Performative" capitals: developing the capital of the capital city of Jerusalem
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Abstract. The article continues a new page in political geography related to the use of performative rules in the interpretation of spatial phenomena. The capital, in our case Jerusalem, as the brightest embodiment of spatial relations in the state, from the standpoint of performativity will be presented as a special symbolic system that contributes to the capital growth of the capital, which will allow deconstructing this phenomenon in a new and original way.

The case of Jerusalem appears through the prism of the manifestation of the capital of the capital. A performative approach to the capital city opens up new possibilities for interpreting the essential features of the symbolic and real capital.
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1. The production of symbols by the capital is a performative tool for capital development in the capital.

State capitals are main political centers that have always been perceived as key places of accomplishment. In order to "fix" the points of political tension, to tie them to a certain topos of the geographical and political space, the capital itself produces symbols [1]. Unique symbols generated by a capital will always declare the capital of their place of origin. A. Ovsyannikov [2] defines capital as a status attribute of a city that has metropolitan institutions, a constructed image based on the unique qualities and characteristics of a settlement that distinguish it from others [2]. Symbols expressing the phenomenon of metropolitanism, which endow the city, in our case, Jerusalem, with unique content, serve this selection.

When the political vector changes, the semantic content of the symbol changes, without being a constant, new symbols are consolidated and old symbols are replaced. The stability of symbolism in time depends on the depth of justification in human perception, the political component, attachment to some event, the ability to extend the symbol to a larger number of phenomena.

Capital symbols do not have universality, since the place that produces the symbols is unique; they are relevant in a certain position of space in close connection with the geographical and historical content, which is fully true for Jerusalem. The symbolization of a metropolitan place or object is carried out on the
basis of being rooted in history, emotional content, “dream potential” contained in the space of the center [3].

The geographic space is initially filled with symbols they only need to be "read" [4]. Such reading is carried out when the place becomes a capital city, and all its symbolic manifestations, "materialize". Symbols of the “capital area”, personifying the capital, have not only their own symbolic, mental meaning. The symbolic asset “capital of the capital” has political content and is widely used by actors of political actions and procedures in the process of political imaging (the term of C. Rutgeiser) [3].

The creation of symbols by the capital has certain signs of iteration and with each new cycle is capable of increasing the capital of the capital: the very presence of state symbols, for example, in the capital's locality initiates the emergence of new symbols, they are mutually constructive.

The symbols produced by the capital are a collective resource. It can be effectively used by power structures to solve intra-capital and national political and social problems. Symbols serve not only to identify the metropolitan area, but also to consolidate the metropolitan community in relation to the non-capital, and the state in relation to the rest of the world community.

However, “counting” the symbolic content of the capital is a non-trivial task, usually shared by several scientific disciplines, since none of them individually is able to disassemble the “component-wise” complex saturated metropolitan content, the composition of the capital of the capital.

As the historical experience of the existence of Jerusalem (here: the temporal length of existence) shows symbolic meaning is carried not only by traditional subjects of the study of the symbolic (monuments, unique toponymy and architecture, museum subjects, urban power practices, political symbols, religious values), but also by themselves capital Jerusalem narratives (which might be, for example, a way of presenting the history of the capital). Performative analysis is in this context a useful tool for deconstructing the capital development process in the capital city of Jerusalem.

Space in political geography is not so much “anchorage to the ground” / mapping of an abstract social process, but a conceptual, connecting (intertwining) language for explaining content meanings. With a certain degree of simplification, we can say that space is performative in itself and exhibits illocutionary power, which is inherent in the linguistic “consumptions” that D. Austin studied.

Since space is not a language that can be reproduced verbally, how then can its performativity be manifested? Through its embodiments: the institutions that we call space-oriented can be considered manifestations of the performativity of space. Capitals, borders and boundaries, maps, permeability channels (paths). Why are they performative? Their content essence is to embody the space that they represent. This representation is not always “natural”. In most cases, these processes are artificial, implanted discursively, accepted confidentially. It is impossible to issue an order in the language of space, but a manifestation can be carried out. A striking example of such a manifestation is the case of Jerusalem.

2. The performative component of the capital of Jerusalem

The territory of modern Palestine (as a geographical area) is currently contested by the State of Israel and an entity without state status, that is Palestine. The world community is concerned about the situation with the politics of the Jewish people. Jerusalem was more the nucleus of attraction for the Jewish people than a full-fledged capital, and it was only thanks to the large-scale performative that there was hope and the opportunity to find a formal capital.

Jerusalem was a source of gravitation with a centripetal vector as a capital without actual statehood [5] in a sense of theocratic sense.

Jerusalem is not only a sacred locus, but also a sacred dominant of the entire Holy Land. The cauldron is a sacred topos of Jerusalem for the Jews, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher (Resurrection of Christ) in old Jerusalem is a sacred image of Jerusalem for Christians, a spatial icon [6]. The al-Aqsa Mosque (remote mosque) on the Temple Mount of Jerusalem is the sacred shrine of Islam. These spatial objects carry an
important semiotic load: semantic, of value, mnemonic, sacred, cultural, aesthetic, religious, communicative; they participate in the genesis of the spatial-performative metropolitan system.

Let us highlight several time intervals in the existence of Jerusalem, which should be paid attention to due to their key pivotal significance, the presence of bifurcation points.

The collapse of the Ottoman Empire. On November 2, 1917, the Balfour Declaration is approved by the British Cabinet and submitted to the Entente Supreme Council. The declaration states that the British government is supportive of creating a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. The declaration, supported by American President Wilson [7, 8], makes it possible to gather Jews from Galut and create a not entirely secular national entity. The non-secularity is explained by the fact that the Jewish ethnicity historically had religious origins more than that of other ethnopolitical communities [9]. Judaism was in some way the "civilizational" beginning of the Zionist "revival" [10]. Palestine as the territory of the future Jewish state for the Jews “was the land of Zion and Jerusalem,” the aspiration to Jerusalem as the center of the future life was justified, among other things, by the religious connection between the people and the land [10]. Historian G. Kosach in his work notes that T. Herzl wrote: "Next year in Jerusalem will be the old cry." This performative message is ritualized and links the location of the future state with the idea of a “promised land”. That is, in the consciousness of the Jewish people, through myths and symbols, the historical memory of the capital city of Jerusalem is reproduced, rooted in religious and cult practice, as "granted by the Lord" [10].

British Mandate in Palestine. From 1920 to 1948, Palestine was under British rule. Regulative and administrative activities in the territories were implemented on the principles of representation of the parties that made up the legislative, executive wing and the representation of the World Zionist Organization.

The main players on the political field during this period were the social-Zionist, liberal-Zionist (all-Zionist), revisionist-Zionist (extremely nationalist) and orthodox religious parties. The nationalists did not accept compromises with the Arabs and used military force against those who disagreed with their policies. Let us also designate the existence of a conspiratorial communist party on the territory of historical Palestine, which, due to its clandestine position, did not affect the political picture [11]. The mandate of the Council of the League of Nations, giving the right to rule Palestine, was granted to Great Britain on April 19, 1920 at a representative international conference in Italy. The structure of the mandate incorporated the text of the Balfour Declaration, as well as provisions to support the immigration of Jews to Palestine. The last point provided several waves of aliyah1 from Russia, Poland and Germany. The colonial administration prepared the economic basis in the future location of the state of Israel both for the self-sustained and independent life of the state, and for the establishment of its political system. In the 20s and 30s of the twentieth century, calls for the creation of a national state formation of Israel were met with resistance from the Arabs of Palestine, who did not agree to division of it [12]. The deterioration of the economic situation of the Arab population in the context of the build-up of aliyah led to anti-Zionist, and, as a consequence, to anti-British protests [12]. In an attempt to extinguish the Arab-Palestinian unrest, Great Britain developed the notoriously doomed Peel Plan (1937), which was later rejected by both Arabs and Jews, which assumed the existence of Arab, British and Jewish zones after the division of Palestine. To avoid the bond of nationalists of Arabs and Germans, Great Britain makes concessions to the Arabs of Palestine, introducing through the White Paper (1939) and constraining restrictions on the development of Zionist institutions, land use, the economy, and what is most critical on the eve of World War II and the Holocaust, the aliyah.

Since 1947, Great Britain has actually lost control over the state of affairs in Palestine. The Jewish paramilitary groups, which have received real military experience, are taking up a counter-position to the British military presence in Palestine. Great Britain admits its insolvency, handing over the Palestinian problem for solution at the UN General Assembly, where on November 29, 1947, the British Mandate is

1Aliyah (עֲלִיָּה) – is the immigration of Jews from the diaspora to the Land of Israel historically, which today includes the modern State of Israel
terminated by a majority vote. The creation of independent Jewish and Arab state formations on the territory of Palestine was also supported by a majority of votes. The Jewish community, Yishuv\(^1\), supports and accepts the decision of the UN General Assembly, while the Arab Supreme Committee issues an ultimatum, demonstrating a categorically irreconcilable position, announcing the beginning of an armed struggle against Jews.

At the end of 1947, as a result of the victories of the Jews in many armed clashes, the territory of Palestine, which the UN assigned to the construction of the independent state of Israel, was taken under the control of the Yishuv [13, 14]. The creation of the Extraordinary Committee in October 1947 (later the People’s Council with the People’s Administration) can be considered as the starting point for the beginning of the existence of Israeli state sovereignty.

The desire to acquire statehood was so strong and acutely felt that the People’s Council was convened immediately at the hour of the expiration of the British Mandate, on the night of May 14-15, 1948. The State of Israel was formed on May 14, 1948. The acquisition of state subjectivity by the Israeli people has come to pass. The borders of the state are defined by the UN General Assembly Resolution 181 (II) dated November 29, 1947 on the division of Palestine [7, 15].

Ben-Gurion announced the Declaration of Independence, which proclaimed the creation of the State of Israel. The creation of the State of Israel is a kind of bifurcation point, a transition point from the critical state of the system historical Palestine to the work in a stable regime, or at least in a regime of greater political and geographical order.

Arab-Israeli clashes lasted from 1948 to 2006. Immediately after the declaration of Israel, the armies of six Arab countries invaded Israel. The first Arab-Israeli conflict ended with the victory of the Israelis and the expansion of their own territory at the expense of 6,000 km\(^2\), intended to create an Arab independent state.

In 1949, with the mediation of the UN, the agreement reached in fact redrew the contours of the State of Israel. The Negev and Galilee became Israeli, and the West Bank and Jerusalem became Jordanian territory. Gaza went to Egypt. These events forced up to a million Palestinian Arabs to leave their accustomed location and become refugees in the Arab countries adjacent to the Israeli border. The newborn Jewish state has its own twin the Palestinian problem. However, the same event “liberated” a number of Arab countries: Iraq, Yemen, Syria, Egypt, as well as northern Africa from the presence of Jewish communities with a total number of up to half a million people.

The conflicts took place with recessions and intensification of confrontation up to the six-day war of 1967 (06/05/1967 - 06/10/1967). During the confrontation between Israel and a group of Arab states comprising Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, and Algeria, Israel occupied the West Bank of the Jordan River (modern Palestine), East Jerusalem, Gaza (Gaza Strip), Golan (Golan Heights), Sinai. The Sinai Peninsula was first occupied in 1956 in retaliation for the ban on the movement of Israeli ships through the Suez Canal [16].

As a result of the war, Israel extends all branches of government to east Jerusalem. On June 27, 1967, Jerusalem actually fell under Israeli jurisdiction. This event was the first step towards the legislative consolidation of the capital status of Jerusalem.

Thirteen years later, on July 29, 1980, the Israeli Knesset adopted the basic law on the status of Jerusalem, named in the document as the city of the eternal and indivisible capital of Israel. However, most countries do not recognize Jerusalem as the Israeli capital.

Israel has continually attempted a settlement by making effective use of its potential for negotiation. In 1979, as part of a peace treaty with Egypt, the Sinai Peninsula was returned to it, and the border was returned

---

1 Yishuv (יִשּׁוּב) - literally settlement; is the body of Jewish residents in the land of Israel prior to the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948.
to its configuration until June 1967. Diplomatic relations have been established with Jordan, 300 km2 of the occupied territories have been returned. In 1994, an Israeli-Jordanian peace treaty was signed.

Currently, the issue of Israel's state borders has not been finally resolved. Disagreements persist over the disputed territories between Syria, Lebanon and Israel. Israelis control the West Bank, East Jerusalem. By virtue of the existing temporary agreements between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization, the above-mentioned territories were zoned according to the levels of responsibility of the parties.

Under these previous conditions, the location of the capital in Jerusalem (the transfer of the capital in 1949 from Tel Aviv) is more of a sacred character rather than it indicates the direction of polarization outward. Tel Aviv's location is much more preferable for external polarization; at the political level, we assume that the polarization of the now non-capital Tel Aviv is oriented towards Europe, America (North and South). North Africa, which is much closer to the listed parts of the world, is occupied by Arab countries that are unfriendly to Israel, which does not imply polarization on them.

As a result, it can be assumed that Jerusalem is polarized inward, towards sacred important objects and locations. It is difficult to assume a movement to the east as an avoidance of contacts with the Maghreb countries, since Jerusalem borders on the Arab Palestinian Authority (West Bank), as well as closer to Arab Syria and Jordan, polarization to which in this logic should also be avoided.

Thus, the largest city in the country was chosen as the capital, however, which has a controversial international status that has a significant impact on the externalities of the capital city. The choice was made in favor of a center on the “north-south” axis, which is important from a sacred and cultural-historical position of the center. However, in our opinion, the controversial international status of Jerusalem significantly affects the capital of the city.

The existence of the capital can result from several factors: the factor of establishment as the fulfillment of all the necessary procedures, public discussion over a proposal to implement such a project, or even the appearance of a plan / project proposal to organize a transfer. In a similar way, it ends; with the appearance of a plan for transfer to another place, public discussion, loss in favor of the invader, or from the moment of complete destruction.

During its existence, Jerusalem as a capital city has experienced several “typical” situations distinctive of any capital city. These situations are inherently the implementation of performative acts, for example, various mechanisms for the acquisition of capitals or their loss.

An example of a “soft” loss of a capital can be its transfer. The transfer of the capital itself, as an action according to instructions, cleared of symbolic or discursive content, is a frame. The content of the frame is given by a performative act or a performative statement. It is the performatives that fill the “rather empty” frame with discursive meanings, which actually distinguish this frame from others. Performatives, among their other capabilities also carry out the superstructure of existing frames "building up" the second or subsequent layer through transformations, increasing the capital of the capital.
The nature of performativity implies a division into large-scale and local performative acts and events. The principle of the joint correlative organization of local performative statements and performative acts is the "nested" performative proposed by M. V. Ilyin [17].

In the cases of Jerusalem, the political context of the performative act-action is important for the production of performative analysis, as it is an indicator of the presence of certain bases of performatives and the classification of their types. Correlation with the political context is of particular importance in the case of an extraordinary performative event (V. Vakhstein), which is capable of destroying the eventual political structure, as well as causing a failure or breakdown of the previous reception of events [18].

In general, the Jerusalem performative events are successful, since there was no performative failure, the conceived performative act did not turn out to be invalid, there were no total misfires expressed in the inadmissibility or corruption of the act in violation of the rules of procedure, there were no mistakes and obstacles in the rules of the procedure, abuses, expressed in the emptiness or insincerity of the act. Large-scale political performatives are functional, multi-component, contain nested local performatives that trigger symbolic actions and reactive and background performative acts, have duration, and produce externalities outside. The institutional framework contributes not only to the accumulation, but also to the realization of the "capital of the capital".

In relation to Jerusalem, let us designate in more detail the contexts of ongoing political events, that is performative actions. Global Arab nationalism [19] has always had a lack of homogeneity in its peculiarity, unity and peace in its environment has not been achieved. Raising the issue of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, they talk about both the confrontation between the two ethnic groups and the confrontation between the two religions. Arab-Palestinian nationalism is in opposition to Zionism [20]. Both ethno-political communities were aware of their own need for independent self-determination and the acquisition of statehood [10].

The features of movement towards their own goals in these groups were quite performative, they had clear performative features. In structure, these communities differed radically: the Arabs, concentrated and living in one "historical" location for thousands of years, were deprived of a powerful unifying factor, similar to the centripetal force of the Jewish nation, which was in Galut during this period, forcibly expelled,
scattered, but, nevertheless, consolidated in their everyday life, striving for the center of their world, both geographical and symbolic, the capital Jerusalem. In religious activities and ceremonies, to maintain the belief in return, there was a special performatively technique that could be conditionally called a "personal performatively refrain", certain prayers ended with the phrase "next year in Jerusalem." Thus, unsuccessful performatives within a certain frame, even being dysfunctional, at least retain their symbolic content and are not nullified. Within the framework of the prayer frame, the call to see oneself in Jerusalem had a local, but powerful performance effect on the actor himself, uttering a performative utterance, rooting in everyday life, consolidating in rituals and ceremonies the eternal capital of Jerusalem for the Jewish state. Such practices served as a powerful catalyst for capital growth in the capital. A feature of this state of affairs can be considered that the work on the development of the capital of the capital city of Jerusalem began well in advance, at a time when the Jewish state did not yet exist. This made it possible to accumulate in the most rational way, to multiply the “capital resource” of Jerusalem and to immediately make a very significant initial contribution to the capital of the capital city at the moment when the performative political act consolidated its capital status.

3. Conclusion
With regard to Jerusalem, the following can be concluded. In our case, Jerusalem large-scale performative manifests the native frame of the temporary transfer of the capital, and at the level of political and social routine it executes performative intervention in political and social event orders and procedures [18]. Subsequent nested performatives re-dynamize the process of capital development in the capital city of Jerusalem.

The capital must be located in a special environment. Such an environment should be a sustainable platform for the implementation of the capital's functions responsible for the effective management of state formation [21]. The stability of the metropolitan platform must be ensured by all possible means, including through the accumulation and augmentation of the capital of the capital, which allows the capital of Jerusalem to be rooted in the consciousness as something unshakable and monumental.

Jerusalem in a performative way acquires a wide range of metropolitan functionality and it manages to build up and multiply the capital's equity capital through the performative "transfer" of the qualities of the historical metropolitan location and reframing of the deep-rooted ideas about this political and geographical location [21]. The leading role of Jerusalem as the capital of modern times, as a political, and not only religious and national, center would develop and grow slowly, but the illocutionary force of the performative act indirectly but densely fills the metropolitan location with capital discourses and symbols. The performative act gave Jerusalem as a capital place not only dynamism and a vector of development, but also endowed it with its own vital and political power. The capital of Jerusalem exists on a performative basis, reproducing spatial subjectivity.
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