else” These children have now grown up but echoes of the past still haunt the fabric of the space that surrounds them. How do these memories inform what they have become? This associational documentary journeys around Sarajevo, juxtaposing stories of the past with present day images of the Bosnian city. The stories told come from those who were and are students of the world famous Academy of Performing Arts in Sarajevo. This film was made in response to the Belfast Sarajevo Initiative, a collaboration between Queen’s University Belfast and the Academy of Performing Arts. Staff and students from both institutions created a 10-day site-specific performer-training programme. During 30 hours of workshops involving students working together intensively, practically and collaboratively around the theme of childhood memory, an experimental theatre piece entitled “We Are Not Afraid” was devised. This culminated in a public performance of the work at the international theatre festival MESS in Sarajevo. It is through the juxtaposition of past memories and present day imagery, including the Mess performance of We Are Not Afraid that we gain a greater understanding of life as a young person living in a post conflict Bosnian society and a visual snapshot of present day Sarajevo.
Luke Kelleher and Martin Melaugh

INCORE (International Conflict Research Institute), University of Ulster
Visualising the Conflict: Immersion in the Landscape of Victims and Commemoration in Northern Ireland

The University of Ulster received funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) to undertake a two-year project to develop a digital Archive related to the topic of victims. The project was entitled ‘Remembering’: Victims, Survivors and Commemoration in Northern Ireland. A team of researchers based at the Magee campus of the university documented the developments that have taken place in this subject area since 1997. Information that was collected during the project was made available through the existing CAIN (Conflict Archive on the INternet; cain.ulster.ac.uk) Web site in June 2009. CAIN is a Web site which provides a wide range of information and source material on the Northern Ireland conflict and politics in the region from 1968 to the present. The CAIN Project began in 1996 and the Web site was first made available on-line in March 1997.

Following the completion of the original project the AHRC announced additional capital funding and called for proposals to the Digital Equipment and Database Enhancement for Impact (DEDEFI) Scheme. CAIN submitted a proposal for a follow-up project which was designed to improve the access to, and the impact of, the databases which were compiled during the first project. Crucial to its success was the provision of a visual dimension enhancing the key databases collected during the first project. These key databases included Malcolm Sutton’s ‘Index of Deaths’ and a further database of conflict-related memorials in public spaces in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. A key element of the second project involved mapping location data related to victims and commemoration onto the Web. This was undertaken using both Google Maps/Earth and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to locate and add the latitude and longitude values for each record in the databases. GIS software was also used to analyse the data and to produce high quality maps. These maps show the location of deaths and memorials related to the conflict correlated with various socio-economic factors. They are designed to provide a spatial dimension and context for the data which they exhibit. This paper discusses the techniques used to create these maps and highlights some of the key findings to arise from them. The project produced innovative material, which was then made publicly available on the CAIN Web site. This material will aid research and provide additional insights for peace and conflict research and study within Northern Ireland and elsewhere in the world.
La Villette in the 19th arrondissement in contemporary Paris, France has been associated with crime. During the 1990s gang activities were prevalent in the area yet recently young men of African descent have embraced the Islamic faith, setting up local associations that discourage violence and unify their community. However gentrification means that spatial and social disconnection is growing between new and existing inhabitants, effecting group identities and the displacement and relocation of French-West African neighbourhoods from North East Paris into suburbs. In sociology, the term integration refers to the cultural adaptation of individuals into a new social and spatial environment. In Western societies the spatial integration of Ethnic minorities, is often disguised by calls for their assimilation within their chosen society. The process of integration contrary to that of assimilation normally implies a larger cultural transformation of the integrating body. Compared to the process of assimilation, integration also appears less painful to newcomers. The complexity regarding the integration of the Muslim communities of Asian and African origins, into France and the European Union is partly linked to a racial conception of what a Muslim is. If the Anglo-Saxon world largely opted to integrate migrants in the second half of the twentieth and early twenty first centuries, the Latin world including France has always used assimilation; a process seen by many as the mere continuation of a colonial system within the homeland or ex-colonial country. There is therefore much merit in exploring how informal communal networks generated in French-West African neighbourhoods could intersect with architectural/cultural redevelopments and current political and economic policies of citizenship within the French state. ‘Collective or public memory’ could provide an entry point to explore and map shared locations, social possibility, participation or exclusions. Conversations connect memories through acts of collaboration. People share their recollections with members of their group and rationally reorganize their stories of the past in accordance with others’ understandings of events, with and against other people situated in conflicting groups, in the context of alienation and through the knowledge that their predecessors and contemporaries transmit to them (Halbwachs, 1992: 48, Karstedt, 2009: 3-4). Collective memory is also utilised to hide identity and this ongoing project explores how visual and oral histories connect with everyday life through acts of cooperation. How could collective memories form and influence contemporary visual realities, legal procedures and pictorial archives? Political institutions use historical photographs of everyday life to visualise and create specific social histories and commemorate public memories. Our aim is to create alternative historical viewpoints of the 19th arrondissement and utilise photographic, participatory processes and architectural spaces to trigger collective or public memories from within the French-West African population; activating new oral/visual discourse about spatial division, social conflict/cohesion, assimilation and integration in contemporary Paris and within French society.
Rassem Khamaisi

Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Haifa; and IPCC, East Jerusalem

**Barriers to Achieving the Right to Plan and Socio-Cultural Urban Conflict in Jerusalem**

Planning is not just a professional and technical procedure; it’s a socio-political action which determines the allocation of resources. The literature has a numbers of planning definitions that take into consideration the planning objectives, planning system and planning processes, as well as the large debate of the planning approaches; top-down vs. bottom-up, planning with/ for community. Planning and producing plans articulate the power relation in state and in society which has a clear role in shaping the urban fabric, and defining the rights in private and public spaces. Planning is a process that includes various stakeholder interests and needs in the urban fabric, in addition to the cultural orientation. It can contribute to social-cultural and geopolitical conciliation in urban fabric under conflict and dispute and vice versa. Planning and plans’ implementation that ignore the cultural-political diversity and deny the right of community to their city and public space may lead to escalate the conflict, and deepen the gaps and disparities in the urban conflict.

The goals of the presentation and paper are to shed a light on the technical and procedural barriers used by the planning system and through the planning process to prevent or at least delay action in initiating, discussing, authorizing and implementing plans. Despite the explicit official declaration of the democratization and decentralization of the planning system, their many implicit barriers connected to the components affect the planning process and guide bureaucracy/employees behaviour. On the other hand, among the community there are internal socio-cultural, political and structural barriers that are combined with external barriers, despite the asymmetry between the internal and external barriers which create a false planning that contributes to the expansion of the urban conflict. The deposition this paper presents is: barriers that exclude the right of the Palestinians to plan deny and limit their right to the city. Urban planning is used as an effective mechanism to shrink the Palestinian right to the city which in turn secures the urban conflict.

The paper is based on field research and planning efforts conducted by the author (the researcher as Planner) where Jerusalem is the case study. This case is not unique, although it carries some special aspects in situation and status, yet similarities in other places under colonial regime, city and sociality in conflict were found. These similarities were found among the Arab Palestinians in Israel. The presentation and paper’s main focus however will remain on Jerusalem.
Since 2000, and especially since the Annapolis Conference in late 2007, Israel has been busy augmenting the Jewish presence in East Jerusalem. First, Israel expands its settlements in order to link them up and create a continuous block of Jewish habitation. Second, Israeli settlers have moved into Palestinian neighborhoods with the express purpose of preventing the ethno-national division of the city according to President Clinton’s parameter of “Arab areas are Palestinian and Jewish ones are Israeli.” Third, Israel works to add, de facto, further territories to Israeli-ruled East Jerusalem. Fourth, Israel wants to divide al-Haram al-Sharif (the Muslim name for the holy site that the Jews call the Temple Mount) from Palestinian residential areas. Fifth, Jewish national-religious groups have pressed to change the status quo at al-Haram al-Sharif/the Temple Mount.

Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem tell only one side of the Israeli regime there. The other side of the coin is the Palestinians’ living conditions.

In my presentation I will discuss these five fields of activity and show how that they are directly related to Israel’s policy elsewhere in the occupied Palestinian territory. In other words, whereas Israel argues that Jerusalem is different than the West Bank, in fact Israel uses in East Jerusalem similar ruling methods to those it uses in the West Bank.

Conflict in Cities, Department of Architecture, University of Cambridge
Visualising Policy? The Case of Dividing Jerusalem

This paper addresses the problem of ‘visualising’ policy in contested cities, through maps, drawings and other visual imagery. It focuses on the example of Jerusalem and current proposals to divide the city. In particular the paper focuses on the question of a ‘special regime’ that most proposals envisage for the Old City, which would effectively sever it from the rest of the city and wider hinterland. The proposals will be contrasted with visual research Conflict in Cities has conducted on key interface areas in the Muslim quarter that bears witness to the urban metabolism of the Old City. This allows shedding critical light on the deadening urban effects of leading proposals under discussion, such as those of the Geneva Accords, the Jerusalem Institute of Israel Studies and the UNESCO Action Plan. The key question we pose is: what is the purpose of visualising the city? This question is framed as the tension between urban design as a posteriori ‘problem solving’ for policy choices versus visual research as a tool of analysis and critique of policy. The paper argues for using visual research and representation as a vehicle for understanding the interaction of communities and rich urban settings, rather than using it as instrument for legitimating policies that rarely take a serious look at the dynamics of everyday life on the ground.
Craig Larkin

Conflict in Cities, Department of Politics, University of Exeter
Resistance, Resilience or Resignation? Palestinian Jerusalemite
Responses to the Separation Barrier

Since the construction of the Separation barrier in 2003, there has been significant focus on anti-wall discourses and campaigns by NGO’s, activists, international community and Israeli leftist groups – yet little empirical work on how these forms of protest, impact and inform local Palestinian responses, particularly within Jerusalem? Do such protest movements reflect grass-root concerns or have they become a replacement for local activism? Are they monopolising the public debate or are they providing space and support for communal acts of resistance? How are local residents implicated in the process? This paper will focus on the diverse and complex responses of Palestinian communities affected by the wall – dislocated from family and urban networks, encircled and enclosed by the trajectory of the barrier and forced to adapt to new spatial surroundings and changing social conditions. It seeks to probe beyond the dominant narratives and popular accounts of ‘stopthewall’ resistance to explore alternative Palestinian forms of confronting the Jerusalem barrier through graffiti, protest art and alternative wall tours. Such oppositional practices employ the wall as both a site of public contention, but also a space to be reclaimed or re-scribed through text, image and discursive narrative. Resistance assumes more ambiguous tropes and strategies of defiance; invoking humour, hope and irony as well as the ability to adapt, survive or simply ‘get by’ (Allen, 2008). At the same time, it is important to question whether such practices may actually reify the wall’s presence and permanence, and equally whether they encourage a further physical and discursive colonialization of Palestinian space by Western graffiti artists and Israeli left-wing activists?

Olivier Legrand

Department of Geography, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
Urban Sovereignty in Highly Contested Space – Learning from Nicosia and Jerusalem

Jerusalem and Nicosia are archetypes of divided urban spaces embroiled in ethno-national conflicts. Yet the two cities are also undergoing empowerment as part of the growing role of cities in a globalizing world. This paper investigates these ‘divided cities’ by focusing on their urban regime – a question still marginalized in the literature on ethnic conflicts and their urban management. Do cities shape ethnic relations differently to national and ethnocratic states? The paper probes the notion of urban regime and sovereignty by interrogating how the impacts of globalization and ethnic conflict are altering the hierarchically nested relations between city and state. Using a non state-centred approach on sovereignty (state of exception and gray space; social sovereignty and urban regime), it explores how urban planning/policy is proactively engaged, not only in the maximizing of growth, but also in the construction and reconstruction of ethnic relations and regime legitimacy. The comparative analysis of Jerusalem and Nicosia evaluates the ability of these urban regimes to create a measure of urban sovereignty, new forms of ethnic relations and regime (il)legitimacy through their planning policies. The paper concludes by observing that urban cities are likely to play a growing role in the management of both ethnic relations and globalization, and hence their regimes should become a central concern to contemporary urban studies.
Since the signing of the Good Friday Agreement in 1998, Belfast has slowly been making the transition from a city of ‘the troubles’ to a post-conflict city. This is reflected in the city centre landscape in particular which has seen an influx of investment reflected in the new apartment blocks, shops and offices which continue to dominate the terrain creating a sense of optimism that Belfast has left its tortured history behind. Yet despite the proliferation of new buildings, many residential parts of the city remain unchanged. In particular, the historical legacy of segregated housing presents a stark reminder of the city’s uneasy past. The euphemistically named ‘peace lines’ continue to separate working class Catholic from working class Protestant communities. A survey of ‘peace lines’ carried out by the Institute for Conflict Research in 2009 indentified eighty eight barriers separating fifteen parts of the city where clusters of Catholics and Protestants live side by side apart in single identity communities (Community Relations Council 2009). These barriers include walls, steel fences and gates of varying heights and lengths making it difficult to accurately estimate the number of barriers in Belfast due to differing interpretations of what constitutes a peace line.

However, the primary purpose in their construction has been to act as a buffer zone between Catholic and Protestant communities and all of them have been erected in response to the troubles which broke out in Northern Ireland in 1969. The purpose of this paper is to bring a temporal and generational dimension to attitudes to the peace walls. While the mistrust of adults in interface communities is perhaps understandable due to their generational relationship to ‘the troubles’ in that they lived their childhoods during a more turbulent period of the Northern Ireland conflict, young people by contrast have grown up against a backdrop of paramilitary ceasefires, the signing of a peace agreement, the setting up of a Northern Ireland Assembly and the transformation of Belfast into a post-conflict city. How do young people living in peace line communities view peace lines? The paper will explore how young people in interface communities accept, reject and transform dominant representations of peace walls in Belfast. By focusing on the contradictory narratives produced by young people, the research aims to demonstrate the diversity of their experiences of growing up in a city divided by physical and symbolic boundaries and the ways in which they make sense of segregated urban landscapes.
Nimrod Luz

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, The Western Galilee College

Spatial Discourses of Sanctity as Means of Struggle and Empowerment in a Contested City Israeli-Palestinians and Re-‘Inventing of Traditions’ Regarding the Haram al-Sharif

Urban scholars have a long tradition attending to how certain social groups come to experience and represent the city in ways different to others. These very representations in public discourse are shown to be entwined with the production and reproduction of the material needs as well as signs and symbols sustaining groups’ identity. In this paper I look into the ways the Islamic sacred site in Jerusalem is increasingly being represented and perceived not only as the most important religious symbol but also as a mythical site of national revival. Over the last thirty years there has been a surge of activities promoting the place not only as an Islamic center but also as a key national Palestinian site. This paper is taking the challenge to explain some of the current complexities revolving the religio-political contestation over Jerusalem. I argue that the urban landscape is both the medium and the outcome of the intersection of different sets of religious values but also of conflicting national aspirations. My aim is threefold: a. To examine the ways the Haram al-Sharif is being produced and explained against the background of a minority struggle for empowerment through the cityscape, b. To contextualise the symbolic (and very often highly material) struggle over Jerusalem as a space of flow where the urban is growingly influenced and influencing different scales and informing a national revival mythology, c. To build and argument around the relevancy of religiously based conflicts in contested cities.

Albeit, it needs to be stressed that the case of Jerusalem, unique as it may seem, is part of the growing importance of religion in urban conflicts. Further, recent riots in French cities over the very ‘right to the city’, street revolts in various European cities and the last contestation over memory and monuments in “Ground Zero” seem to demonstrate how the urban scale is increasingly succumbing to influences of multi-scalar settings. This paper seeks to further our understanding regarding the relevancy of these forces and the role of religion and sanctity in the conflicted urban milieu and the way they inform and shape contemporary cities in conflict. In particular, I would like to build an argument around the importance of sanctity and sacred sites in dictating not only the nature of urban conflict but also the feasibility of reconciliation and daily management of the city. The paper is based on extensive survey of Islamic sources and spatial survey of the changes in the Haram al-Sharif and environ conflated and complimented with thirty open-ended interviews of public figures, religious luminaries, intellectuals and commentators of the Palestinian minority in Israel. The interlocutors discussed freely and at length their understanding of the place, it’s role in recent history and its status in any would be peaceful solution between Israel and the Palestinian Authority.
Mostar’s Central Zone: Battles over Shared Space in a Divided City

An Interim Statute of the City was enacted in 1996 as a temporary solution for the self-governance of Mostar. With this Statute, the de facto division of Mostar into Croat and Muslim sides which had occurred during the war was institutionalized in the city’s postwar government. Seven largely autonomous municipal districts were established within the city, three in the west with Croat majorities, three in the east with Muslim majorities and a small jointly controlled Central Zone.

As the only politically shared space in the city the international drafters of the Interim Statue hoped the Central Zone could foster discussion and interaction between the two sides. It was also hoped that the Central Zone would provide a physical starting point for a reunited city when the Interim Statute was eventually replaced with a permanent one. Because the Central Zone was clearly designed to undermine the city’s division and “nationally exclusive rule” it was the most contentious issue of the Interim Statue negotiations. Debate over the borders of the Central Zone incited the passions of everyone involved, regarding both questions of how much area of the city it should include and precisely which buildings should fall within its boundaries.

This paper will explore the proposals and responses of various groups and institutions (local, national, and international) that participated in the discussion of the Central Zone’s parameters as well as address the motivations for, particulars of, and reactions to the last minute changes to the boundaries of the Central Zone that were made at the signing conference in Rome. This paper will also document and analyze the attempted and completed reconstruction and new construction projects that occurred within and adjacent to the Central Zone, with a particular focus on the Liska Street Cemetery (excluded from the zone and a source of contention), the thwarted attempts to build a Croatian National Theater and Catholic Cathedral, and the begrudging sharing Old Gymnasium.

The debates surrounding these projects and the Central Zone itself all focused on questions of how the physical transformation of the city impacted its division and potential reunion. This paper will argue that while the international community and city administration’s attempts to preserve the shared, multicultural composition of the Central Zone successfully prevented its domination by any one particular group, they simultaneously contributed to the solidification of the city’s spatial division by ensuring that all Croat and Muslim cultural and religious institutions were built only within religious-national enclaves on either “side” in the decade after the war. Because the Central Zone was kept free of structures with particular associations and the only communal institutions built there were the city and federation government buildings, the result was actually to create a zone of interest to neither group and thus a buffer that prevented even accidental contact between the groups and the familiarity and understanding that might facilitate.
Since the beginning of 19th century the Balkans has become a synonym for aggressive nationalism and unbridled violence. Moreover both nationalism and protracted warfare are often seen as the most important impediments to social advancement of the region. In contrast to these highly popular perceptions I argue that for much of its history the Balkan region was characterised by limited inter-state violence, absence of serious urban conflicts and by notable lack of nationalist ideologies. Furthermore by comparing the processes of nation-state and city formation and warfare in the Balkans with those in Western Europe the paper aims to show that it is the weakness, not the strength, of nationalism and protracted warfare that historically have been the principal obstacles for social, economic and political development. Unlike the early Western Europe where the cities, states and nations often developed together and where the protracted organised violence increased the infrastructural potency of states and eventually made its citizens loyal to their respective polities, the relative stability and shortage of large scale warfare in the Balkans has contributed to the fact that the region lagged behind in the development of large urban congregations and the robust state capacity.

The general argument of the paper is developed in dialogue with Tilly’s theory that ties city and state formation to proliferation of wars and Gellner’s model that links the rise of nationalism to emergence of standardised educational systems and industrialisation. In an attempt to partially disapprove Tilly and vindicate Gellner I argue that the experience of the Balkan region indicates that although wars can prove important catalysts of city and state formation they may not necessarily contribute to nation formation. When the cities, states and nations emerge together wars are likely to act as incentives for further state development but when these processes develop around different trajectories they can find themselves on the collision course and the nation-formation can undermine state development.

Murals are a prominent, internationally recognized feature of Northern Ireland’s landscape. While few deny their political, cultural, and economic importance, possible shifts in the contents, locations, and purposes of murals have received less attention. What, if anything, has changed in the contents and locations of public symbolic displays in violence prone areas of Northern Ireland? To begin to answer this question, we examine both thematic and spatial changes in the population of murals in West Belfast between 2009 and 2010. Supplemented by key informant interviews, the findings of the analysis suggest that changes in murals entail multi-faceted, tactical efforts to either facilitate, resist, or mediate social change (political, social, economic, and cultural). These efforts frequently involve processes of resistance, negotiation, and the channeling of resources. In this sense, changes in murals provide a microcosm of the peace process in Northern Ireland.
Built Environment Research Institute, University of Ulster, National Research Council of Italy, Urban Planning, University of Naples


Several contemporary cities are plagued by issues of social conflict, due to the presence of different groups divided by their income, culture, religion or race. This condition often co-exists with an on-going globalization process, which reframes the geography of local conflicts in the wider arena, thus deeply impacting the perception of the local stakeholders in respect to the broader community.

We intend to look at Belfast from an urban point not just as a city where economic development and regeneration occurred. The influences of global capitalism has shaped the urban form over the last fifteen years since the peace process but at the expense of clearing out the heritage of the divided city and its past.

This paper focuses on the potential of an urban-design centred approach in analysing, interpreting and managing conflicting neighbourhoods, whose residents show distinct cultural features. A case-study research method is adopted, in order to capture the multi-faceted issues embedded in such a complex condition. The paper therefore focuses on Belfast, which has been struggling for years with problems related to the inter-religious conflicts. By applying a Kevin Lynch based approach, the urban pattern of some areas in Belfast (i.e., the interface areas crossed by the so-called peace-lines) are analysed, in order to show the impact of the social conflict on the urban grid. A lot of research has been carried out by scholars on the peace lines and walls, but the originality of our proposal is to look at this theme from an urban design approach, and to analyse the divided city and the future shape of it from an urban point perspective, not just an economic or social one. The potential of retrofitting the existing damaged urban grid by gradually re-designing the urban pattern would be tested and demonstrated, through interviews to community workers in order to verify the opportunity to mediate the conflict in these kind of “cross-border” areas. This research is aimed at using the retrofit and urban solutions to re-brand and re-imaging divided cities and conflict-damaged cities and turn that divisive element ‘the wall’ into a positive asset that will offer an alternative approach to city regeneration and governance, that is based in urban design quality gain not just only in profit. The concept will be further developed by looking at the division as part of the heritage and context of the city, that could be turned into a positive urban element to attract global attention for the local, community on a re-branding city approach.

Finally, the methodology is further tested in an Italian divide city like Naples, in order to verify its transferability and its potential into an international perspective and its application to other divided cities and gated communities worldwide.

This paper pushes the existing body of knowledge forward, by introducing an innovative methodology in the urban design practice, suitable to be implemented in conflicting neighbourhood contexts.
In December 1917 the British occupied Jerusalem and in a few years established a Mandate to rule Palestine. During the First World War British policy makers made several contradicting promises to different actors in relation to the Middle East, the most dramatic to the Zionist movement with the Balfour Declaration promising the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. When the Balfour Declaration became public knowledge in late 1917 the attitude of local Arab Christians towards the Jews changed, as they felt threatened by Jewish immigration. This paper aims to show how the war had a major impact on the local Christian communities through the renegotiation of local alliances and on the de-marginalisation of the Christians, who subsequently became an active part of the emerging Arab nationalist movement. Through the discussion of the Nebi Musa riots that took place in April 1920, at the zenith of this renegotiation of alliances, this paper will also show how urban violence was turned into a test of national struggle between Arabs and Zionists and how violence became part of the local political vocabulary marking permanently the local identities of Jerusalem.

Local Christian notables in Jerusalem joined their Muslim counterparts in political, cultural and literary associations which opposed Jewish immigration. One of the main problems of these associations was the political vision of their Muslim members concerning the future of Palestine. Some local Muslim leaders encouraged Palestinian Christians to convert to Islam, as some Muslim leaders viewed Christian faith closely intertwined with European interests in the region and therefore corrupted. This paper argues religions were not transformed in their doctrines, but allowed some exchanges due to the contingency of the situation and political reasons. In April 1920, in occasion of the Nebi Musa celebrations, an Islamic religious festival whose purpose was to create a bond between various parts of country, riots broke out. Several
Ruth McAlister

School of Criminology, Politics and Social Policy, University of Ulster

Transitional Challenges for Loyalist Paramilitaries in ‘Post’ Conflict Belfast

Following 40 years of conflict there is a growing momentum behind the creation and vision of Belfast as a shared city. Indeed much academic literature has been written on Northern Ireland’s transformation from a conflict-ridden society to that of a ‘transitional’ society or ‘post’ conflict society. Conversely it has also been argued by Sluka (2009) that there is no peace in Northern Ireland, and that the future looks bleak. In particular he predicts a resurgence of loyalist violence and a renewed paramilitary campaign, rather than a real and lasting peace. This paper suggests that such negative suppositions are deeply unhelpful in understanding the complexity of loyalist paramilitaries, their transition, and to the difficulties that loyalist communities encounter.

There is mounting evidence that loyalist communities face a number of challenges, for example, some are among the most deprived areas in Northern Ireland with the profile of the Inner East and Greater Shankill areas of Belfast showing evidence of high levels of relative deprivation. The impact that relative deprivation has on loyalist communities only serves to magnify the other problems faced in these areas, such as that of an ageing population, high crime rates, high unemployment, low educational attainment, poor housing, poor health, and lack of community cohesion. Loyalist communities are further described as having poor social capital, a lack of community infrastructure and poor access to funding. Another complicating factor is that there is a view within these communities that the 1998 Belfast Agreement has benefited the nationalist community.

Whilst understanding the issues facing loyalist communities in disadvantaged Belfast is important and provides context to the paper, the focus of this presentation is on the transitional struggle of loyalist paramilitaries. This research builds on one of my PhD findings which identified that loyalist paramilitaries still control the community voice in some areas of Belfast. In order to explore this in more detail a further 15 in-depth semi structured interviews with loyalist ex-combatants, protestant politicians and the local community have been undertaken. Preliminary analysis suggests a growing frustration and bitterness between former loyalist paramilitaries and the state, including dissatisfaction with Protestant politicians, increasing resentment about the way the media report on former loyalist paramilitaries and the perceived erosion of Protestant culture. This paper proposes that these challenges must be addressed in order to assist the volatile transition of the loyalist paramilitary organisations. Ignoring the complexity of the issues facing loyalist paramilitary transformation may have grave consequences for Belfast as a ‘post’ conflict city and for loyalist communities more generally.
Twenty-one years after the onset of armed struggle against Indian rule, a cultural crisis grips the Kashmir Valley, situated high in the Himalayan mountains on the contested border between India and Pakistan. Violence, fear, and censorship closed the social spaces where the emotional impact of the turmoil could be expressed in the Kashmir community. For the past two years, Elayne McCabe filmed and researched the relationship between the Kashmir Valley’s artistic heritage and contemporary artist community. From old Srinagar’s architecture, to Sufiyana Mousiqee (Islamic Sufi Music), to present-day poetry and visual art, her project documents the transformation of Kashmir’s cultural expression within the context of conflict and globalization. Ms. McCabe is creating Kasheer, a feature length documentary film exploring the intersection of contemporary art, cultural identity, and political mayhem to offer a new perspective on the everyday realities of Kashmiri life in crisis.

Kasheer uses artistic representations of the conflict to build a larger narrative about the social-psychological landscape of contemporary Kashmir. The militarized neighborhoods, destroyed architecture, temples, and mosques, abandoned homes, and environmental pollution are physical manifestations of the breakdown of Kashmir’s community in the aftermath of the militancy. These spaces provide a visual framework in which to contextualize the challenges faced by the art community to produce work that both preserves a distinct cultural identity and represents the Kashmiri experience on local and international levels. Today there is a peculiar lack of community willpower to preserve the region’s indigenous language, heritage sites, and folk traditions, which are integral aspects of a national identity. Artists and thinkers often refer to this cultural decay as part of India’s occupation strategy, on par with Chinese tactics in Tibet. The film examines both the work of artists and the physical transformation of the region to explore the specificities of the Kashmir conflict and the idea that systematic destruction of culture and identity is part of war itself.
Sara McDowell

School of Environmental Sciences, University of Ulster

‘The Battle for Jerusalem’: Political Archaeology and Memory in the City of David

This paper explores the ramifications of recent excavations in East Jerusalem and contextualises them within the ethnocratic project of the Israeli state. It focuses specifically on the events currently unfolding in the neighbourhood of Silwan which is located in the Holy Basin just outside the old city’s Southern walls. Home to some 40,000 Palestinians, Silwan has increasingly found itself at the epicentre of the battle for Jerusalem which has gained increasing currency since the failure of the 1993 Oslo Accords. Annexed to Israel in 1967 following the Six Day War, East Jerusalem represents for those advocates of a two-state solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, the future capital of a Palestinian State. Yet the meandering territorial aspirations of Israeli settlers into this part of the city have important implications for the prospects of peace in the region. Political archaeology is in many ways facilitating the renegotiation of the Green Line Boundary and mapping Jewish presence onto the contested terrain of East Jerusalem. In the centre of Silwan lies a new place of pilgrimage for Israel’s Jewish population: the City of David. A huge archaeological compound, the City of David is thought to be the location of ancient Jerusalem with remnants pointing to both the First and Second Temple periods. The park, which is now a thriving tourist destination, was handed over to Elad in 1998, a private ‘non-profit’ organisation which works to settle Jews in East Jerusalem, by the Jerusalem Municipality and the Antiquities Authority. Since the takeover, Elad’s scope over Silwan has steadily increased with more and more Jewish families steadily settling in the neighbourhood. Coupled with the increasing encroachment of the separation barrier which severs the neighbourhood from its Palestinian neighbours, the right to belong in Silwan is slowly being withdrawn from its Palestinian inhabitants. The ‘new’ City of David site has irreversibly bound East Jerusalem to its Western counterpart, further complicating the territorial boundaries and fusing the national conflict with the religious one.

Christopher Loughlin

School of History and Anthropology, Queen’s University Belfast

That Damnable Northern Ireland Labour Party: Violence and Intimidation Against the Belfast Labour Movement, 1924-1930

There is a widespread assumption that public space in Belfast has been contested solely by Unionism and Nationalism. This paper will argue that a third antagonistic element fought for political room and territory: the Labour movement. Much has been made of the failure of Northern Irish Labour to politically challenge Unionism and Nationalism, but explanations of why Labour failed are still disputed. This paper will contend that intimidation (by state and non-state actors) hampered and restricted the ability of Labour to make an impact on the politics of Northern Ireland in the inter-war period.

Labour disorders, such as the 1932 Outdoor Relief riots, are perceived as the exception to the natural Unionist-Nationalist dichotomy. Legislation, however, was used to ban, prohibit, and censor the actions of Labour activists. Suspect demonstrations were banned. State forces (such as the police and B-Specials) were used to intimidate members of the Labour movement. Violence was used to break up meetings, intimidate Labour activists, and to curtail the political development of Labour politics.

The paper will contribute to the debate over why Labour was a political failure in twentieth century Ireland. It will also help demonstrate one aspect of the discriminatory practices used by the Ulster Unionist regime in inter-war Northern Ireland. The question of the use of repressive anti-terrorist legislation in the British Isles and its application against wider civil society will also be addressed. Lastly, the paper will contribute to questions about territoriality, the significance of Labour identity, and the struggle for public space in Belfast.
Maura Moore and Johnston Price

Forthspring Inter-Community Group, Belfast
‘Neutral’ or ‘Shared’ Spaces in the City?

The proposed paper will focus on Forthspring Inter Community Group as an example of a project developing a shared space on an interface. Forthspring was established in 1997 by Springfield Methodist Church and 3 locally based projects with the aim of promoting reconciliation between the historically divided communities adjoining the Springfield Road in West Belfast. The 2 communities, Woodvale and Clonard/Springfield Road area, are separated by the longest and oldest peacewall in Belfast.

The paper will briefly describe the work of the project and explore how the origins of the project impacted, and continue to impact, on how the project is used and perceived by both communities. It will attempt to assess the impact of a project with the ambition to promote reconciliation on an interface and the limitations faced by such a project. The paper will consider the impact of broader economic, political and social factors on a reconciliation project, having first defined how the project itself conceives reconciliation. Economic factors include the absence of regeneration of interfaces against a backdrop of major regeneration projects in other parts of the city and the specific experience of the decline of traditional industries locally and the way in which new employment opportunities have embraced fair employment but done little to build community links. Work and community were once linked, often with negative consequences, now they are almost entirely separated with differing, but still negative, consequences. The paper will look at recent economic developments locally and consider the absence of development on the large InvestNI site, previously owned by Mackies, the site of Bill Clinton’s visit to West Belfast in 1995 and the proposed site for the West Belfast university campus that did not come to fruition.

Political factors include the hesitant progress of the peace process and the political settlement plus the current debate on Cohesion, Sharing and Integration. The project will consider how political and administrative boundaries contribute to reproducing the very divisions the project strives to overcome and the possibilities for movement in a polarized political landscape.

Social factors include demographic changes – the significant decline in the Shankill/Woodvale population and the growth of the population and housing demand in the Clonard/Springfield Road area and specific events during the year including the Whiterock Parade, an annual disputed Orange Order parade, which has given rise to serious rioting at various times. The paper will explore intergenerational issues – the relationship between young adults and older people is often fraught on the interface. It will also explore the relationships within communities as well as between communities. A key factor in determining cross-community relationships is the extent to which the individual communities are stable and self-confident. An initiative by Northern Ireland Housing Executive, Shared Neighbourhoods, will be referred to. Forthspring is being supported by NIHE to develop itself further as a shared space under this programme.

The paper will argue for the need for shared spaces at the very places were communities are most divided physically to facilitate the social intercourse that will allow interaction, that in turn facilitates reconciliation. Initially these spaces are occupied by local residents most committed to building bridges but as they become more established, and better resourced, they can become part of the normal social fabric and a catalyst for diverse communities rather than the maintenance of segregation. The paper will argue for a strong definition of shared space as places were people interact explicitly as members of different social, political and ethnic groupings and against neutral spaces or shared spaces that don’t promote interaction or in practice encourage parallel use by segregated communities.
Any assessment of the relative stability of Belfast and Montreal would have found it hard to predict the every different outcomes which emerged by the end of the century. The citizens of Montreal had recently burnt their parliament, survived a threatening rebellion involving several elite families and generated a series of ethnic political organisations for the followers of Saints Andrew, Patrick, George and St Jean Baptist. In Belfast serious civil disorder was reserved for election celebrations but there nothing on the scale of many British cities. Bristol had burnt half a bourgeois suburb, Merthyr kept the army at bay for several days and the north of England required substantial military resources to suppress the 1842 rising. By 1914, Montreal had achieved prosperous accommodation and Belfast gained a reputation for endemic violence and instability Montreal and Belfast had much in common. They were industrialising port and commercial cities. Both had origins in military and cultural conquest. Both encapsulated conflict lines of ethnicity, religion, language and class. Stress was intensified by rapid population growth and substantial swings in ethnic composition. This paper will examine the structures and processes by which Montreal achieved an accommodation of difference whilst Belfast created a culture of exclusion and violence. The contrast was exemplified by the manner in which Anglophone and Francophone shared municipal power and co-operated in many commercial and development projects. In Montreal, Francophones owned around half the real estate, whilst in Belfast Catholics had little share of capital. The Quebec Act of 1774 had left spaces for the development of civil society very different from conditions in Ireland. French Canadians were guaranteed their religion, language and property rights enabling a pillarised construction of civil society within a federal structure. Elites co-operated in the modernisation of law as well as major capital projects of suburban, port and railway building. In Montreal the spaces for self rule at local level were expanded in suburbs, parishes and voluntary associations. In Belfast they were limited and contested.

The last 15 years have seen ethno-religious segregation in Northern Ireland stabilise as mixed residential neighbourhoods have expanded on the back of peace and political stability. However, the recession has exposed some of the fragility of these changes and in particular the overreliance on property led growth and the housing market to achieve lasting forms of desegregation. This paper examines the nature of socio-cultural spatial change and in particular how uneven urban restructuring has privileged some housing markets at the expense of others. Using data collected in 1996, 2003 and 2010 the paper shows how planning, counter-urbanisation and comparative wealth have slowly challenged rigid patterns of segregation. Here, the analysis suggests that neoliberalising processes and global economic changes increasingly shape the pattern of segregation and levels of mixing in the context of fragile and uneven ‘post-conflict’ change. The paper concludes by highlighting the implications for skills among planners and regeneration practitioners both nationally and internationally.
Jerusalem, as a politically divided city, mirrors the wider Palestinian Israeli conflict and symbolizes the essence of the historic dispute of both sides’ claims to the city. Throughout the history of negotiations, treaties and conventions, the city was labeled as a Judized center for Israel that cannot be waivered and Palestinians insisted that no solution will be reached without resolving the issue of Jerusalem.

On a Geo-demographic level, Jerusalem city had witnessed extreme territorial changes due to the dominance of Israeli settlements that were and still are being built in and around the city and has challenged the identity and character of the city. On a functional level, until the eve of the Peace Process, East Jerusalem was the metropolitan of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, where the city hosted the largest service, media and political institutions.

Gradually, Jerusalem was torn out from its Palestinian urban context and Ramallah had become the new urban center for the West Bank, especially after the erection of the Separation Wall in 2001. This had also lead to the transference of functions from Jerusalem to Ramallah leading to transference and displacement of professionals and businesses to Ramallah city as well.

The purpose of this paper is to depict the urban functionality and context of Jerusalem city in reference to the Palestinian context, and how it affects the conflict in the city. The paper will present a barrier analysis of obstructions or the city (east and west) from becoming a capital for two states on functional and spatial levels, and where it leads - intensification of conflict or the resolution of the conflict. The analysis will zoom in on the Old City and how it serves as a living center, addressing its functional and geo-political conditions, who it is serving, and the impact it has on the conflict in the city in its entirety.

The paper will also define the options and chances of creating a Palestinian urban zone with Jerusalem as its heart and Ramallah and Bethlehem as its satellite urban centers.
Idit Nathan
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Seam and Separation Lines - On artworks’ ‘profanation’ of the divide in Jerusalem

‘Just as none of us is outside or beyond geography, 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.’ (Edward Said)

‘For me, the political always comes into play in questions of divisions and boundaries’ (Jacque Rancière)

Since the establishment of the state of Israel the various ‘seam’ and ‘separation’ lines as well as concrete structures slicing through the region have inspired artists grappling with the interplay of the political and the poetic in the context of the conflict and its implication on national identities. Jerusalem sits at the heart of this grid of lines and concrete structures, where two people share a complex and ‘stubborn history of intimacy’ (Hochberg, 2007: 4). The paper will follow Robert Atkin’s assertion that ‘if art is to continue to matter, artists must not only provide alternative ways of participating, but also of cultivating critical perspectives that ensure the possibility of individual and collective engagement...’ (2008: 64). By focusing on recent works, which are ‘relational’ in nature (Bourriaud, 1998) it will suggest that the very shift of viewers’ relationship to the work, as the works move out of the gallery and into the city itself in some cases and challenge our modernist or conception of the gallery in others, is instrumental to why these works can be seen as Agambian acts of ‘profanation’; an act that Agamben sees as a ‘political task’.

In my discussion, I shall examine recent works such as Love Sum Game (2006) by Israeli artists Eitan Heller and Joseph Sprintzak - who played an impossible tennis match across the eight meter wall. I shall also discuss Radio Ballash (2007) by artists Adi Kaplan, Shahar Carmel and Noam Kaplan, who invited audiences to share a taxi ride along the ‘seam line’ in the city whilst listening to a radio sketch narrating a region without borders. Finally, Francis Allys’ Green Line (Sometimes doing something poetic can become political and sometimes doing something political can become poetic) where the artist’s action of dribbling green paint along the forgotten Green line in the city is then documented and relayed to an audience who can choose the narrative to accompany the video in the gallery, will also be discussed.

This paper is part of a larger practice led fine art research project currently under way based at Central St Martin’s College of Art and Design at the University of the Arts London, titled Art Of Play In Zones Of Conflict – The Case of Israel Palestine, which examines the inherent contradictions derived from the juxtaposing of war/conflict/violence with play/games/humour/fun4 (http://www.csm.arts.ac.uk/49587.htm).
Michael O’Broin
Trinity College Dublin
Citizenship After Conflict, Citizenship After Politics: Shared Space and Technologies of Citizenship in Contemporary Belfast.

This paper focuses on the analysis of technologies of citizenship and their effects on politics through the lens of urban regeneration in Belfast. On the basis of qualitative interviews with participants in the Skainos urban regeneration project, located in East Belfast, and documentary research on the broader ‘shared space’ policy context, I argue that post-conflict citizenship tends towards post-political citizenship. Where citizenship, like the state itself, is founded on the recognition of differences in order to resolve conflicts, both conflict and universality are eroded if not eliminated altogether. I explore both how this takes place through contemporary technologies of citizenship and what the effects of these technologies are on politics. The analysis of citizenship as a set of socio-spatial practices linking identity, politics and ethics provides an important perspective from which to approach both the ‘post-conflict city’ and the ‘post-conflict state’.

Niall Ó Dochartaigh
School of Political Science and Sociology, National University of Ireland, Galway
Cities Inside-Out : The Externalization of Cities in Conflict

Conflicts in cities are nested in wider national and international contexts that frequently frustrate the efforts of states to confine such conflicts to a local or national context. This paper outlines three aspects of the externalization of cities in conflict, three ways in which urban spaces are rendered alien. It examines firstly the externalizing effect of the militarization of urban spaces, outlining the ways in which military geographies interact with rebel strategies to constitute urban spaces as war zones, fields of battle detached from the domestic realm of order. It looks secondly at the related issue of the detachability of cities in conflict, expressed through state openness to redrawing international boundaries in order to formally externalize certain cities. Finally, this paper outlines how the embeddedness of urban conflicts in wider geopolitical contexts gives an international and external character to urban conflicts that shapes the everyday actions of actors on the ground. The paper draws primarily on examples from the Irish case to argue for the importance of the dynamic relationship between interior and external spaces in shaping urban conflicts.
This paper explores the changing relationships between cities and frontiers in contested states i.e., where the territorial borders of the state, or even its very existence, are at the heart of political conflict. Building on the framework of the Conflict in Cities Project, www.conflictincities.org, the focus is on a number of contemporary cities, divided on ethno-national grounds, and spanning Europe and the Middle East. These cities are either located in the historic frontier lands of empire and/or in the contested borderlands of contemporary national states.

The city – frontier relationship bears a heavy weight of historical connotations. Cities, seen as central places, have long been associated with civilisation and with the commercial and civic capacity to ameliorate and even to transform conflicts of many kinds. Frontiers, on the hand, have been identified with unsettled and contested peripheries with shifting and porous borders. The conventional history of the contemporary system of national states implies that frontiers have been reduced to borderlines, homogenising and controlling what lies within clearly delimited territorial jurisdictions. It followed that cities were fully embedded and clearly subordinated to their respective states. This paper challenges this idealised narrative of the contemporary national state system and its cities. Always problematical, it is now even more clearly unsustainable.

In practice, many national borders retain frontier-like characteristics or have become more frontier-like under the influence of economic and cultural globalisation. More importantly, old frontier zones, e.g., in the Balkans and the Middle East, have continued to exist beneath the mosaic of national states – i.e., in areas where empires have overlapped and interacted. These zones incorporate many contemporary states and cities but remain difficult spaces for state and nation-building.

They often carry with them the legacy of previous conflicts which, even if they lie dormant for decades or centuries, have the capacity to be reactivated under contemporary conditions.

The paper addresses how ethno-nationally divided cities located in these frontier zones deal with violent conflict - whether they can still perform a civilising role, in the face of conflicts of the ‘frontier’. It suggests that ethno-national conflicts help reveal the lineaments of old frontier zones and the changing interaction between cities, frontiers and the territorial national state.
Sonia Paone and Agostino Petrillo
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Frontlines in the City: Via Padova in Milan Between Militarisation and Ghettoisation of Migrants

In the center of Milan via Padova represents an historical crossroads of immigration. At the beginning of the sixties the road was the place where the fluxes of migrants from the south of Italy found home. In the last years many immigrants reached via Padova coming from different parts of the world: Latin-America, Morocco, Egypt, China and other countries. In February 2010 a young Egyptian was killed by a Latin American boy during a street fight. After the murder a riot exploded which involved Egyptians, Moroccans and Latin Americans. Shops were destroyed and police used force indiscriminately against the inhabitants. In the following days the administrators of the city introduced extreme control measures - massive presence of police in the area, curfew for ethnic shops, controls of the rent conditions, obsessive controls of residence permissions and thorough search. New forms of urban control have been implemented, involving a limitation of the personal liberty and a particular attention to the houses and the shops of the migrants. Moreover, public “ordinances” regarding night circulation have been published.

The aim of the paper is to use via Padova in Milan as a paradigmatic example in order to discuss the extreme forms of governance of urban conflicts that use methods and measures that evoke a state of emergency and that are hardly reconcilable with the democratic government of the city.

Andrew Percy, Kareena McAloney and Claire McCartan
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Teenagers’ Exposure to Community Violence in Post Conflict Northern Ireland

As Northern Ireland transitions to a post-conflict society the nature of community violence and its influence on adolescents following the “Troubles” is an important area of research interest. Adolescents are particularly at risk of victimization and associated social, emotional, and psychological health problems. Using data from the fifth sweep of the Belfast Youth Development Study (N=3828 young people aged 15-16), this paper examines the extent and nature of young people’s exposure to various forms of community violence.

Exposure to violence includes direct knowledge of community violence (e.g. family members beaten up or attacked), witnessing community violence and being the victim of community violence. In addition, it examines the relationship between exposure to community violence and other social and health problems. Knowledge of violent events was particularly prevalent amongst the sample, suggesting that the social and psychological legacy of the “Troubles” may pass onto post-conflict generations. Over three quarters of young people had experienced violence within their community. Exposure was associated with higher levels of depression, psychotic symptoms, and substance misuse. The findings suggest that adolescents in Northern Ireland are vulnerable to both direct and vicarious victimization, and, subsequently, to significant risks to psychological well-being.
The right to the city is like a cry and a demand, writes the French philosopher Henri Lefebvre. In his seminal work The Production of Space, Lefebvre makes a distinction between representational space (appropriated, lived space, space-in-use), spatial practices (everyday activities of reclaiming and populating space, determining its segments, and territorialization of needs and desires within that space), and representations of space (planned, controlled, ordered space) “passively experienced” by its users. Urban spaces often start as representations of space (a square, a park are materialized projections of the spatial visions of urban planners, scientists and social engineers), but through its use people appropriate it, socially produce it into representational space (i.e. symbolic spaces directly experienced through images and symbols). Spatial practices, concerned with the production and reproduction of material life, rely on representations of space and representational spaces to provide them with the spatial concepts and symbols/images necessary for spatial practices to operate.

Public spaces are sites of interaction and encounter (in the street, the square, the park) as well as places of interchange and communication. As spaces for popular use and areas shared by all citizens, public spaces are the primary source of local identity. Public space is a space for representation, where heterogeneous social groups openly assert their identity. But, since it is also by definition a space of exclusion, this right to representation has to be continuously reasserted.

Drawing on insights from major theorists of public space, this paper will explore the ethno-national divisions in the city of Skopje, Macedonia. As a site of intersection of numerous ethnicities, religions and cultures, Skopje is a deeply divided city along ethnic and religious lines. These divisions even manifest themselves in physical terms, with the predominantly ethnic Macedonian and Christian Orthodox population located in one part of the city, and the ethnic Albanian and Muslim in another, divided by a river that runs through the center of the city and serving as a visible border between the two communities. This gap has even widened in the wake of the 2001 inter-ethnic conflict in Macedonia.

A number of contemporary Macedonian artists working with/in public space, including the author of this paper, have centered their practices around ways of addressing and overcoming the invisible borders created in the city. This paper will focus on several examples of creative reuse, artistic conversion and social re-writing of the urban landscape, in an effort to create a city which is inclusive and representative of all.
In many ways, Jerusalem’s holy places are central to the present conflict in the city. But within the idea of sacred space and religious life as understood and practiced today, and in terms of the wider urban setting, they are confusing and often paradoxical. As professed by many of the adherents of the world’s three major monotheistic religions, these sites are simply a continuation of a 3000 year history of conflicting interests and violent appropriations. Yet, we also appear to be witnessing a different version of contentious holiness where modern secularism has instilled the sites with new meanings based upon national aspirations. With the increasing domination of the latter, we must ask how it affects the nature of the Palestine-Israel conflict and its impact upon the city.

Clearly our concept of temporality has altered with modernity, so that sacred space in contested territories today is not so much regarded as a link to an unattainable eternity but more likely to be adopted as a way of re-enacting and recruiting the historical past for a present cause. The ‘my temple/church/mosque/synagogue has always stood on this site’ argument has become the primary refrain for the political legitimisation of holy sites in many parts of the world. In Jerusalem, the arguments for the present and future rights to land, are dominated by a meta-history that has had two contradictory impacts upon local and international interests: firstly, secular authority becomes the chief arbitrator in religious struggles, and secondly, everyday urban life is regarded as insignificant and even unconnected to the larger claims of sacred history. Resistance to both is becoming increasingly common.

Taking account of these problems, this paper will explore paradoxes in the modern meaning of ‘sacred space’, focusing upon the struggle for Jerusalem’s holy places.
This paper argues that if we are to contribute to a just resolution in Israel / Palestine, it is the study of Tel Aviv-Jaffa that should be at the centre of research related to urban conflict. Indeed, the magnification of Jerusalem as the epitome of the conflict only serves to mask the true root of discord. The focus on religious difference in the form of a ‘Muslim versus Jewish’ clash has acted as a cover for the colonial ambitions which guided the first wave of Zionist settlers. Rather it is in Tel Aviv that these ambitions were most apparent, established as the first exclusive Jewish city and in direct competition with its neighbour, the ‘Bride of Palestine’ or Jaffa.

Spatially the juxtaposition of Jaffa, as the socio-economic Arab centre of historic Palestine, with Tel Aviv, conceived as its Jewish modern antithesis, exemplifies the wider conflict. Indeed, both the explicit and implicit borders between Tel Aviv and Jaffa shadow the political discourse of separation at the international level. Importantly, any critical research of Tel Aviv must be undertaken with an awareness of its relation to Jaffa. Once united as one metropolis in 1950, the destinies of these two cities were bound together, yet under the control and domination of one ethno-national group. When Tel Aviv was no longer able to expand northwards, it set its sights on the South, searching for avenues by which to revive Jaffa’s distant (Pre-Palestinian) glory. A postmodernist discourse promoting authenticity and tradition emerged, rejecting the modernist vision of redeeming and ordering space. This outlook was created within an Orientalist framework romanticising the ‘Old Jaffa’ whilst advocating the construction of ‘New Jaffa’ according to the rationality and neutrality of market forces. Attempts have also been made to create an invisible border between ‘North’ Jaffa and ‘South’ Jaffa, presumably to suggest that the North is better aligned with Tel Aviv. It is this fight over land and legitimate historical narrative that is being waged in all of Israel / Palestine and Tel Aviv-Jaffa was its first battleground. Today, that struggle continues as neoliberal policies have only heightened existing socio-economic inequalities experienced by the Palestinian population, furthering pushing it into the margins of society. Urban development has become a tool, not just for the ethnicization of space, but also for the furthering of private, profit-driven interests. These dual agendas have complemented one another as market demands have successfully reinforced ethnoclass differentiations.

Yet despite these realities, emerging social movements have sought to challenge these forces through advocating for an urban vision that rejects the presumption of separation. Perhaps as researchers we should support such endeavours; ones that attempt to completely reframe the discourse of the conflict and promote a future based on equality and democracy, not separation and ethnicity.
For Henri Lefebvre, cities possess centres of power, which by virtue define the peripheries of exclusion. Despite living in a Northern Ireland twelve years after the signing of the Agreement, the grounds of Belfast City Hall are often still considered by the Nationalist minority in Northern Ireland to be under Unionist hegemony. Recent public policy initiatives aim to create shared space focus on integrating society and dismantling the physical barriers left by the conflict, often neglecting the impact of the legacy of violence and the sustained psychological barriers. This paper will discuss the remaining invisible borders and the ways in which these psychological barriers affect the ongoing process of developing and negotiating ‘shared’ space.

One specific case study will be used to illustrate the complications of creating ‘shared’ space in a society undergoing conflict transformation. On 2 November 2008 the British Ministry of Defence hosted a Homecoming Parade for the Royal Irish Regiment returning to Belfast from Afghanistan. The contentious nature of the event was apparent, with a potentially dangerous combination of groups present – including police monitoring both the parade and the crowd, a Sinn Féin/Relatives for Justice contingent protesting meters away from parade supporters and dissident Republican group éirigi attempting to gain access to city centre to protest against the parade. The way the homecoming parade was experienced was largely based on competing perceptions of the space in which the event took place, those participating, and the conflict in general.

Although this was the first homecoming parade in Belfast, there is the potential for future homecoming parades as the precedent has been set. Ultimately, the reality of sensitively negotiating events in the midst of developing ‘shared’ space is challenging – but what does ‘shared’ space really mean in the context of contemporary public policy, how do particular instances of contentious events coincide with the idea of ‘shared’ space, and what are the implications for public policy aiming to develop of ‘shared’ spaces for everyday use? These three questions will be explored ethnographically, particularly focusing on perceptions of space, the symbolic capital acquired by those who demonstrate at Belfast City Hall, and the delicate balance between creating ‘shared’ space and maintaining individual identity.
Jonathan Rokem

Department of Politics and Government, Ben Gurion University of the Negev

Re-visiting the Divided Cities Discourse - Comparative Study of Urban Division in Stockholm, Berlin and Jerusalem

The reality of spatial, social and political divisions in cities has generally been recognized for over a century in urban studies. Until the 1980s the main ‘divided cities’ discourse focused on themes common throughout the developed Western world. Such cities are characterized by ‘divisions’ of group membership and identification, cleavages in socioeconomic status and residential segregation. This loose definition of “divided city” spans a wide comparative range. In the last two decades a growing body of literature started to focus particularly on “divided” or “contested” cities. These cities are claimed to contain extreme ethno - national divisions resulting from an active national conflict and questioning the legitimacy of the nation state itself (Brand et al 2008: 4; Anderson 2008: 6; Calame & Charlesworth 2009: 2). Distinctive attributes and tensions position these cities within an exclusive discourse differentiating them from other urban areas. Well known examples of contested cities are: Belfast, Jerusalem, Johannesburg, Sarajevo, Baghdad, Beirut, Algiers, Brussels, Kirkuk and Mostar.

These exemplars have all been articulated as members of the Divided Cities Discourse (DCD, hereafter) The DCD analyzes urban transformations through western planning theories and their applicability in extreme cases of ‘divided’ or ‘contested’ cities; on the other hand much less attention has been given within the DCD to practical planning experience and what can be learned from it in other less extreme ‘divided cities’ “at different stages of transition” (Form for Cities in Transition 2010). This research suggests that rather than limiting the use of the DCD to a selected number of extreme cases, there is an increasing need to broaden the category itself. I propose this can serve to better understand and adapt planning policy and practice to ethnic minorities and migrants in an ever more fracturing urban social and spatial reality.

My main interest is in understanding how and in what ways urban segregation in ‘ordinary cities’ (Robinson 2006) is similar or different, to the DCD cities?

The research will focus on three different case studies, of three different communities, in three different cities, Stockholm, Berlin and Jerusalem. The analysis will ground itself in three main levels of investigation, the role of the nation state in planning policy, planning policy on the urban level and local civil society and community action within the planning field. Furthermore I will assess what can be learned from the role of national and local institutions implementing planning policy and practice in effecting ethnic minority communities’ social and spatial division, and the local communities and NGOs actions and perceptions of these processes.
Katy Radford
Institute for Conflict Research, Belfast
Anniversaries, Arts and Shared Memories - Embedding or Liberating Divisions

In Belfast and other cities in Northern Ireland, the historical and contemporary issues evidencing separation between communities have long been lauded and recorded in image and in verse, in theatre and on film. Public performances of music in street rituals are frequently used to both mark out territory and sustain sectarian division, and displays of visual art on murals on gable walls are often re-worked, revised and repainted as circumstances and local politics change.

A decade of significant political and social anniversaries commencing in 2011 provides the opportunity to consider the role the arts can play in forging connections between citizens and communities that have previously been isolated from one another. Drawing on empirical evidence and an analysis of work supported by the Arts Council of Northern Ireland, this paper will consider the potential for using arts initiatives as a way to address division between individuals and communities of older people irrespective of their ethno and political background.

Michael Safier
Development Planning Unit, University College London
Causes, Objectives and Interventions in Urban Conflict; The Cosmopolitan Contribution to Urban Peace-Building

Based on a comparative analysis of divided cities experience with urban planning to date, the paper explores links between the multiple and intersecting causal dimensions of urban conflict, the multiple and inter-related objectives of urban peace-building, and the need for a planning tradition specifically focused on intervening in contexts of conflict and division.

Evidence from five divided cities in contested societies - Belfast, Mostar, Nicosia, Beirut, and Jerusalem shows that urban planning contributions to improving urban conditions of everyday living have been significant, but in relation to peace-building and promoting socially just co-existence between contending communities sharing urban space, such contributions have been at best tangential or marginal.

It is argued that what is missing is a more precise set of linkages between the multiple and interacting causes of conflict which determine the agenda for planning, the multiple and interrelated objectives to be pursued in planning interventions seeking to contribute to urban peace-building, and a set of principles and practices matching with both.

This is the setting for a new urban planning tradition based on ‘Cosmopolitan Development’ to be formulated and introduced into the divided city context. The paper begins to articulate the knowledge-base, agenda, process and institutional aspects of such an approach.
Susan Salhany
Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton University
The Government of Parades in Northern Ireland: From Policing ‘Public Order’ to Governing ‘Community Relations’

This paper forms part of a larger research project which investigates the trend (1994-present) in Northern Ireland towards the governmentalization of the symbolic landscape. Since the peace process began in 1994, the public use of symbols and symbolic displays has received increasing governmental attention. Symbols such as flags, banners, and murals, are increasingly recognized as potentially being used in ways that either ‘promote mutual respect’ or in ways that further promote conflict and division (Belfast Agreement 1998). Along with this recognition is a distinct shift in how symbols are thought about and dealt with: Rather than simply ban or prohibit displays deemed contentious, how symbols are used more generally is to be governed— that is, their use is to be administered, guided and shaped in ways that promote consensual community relations, rather than division and discord. Using the work of Michel Foucault and the later governmentality literature as a theoretical framework, I investigate this trend using one central case— that of contentious parades and the work of the Northern Ireland Parades Commission. This present paper documents how the space of contentious parades is made into a field of governing intervention.

Since the 18th century, parades have been a flashpoint for violent conflict between Catholics and Protestants, and as such, have long been subjected to state controls. These controls, however, have primarily taken the form of legal measures. Laws were made and enforced by the police to ban or restrict parades that disturbed or might likely disturb the peace. The advent of the Parades Commission in 1998 marks a distinct shift in governing rationality. I argue that through a process of problematization in the mid-90s, parades emerge as a new kind of political problem, requiring a new governing solution. Specifically, parade disputes shift from being a problem of ‘public order’ to be dealt with by police using public order laws, to a problem of ‘community relations’ to be governed by a Parades Commission. The primary tasks of the body are to: ‘educate for greater understanding’, ‘promote and facilitate mediation’, ‘encourage local accommodation’, and ‘monitor contentious parades’ (North Report 1997). These endeavours are hallmarks of what Michel Foucault saw as a type of power particular to modern western societies— a type of power that works not primarily through force or prohibition, but through what he called ‘government’, defined as the ‘conduct of conduct’. The consequences of this shift are significant for parading and more broadly: gradually, the symbolic landscape of Northern Ireland is emerging as a new domain to be configured; that is, mapped, made knowable, and rendered actionable for the purposes of government.
Obadiah Samuel
Centre for Conflict Management and Peace Studies, University of Jos
Contested Cities in Northern Nigeria: A Reflection on the City of Jos

This paper examines the phenomenon of post-conflict partitioning of contested cities in Nigeria, with particular reference to the city of Jos, Plateau State. It attempts to trace the transformation of Jos city from what was widely acclaimed as “Home of Peace and Tourism” to a contested one to the manipulation of religious and ethnic sentiments by indigene and settler communities (the Birom, Anaguta and Afizere, mainly Christians, and the Hausa-Fulani, mainly Muslims respectively) in the area, in their attempt to politically control the area. It further establishes that the contestation over the city of Jos, climaxed in violent clashes between the aforementioned categories, first in 1994, then in 2001, 2002, 2008 and 2010, has brought about challenges, among which are the partitioning of the settlement pattern of the city along ethnic and religious fault lines; emergence of unplanned settlements within Jos metropolis; gradual loss of state control within ‘strongholds’ of certain ethnic cum religious communities; illegal arms stockpile; and silent killings and abductions within ‘partitioned’ territories, among others. The paper recommends that for there to be lasting peace in Jos, steps such as the implementation of the Jos Master Plan (a city planning scheme); tighter arms control measures to prevent illegal transfer of arms into Jos; harmonization and implementation of previous reports of commissions of inquiry into the crises in Jos; and increased synergy between the Federal and State Governments in intelligence gathering and law enforcement in the area should be urgently taken.

Ian Shuttleworth and James Anderson
Conflict in Cities, School of Geography, Archaeology and Palaeoecology, Queen’s University Belfast
Demographic Change Through Conflict: Belfast from the 1960s to the Present

Demography can become highly politicized and problematical in ethno-national and other conflicts. The numbers, distributions and trends of different population groups can be shaped by conflict and constitute its conditions. The changing ‘balance’ of relative numbers, the differential birth and death rates and migration patterns, and the spatial segregation or mixing of the various groups may all assume crucial importance as central factors in the conflict and its political discourses. Politicization can affect the availability and reliability of population statistics as well as their interpretation, and often for the worse though with the compensation of generating alternative, qualitative forms of evidence amenable to discourse analysis. The present paper situates its analysis in this context of politicized demography but concentrates mainly on the statistics of demographic change in Belfast from before the present ‘Troubles’ started in the late 1960s, through the worst years of the conflict and up to the present so-called ‘post-conflict’ situation. Drawing on a unique time-series of grid-square data for 1971, 1991 and 2001 for Belfast City and its wider ‘urban area’, it provides a broad, critical overview of the population changes and their reciprocal relations (or imputed relations) with the political conflict.
In response to the conflict management research in divided cities, this paper will focus on comparative study of the EU engagement in this sphere. The analysis centres on reviewing the EU policies and special institutions and by analysing the results achieved in the three conflicts which have occurred in its current or potential member states. In the case of Northern Ireland as well as in Cyprus, the EU ‘inherited’ the conflict, while in Macedonia it became involved in an early stage thus hoping to settle the conflict by the time of Macedonia’s accession.

These three conflicts have different durations and have occurred in radically different environments. The EU has not shown activity in the Northern Ireland conflict before the province became part of Britain’s membership unlike the other two cases. Although the EU has declared its support for Cyprus’s reunification before its accession in 2004, it was presented with a failure of the peace settlement. Thus it was forced to create a new strategy which should facilitate the process. In Macedonia, the EU has taken an active role since the violent clashes between the government and insurgents’ forces in 2001 and has been effectively, although not flawlessly, managing the local conflict.

Despite these differences, the three conflicts share similarities that made it possible for the EU to become directly or indirectly important for their management and hence build its legitimacy as a conflict management actor. All three of them are ethno-territorial and have occurred between case-relevant major groups where the minority felt continuously disregarded by the majority in political government. These two groups have experienced violent clashes against each other which gained international attention and thereby international involvement (including that of the EU) thus recognising the international presence as a factor in their management. It is also important for them that gradual consensus to establish that a power-sharing model which guarantees equitable representation for each community has been recognised by the elites.

The argument shows the evolution of EU’s deliberate approach in conflict management in territories which are or will become part of the European Union’s space and comments on the mutual effect of this engagement: both to the conflicting parties and the institutionalisation of the EU’s conflict management policies. By connecting the impact of its leverage in negotiating the differences, with an emphasis on the surveillance strategies as they are realised in Belfast, Skopje and Nicosia, this paper attempts to understand the EU’s method in dealing with conflicts in its own yard. By the particular examination of the policing and control models and police forces, their ethnic composition and relations with communities in particular, it reflects on the existing patterns of cooperation between these divided cities within the geopolitical context. Overall, this paper aims at revealing the effects of sharing the benefits of European Union membership in implementing the political agreements in each society in conflict.
Differences and otherness inside the city often translate into patterns of social and spatial segregation, with the inevitable exclusion from the cultural and economic mainstream of those who lack access to resources and decision-making. This paper focuses exactly on those excluded spaces and their inhabitants’ everyday practices, neglected by the economic and political powers. Defining them provocatively as urban voids, the paper wants to show, on the contrary, that they actually have never been empty, but rather always filled up by informal activities, which have charged them with new meanings that are no longer possible to deny.

The case study of Istanbul exemplifies all this: inner city blighted neighbourhoods and gecekondu (‘built over night’) settlements on the extreme outskirts of the city, are seen by the authorities as plagues to be healed, examples of distorted urbanism to be eradicated to make space for new real estate developments for the upper middle class. Recently the pressures on these areas are highly increased: political authorities and planners are pursuing a global vision for the city to attract foreign investments and tourism, promoting programmes of urban boosterism throughout the city. These generic islands of capital, gated communities and new Central Business Districts, are only the most visible peaks of a deeper and holistic process which is transforming Istanbul in an archipelago of homogeneous and gated environments. In this context, the urban voids are seen as embodying the possibility of redemption for the city. They are spaces where otherness and openness are still possible and valuable: they can enable a Resistance to the mainstream, putting forward an alternative vision, suggesting new creative uses of space, being able to build innovative livelihoods and to write new common narratives.

The paper wants to analyse this resistance from a semiotic point of view. The voids are seen as signs and the resistance is then defined as the capacity to undergo changes of meaning. The looser their identities and their hierarchical structures, the higher will be their capacity to escape the capture of the State’s power and its Spectacle. The case of Istanbul will help to develop three semiotics categories (fair, monument, stage) which will interpret the life of each void as an uninterrupted sequence of signifying operations, looking at their built environment and its relation with dynamics of power and resistance. It will be shown how internal pressures tends to close a void. All the voids face indeed an inevitable entropy: once the internal structures of powers have solidified it is harder to assure openness toward new identities. Hence the meaning will change slightly and rarely: it is the case of many gecekondu settlements, whose strenuous resistance against the threat of eviction have transformed into hardly accessible spaces. On the contrary, inner city blighted neighbourhoods (e.g. Tarlabasi, Suleymaniye) will be seen as young voids: their loose identity and structures still allow them to act as gates for many migrants, whose rapid cycle is renewing continuously their nature and meaning.
Tommaso Vitale

In Italy, Roma minority groups live in a diversity of settlements, each of them with very specific spatial and socio-economic conditions. In fact, the presence of Roma groups within towns brings the attention to the relation between ethnic and cultural heterogeneity and political integration as it changes from town to town.

Starting from an approach of "political sociology of public policy", our main hypothesis states that it is fundamental to analyse in depth the role played by public policies on a local level in order to understand the living conditions of the Roma communities as well as the conflicts engendered by their settling in the urban space. The theoretical frame defines the polarisation between Roma and non-Roma in urban setting as an explanandum of the conflicts (and not as an explanans), showing the role that political parties and activist groups play, and more over the different role Public Administration plays in ethnic polarisation processes at the urban.

To verify the main hypothesis (i.e. the crucial role played by policies) the paper analysis data from a comparative analysis of local contentious interaction with Roma and Sinti Groups in ten Italian towns. The administrative side of State, especially at the local level is unnoticed in most of the literature on urban conflicts. Political opportunity structure is very important, but the main result of the research signal that policy instruments and the way in which are used have a deep impact in the dynamics of contention. When urban conflicts on Roma settlements produce non-negotiable identities, it depends also on public administrations' difficulties to manage compromises and adjustments against the parties. Irreconcilable positions and hard feelings of hostility among the parties do not depend on cultural affiliations: they are the outcomes of an institutional environment with a lack of mediation.

The relevance of the research to the main conference theme is due to the fact the paper enables to situate the assumptions about prejudice and ethnic hostility, explaining them not only through exogenous factors, regardless of the multiplicity of urban contexts, but also taking into account the role played by the local administrations within the dynamics and the historicity of each local conflicts. It also permits to account for mechanisms of diffusion, escalation and scale shift in urban conflicts, trying to avoid the trap of a radical endogenous explanation.

In Italy, Roma minority groups live in a diversity of settlements, each of them with very specific spatial and socio-economic conditions. In fact, the presence of Roma groups within towns brings the attention to the relation between ethnic and cultural heterogeneity and political integration as it changes from town to town.

Starting from an approach of "political sociology of public policy", our main hypothesis states that it is fundamental to analyse in depth the role played by public policies on a local level in order to understand the living conditions of the Roma communities as well as the conflicts engendered by their settling in the urban space. The theoretical frame defines the polarisation between Roma and non-Roma in urban setting as an explanandum of the conflicts (and not as an explanans), showing the role that political parties and activist groups play, and more over the different role Public Administration plays in ethnic polarisation processes at the urban.

To verify the main hypothesis (i.e. the crucial role played by policies) the paper analysis data from a comparative analysis of local contentious interaction with Roma and Sinti Groups in ten Italian towns. The administrative side of State, especially at the local level is unnoticed in most of the literature on urban conflicts. Political opportunity structure is very important, but the main result of the research signal that policy instruments and the way in which are used have a deep impact in the dynamics of contention. When urban conflicts on Roma settlements produce non-negotiable identities, it depends also on public administrations' difficulties to manage compromises and adjustments against the parties. Irreconcilable positions and hard feelings of hostility among the parties do not depend on cultural affiliations: they are the outcomes of an institutional environment with a lack of mediation.

The relevance of the research to the main conference theme is due to the fact the paper enables to situate the assumptions about prejudice and ethnic hostility, explaining them not only through exogenous factors, regardless of the multiplicity of urban contexts, but also taking into account the role played by the local administrations within the dynamics and the historicity of each local conflicts. It also permits to account for mechanisms of diffusion, escalation and scale shift in urban conflicts, trying to avoid the trap of a radical endogenous explanation.
Conflict in Cities, Department of Architecture, University of Cambridge

‘Shared space’ in Divided cities - Does it Exist? What Does it Mean?

The question of “mixed space” or “shared space” touches on key debates in urban studies: segregation and desegregation; the “right to the city”; diversity and multiculturalism, and the condition of public spaces. This article builds on these debates to rethink the meaning and practice of “shared space” in divided cities.

The term “shared space” appears mostly in reference to divided cities, where it is noted by its absence. However, the question of “mixed spaces” - urban spaces where different groups encounter each other regularly and frequently - has been key to discussions in urban studies. The celebration of diversity and difference of recent years has called into question earlier discussions of segregation.

“Desegregation”, defined negatively, never promoted a model of shared space, but rather one of integration and assimilation. However, with the rise of identity cultural politics, the stress has changed to diversity, inclusivity and openness (inwards and outwards). These are often rationalised as beneficial to maintain economic advantage in an age of globalisation. Urban “mixing” is sought by scholars, planners and policy makers, as a means of achieving social cohesion, in post-strike situations (Belfast; Mostar; Mill Towns, England) and in other contexts, such as deprived neighbourhoods (“social mix” in class terms).

Presenting “mixity” as a desirable goal carries a host of questions: How do we measure openness, other than in reductive numerical terms? What is “true” integration? How are we to theorise “diverse spaces”, and move politically to achieve them?

Rather than idealising the potential of cross-cultural integration, this paper draws attention to the wide spectrum of encounters that are actually taking place in urban space. From violence and tension, through indifference, to amicable or professional relations: all encounters involve some element of mutual-acknowledgment, tacit or implicit. This mutual acknowledgement makes a space into a mixed space. Rather than seeking spaces in which everyone feels equally comfortable, the paper suggests looking at the lived spatial reality.

Such an investigation may discover that the image of “parallel lives” and separation often does not convey the depth of integration and interaction between different groups. Drawing attention to the facts of interaction is useful for policy and planning.

Much of the debate on urban mixing has focussed on patterns of residential segregation. Yet as important as they may be, residential areas are only one component of urban life. This focus has contributed to the view of the city as a static mosaic of communities. Another approach would to be focus on the daily movements within the city. As people travel to work, leisure areas, or shopping districts, they often cross the lines of urban divides; and the roads themselves are typically “shared spaces”. Thus, even in highly segregated cities, movement brings cross-cultural interaction to large parts of the city.

While drawing on various examples of “contested cities”, the paper will focus on Jerusalem as an example of the political implications implicit in approaches to “mixed spaces”. In Jerusalem, the question whether “shared space” exists or not is deeply political, and could lead to scenarios that would have a dramatic effect on the city - such as its physical division into two.
In one sense, conflict is a key feature associated with religion in contemporary urban settings. Public expressions of religion in such forms as buildings, gatherings and spatial demarcations frequently lead to contestations with civic authorities and with public campaigns that may themselves have a religious dimension. But in another sense, namely the role of religious or so-called ‘faith based’ organisations in public services, conflict appears to be absent. ‘Public religion’ in this latter sense is largely accepted, or at least tolerated, even within strongly secularised societies such as in Western Europe and (arguably) North America, where the past decade has seen increasingly vocal political calls for religion to play a more active role in servicing citizens and communities. Nevertheless, whilst the principle of fulfilling such a public role has largely seen the absence of conflict, the manner in which such a role is fulfilled may well involve conflict internal to the religious organisations themselves. This is because issues of representation are intrinsically involved in the fulfilment of public service roles – religious organisations must not only be fronted by individuals or committees who can liaise with civic authorities, but also provide personnel to provide services. Given that representation is central to conflict in religious organisations, its reification through civic recognition potentially leads to the exacerbation of conflict. This internal conflict is largely obscured from civic commissioning bodies and service-users, but also from social scientists who (in line with the sociological study of religion in general) have recently shunned issues of power in favour of policy-led notions of ‘social capital’. A focus on issues of representation (and therefore conflict), though, shows that its dimensions are varied and significant: class, gender, and political and theological orientation may all play a role. Within global cities characterised by intense processes of migration, congregations are increasingly multiethnic with the result that ethnicity and nationality may be prominent dimensions. Such is the case for Methodism in London, a mainstream Christian denomination whose local churches have progressively answered the civic call to enter into partnership as public service providers, that is, to become a ‘public religion’. This paper will explore the internal dynamics involved in this case, based upon ethnographic research which involved participant observation and interviews with ministers and lay leaders at five local churches over an eighteen-month period. With an almost wholly white professional ministry but a regular congregational attendance that is nearly 50 per cent black, London Methodism’s emergence as a public religion has occurred through a context of widespread internal conflict that in large part takes an ethno-nationalist form. Indeed, the increasing dominance of ministers in relation to lay leaders, as British Methodism has undergone a process of what may be called ‘Anglicanisation’, means that public service initiatives have become a key strategy in internal social power relations. Such considerations provide a new perspective by which to conceptualise public religions in general, specifically in terms of their social construction through processes that involve internal conflict.
This paper will focus on the French-Hill neighbourhood that was built as part of the Israeli colonization of East Jerusalem and which Israelis consider, is politically and culturally, a part of a “united Jerusalem”. Planned according to modern planning episteme, this neighbourhood is inhabited by Jewish residents, but they are undergoing a process of ethno-demographic transformation as Palestinian residents (both with Israeli IDs and Jerusalem Resident Certificates) have been moving into it in recent years.

Indeed, despite the escalating violence following the first and especially the second Intifada, and the ongoing discourses of enmity, Israeli residents in the French Hill found themselves facing a moral dilemma: “to sell or not to sell” – using Rabinowitz words (1994) – property to Palestinians. While such dilemma has been explored by several researches in relation to Jewish Arab mixed cities such as Upper Nazareth (Rabinowitz, 1994), Lydda (Yacobi, 2009) and Jaffa (Monterescau, 2008), I suggest that the case of the French Hill has some differences stemming from the wider geopolitical context, such as the escalating violence between Israelis and Palestinians during the second Intifada and the construction of the separation wall between Israel and the Palestinians.

Theoretically speaking, I would suggest that the above phenomenon should be examined both within the growing literature on geopolitics and also for its relevance to the study of urban space. However, it is important to note that the critical discussion of geopolitics and ethnic conflicts tends to focus on state borders and national territory while ignoring the relevance of such analyses to the urban realm. In this context, some researchers propose that the impact of borders and territoriality is not diminishing; rather, new scales of territorial affiliations and borders are recognizable that may be flexible but that are still selective on different geographical scales. Indeed, this paper will theoretically and methodologically focus on the relevance of geopolitics to the study of urban space, by which we mean not merely a discussion of international relations and conflict or of the roles of military acts and wars in producing space. Rather, geopolitics refers to the emergence of discourses and forces connected with the technologies of control, patterns of internal migrations by individuals and communities, and the flow of cultures and capital.
This paper explores the pragmatic ways in which mothers living in Belfast’s divided inner city contend with a range of often competing norms as they go about their everyday lives, raising their children, shopping, seeking education, and participating in the life of the neighbourhood and the wider city. The paper understands everyday life in the inner city as a creative practice requiring a complex and often competing range of norms to be juggled and configured in specific ways, in response both to situations and perceived needs.

The situation of mothers at the fore of wider socio-political efforts to disentangle cultural and political identities, in the interest of securing a non-violent future for their children as they grow up in the inner city, offers a rich focus for exploring wider normative tensions in the everyday life of the city. Inner city mothers are faced with maintaining a commitment to cultural reproduction while at the same time supporting anti-sectarianism. The paper analyses some of the ways in which respondents configure these dual norms as they engage in four routine practices: shopping and socialising; moving around the segregated inner city; seeking out schooling for their children; and celebrating collective culture.

Maternal responses to and engagements with these four aspects of inner city life are analysed as indices of their creative configurations of broader normative discord. Thus, the paper focuses on the ways in which a sense of familiarity, security, and a relative easing of hostilities is held in tension with an ongoing sense of fear, as captured in respondents’ attitudes towards these four practices.
It has become conventional wisdom to view public spaces and places in ‘divided’ or ‘contested’ cities as catalysts for bridging inter-group relations. By initiating ‘contact’ between members from across sectarian, ethnic or ethno-national divides, public spaces would induce mixing in everyday life allowing ‘people to know and understand the needs and feeling of others and develop those ‘moral sympathies for the other on which shared civil life can grow’ as argued by Bloomfield and Bianchini (2004:37). Yet the reality of spatial perceptions and practices in urban societies labeled as ‘divided’, ‘contested’ or ‘in conflict/post-conflict’ appears more complex than argued above. Based on focus groups conducted with 100 young men and women in the age group 18-25 living and studying in Beirut, this paper aims at exploring of complex nature of spatial perceptions and practices among the Beiruti youth. The paper focuses on the ways in which the spaces of a ‘contested’ city like Beirut are perceived and mentally constructed as well as used in the everyday lives of these young women and men.

The paper argues that young Beirutis tend to socially mix in the everyday life in spaces they perceive as ‘banal’ while recoil to sectarian homogenous places of residence. Spaces of leisure, work and higher education are perceived and lived as ‘neutral’ as they carry little communal representational meaning beyond their mere functional use. Consequently, the young men and women of Beirut mix in malls, pubs, and university campuses; yet such social mixing does not advance to a level that would alleviate inter-group stereotypes or some inter-group contempt. However, when it comes to places of residence, almost all the young men and women tend to retreat or prefer to retreat to sectarian homogenous neighbourhoods and quarters. The latter spaces, the paper argues, are preferred as they create a sense of communal security while at the same time tend to re-produce social relations in ways to maintain the collective identity of each group and to reinforce a sense of ‘exclusion’.
In this paper, I will try to present the socio-spatial segregation in the city of Mersin, a medium-sized Turkish city (around 1.5 million inhabitants in the total, some 800,000 in the central urban area) situated at the eastern Mediterranean coast of Turkey. The segregation patterns of the city are multiple and intertwined creating tension to the extent that the city is often referred to as a “time-bomb”, feared to explode anytime.

The residential form in any Turkish city that has experienced migration strongly depends on the family- and hometown-based networks which determine the integration of the migrants in the urban land. The urban form is therefore largely shaped along hierarchically structured community networks enjoying great influence in local politics thanks to their indirect links to political parties.

Yet, in the actual state of affairs in this city, the community- and class-based residential pattern is being challenged by an ethnic divide, fuelled by the mass migration of Kurds who forcibly out-migrated from their homelands in the Eastern regions of the country because of conflicts between the Turkish army and PKK. This forced migration flow had a very strong effect on the segregation pattern of the city; socially, it created a tension between the locals of the city (Turkish and Arab) and the Kurdish newcomers generating discrimination in the job market, stigmatization and arousal of the nationalistic vein. Spatially, this ethnic divide was translated as residential discrimination and spatial segregation.

This paper’s focus will be on the study of a neighbourhood in the city of Mersin, Demirtaş. Formed during the 60s following the migration of Central Anatolian Turkish migrants of Alevite confession to Mersin, this neighbourhood has long been the shelter for the migrants and the centre of leftist ideologies. It took this identity from the working class dwellers; i.e. migrants turned into proletarians. During the 90s, the neighbourhood started to receive a new group of migrants, the forcibly migrated Kurdish population. The last 20 years witnessed the deepening of the segregation within the neighbourhood: from the peaceful cohabitation and solidarity at the beginning (yet with major differences in terms of socio-economic profile) that existed between the old and new migrant groups, the neighbourhood reached today to the days of serious clash, the shops of Turkish population being attacked by Kurdish youngsters, leading to the out-migration of the neighbourhood’s founder population. What has changed in the neighbourhood during these 20 years? This will be the central question of this paper.
“Cultural Mapping” provides an overview of the alternative maps created in both Belfast and Sarajevo during the past two decades. Rewriting of the urban cartography in the post-conflict cities implies incorporating personal stories and memories in the reinterpretation of sites of particular relevance, thereby creating alternative maps. The maps as works of art resist the political norms that generally underline the drawing of geographical maps; contrary to strategic geo-political maps, they concentrate on the underrepresented narratives in an attempt to write an alternative history of the city (Sarajevo Survival Map 92-96 (1995-1996), FAMA, Sarajevo or An Alternative Map Survey, Belfast, 2009).

One of the characteristic of post-conflict cities is urban reconstruction, not only in the sense of renovation but also in the recreation of an understanding of urban space and the position of citizens within this space. Ash Amin states that territorialisation is one of the characteristics of spatial multiplicity, which results in patterning of urban space. These urban patterns expose the use of space through citizens’ movements in everyday city life. Instead of focusing on lines of separation and detachment, multiple usage of public space accentuates its sharing aspect by revealing that diverse groups interact with the city sites concurrently:

The lines of power and separation somehow disappear in a heavily patterned ground, as the ground springs back as a space of multiple uses, multiple trajectories and multiple publics, simultaneously freeing and circumscribing social experience of the urban commons (Amin, 2008: 12).

Cultural mapping refers to the attempt of artists to recreate the patterns of city life in alternative urban maps. Artists in both Belfast and Sarajevo have responded to the challenge to provide optional readings of urban space, realising that this highly distinctive form of site-specific art has the potential to promote the multiplicity of city spaces as well as the narratives of those who move and act within these spaces.

Starting with the Sarajevo Survival Map created during the siege, the overview of mapping activities in Belfast and Sarajevo follows the chronological development of the phenomena in order to diagnose the trends, which underline these activities in both cities. Mapping in Sarajevo during and after the war reflected the reaction of the artist to the destruction of urban space and the ways in which it affected the lives of the citizens. In Belfast, during the last decade, artists have been using alternative urban mapping to accentuate those aspects of the city spaces frequently neglected or disregarded in the usual cartography. Though intrinsically different, artistic activities in both cities allude to the responsibility of the artists to engage in the public debate on the fate of the city in the wider political, urban, and cultural context. In the alternative maps, the interplay between the sign and the signifier is crucial; these maps draw not only crude signs of urban geography, they also attempt to capture miscellaneous interpretations of geographical signs. The artists as map creators use a range of materials, symbols, and techniques to recreate the interactive dynamic between the city spaces and its users.
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