

## **Celebrating the Everyday - Jerusalem 2050**

Haim Yacobi

Department of Politics and Government, Department of Geography  
Ben Gurion University, Israel

My proposed vision for Jerusalem 2050 is based on acknowledging the significance of the everyday life in the city. In this paper I argue that historically most of the visions and their planning implications on Jerusalem were focused on the city as an object of desire - linking its urban "heroic" future to colonial, national or religious sentiments. By so doing these visions have ignored the essence of urban existence; the everyday life in the city. In my vision of Jerusalem I propose to celebrate the everyday and to use it as a basis for producing a new urban order which aims to fulfill the *Right to the City* of all Jerusalem's inhabitants. In the paper I present a model which defines two categories that refer to the diversity of Jerusalem's communities. The first category refers to *Universal Planning Needs* while the second refers to *Differentiated Planning Needs*. In reference to this model, I suggest to focus on some sites which call for a creative planning approach. These sites cover a wide range of scales: the personal, the domestic, the interfaces, the forbidden and the resisted. Moreover, in this paper I argue that such a vision also demands a reorganization of urban governance. Here I will propose a new shared urban regime that does not focus on the metropolitan scale of two capital districts, but on the necessity to establish a tier of local municipalities, where most urban governance will take place.

\*\*\*

During the Ottoman period urban development in Jerusalem stemmed from the informal colonialism of the European powers such as Russia, France, Italy and Britain (see figure 1). Planning in Jerusalem for these external powers, beyond the political dimension, involved discourses of modernity, European nationalism and 'cultural' orientalism - expressed in the built environment (Crinson, 1996). The significance of this debate is expressed in the development of the city beyond the walls and in the creation of western spatial 'order', accompanied with modern infrastructure.

During the Mandate period, planning in Jerusalem was part of the geopolitical order in the Middle East as well as part of the escalating national tension between Jews and

Arabs. As I argued elsewhere (Yacobi, 2003) another dimension was the colonial attitude of the British and its view of modernization and urbanization. The escalating national conflict contradicted the considerable effort of the Mandate regime to produce common economic and municipal spheres for both communities, and spatially speaking this period is characterized by segregation. The British Mandate expanded the area of Municipal Jerusalem, mostly to the West of the Old City, thereby including most Jewish neighborhoods and excluding most Palestinian villages. British Mandate authorities prepared several master schemes for Jerusalem such as the William McLean plan, the Patrick Geddes Mater plan, the Clifford Holliday plan and finally the Kendall's master plan that was approved in 1944 (see figure 2).

The 1948 war has dramatically changed Jerusalem's geography, demography and politics. The separation of the city was marked by the wall. 30,000 Palestinian residents of the new city found themselves refugees in their city, while 2,000 Jews were expelled from the Old City. Since, Jerusalem has been divided into two parts. But the 1948 war and the national conflict shifted urban development dramatically. I would suggest that Jewish Jerusalem was shaped through two processes; on one hand during that period the city shrank back into its 'safe' quarters and expanded into its western hinterland. The development of the mass housing districts such as Kiryat Yovel and Kiryat Menachem on an expropriated Palestinian ex-villages land that were populated mainly by Jewish migrants is a good example of it. On the other hand the western part of the city defined its frontier vis a vis the eastern city through settling Jewish migrants - mainly mizrachim - in the frontier neighborhoods, such as in Mammilah and Musrara (see figure 3).

This processes has accompanied with a massive construction of the new Jewish Capital representative center "Kiryat HaLeom" (the National Compound) that included national institutions located at the west such as the Knesset the Israeli museum and the Givaat Ram university campus (see figure 4). From architectural point of view, this process adopted Modernism as a symbol and a functional response to the political situation while the Palestinian vernacular that signified the intimidating 'other' was a subject of demolishing.

The 1967 war and the occupation of east Jerusalem deepened the conflict; on one hand the city of Jerusalem was declared as a united capital while on the other hand the Palestinian inhabitants of the city were excluded from all urban sphere. Furthermore,

land usage policy in Jerusalem encourages Jewish growth while inhibiting Palestinian growth in the city (prior to 1948 Jews owned less than 30% of the property within the municipality of Jerusalem). Today, Jewish ownership or control of property in the city accounts for over 90% of Jerusalem. On one hand the city expands but de-urbanized through the massive expropriation of land and a massive construction of subsidized housing that to some extent reproduced social inequality and demographic control. Nostalgic images of housing typologies that represents the vernacular architecture were adopted, interpreted - often absurdly - and created the new "courtyards" in the satellite neighborhoods of Jerusalem.

An important shift must be noted in relation to post 1967 period; this is the emphasis on moving back down towards the Old City. The frontier neighborhoods that were inhabited up to 1967 by poor, were a subject of redevelopment and gentrification. Yemin Moshe is a good example of this process; the previous inhabitants that protected the frontier from 1948 to 1967 were moved and a massive reconstruction turned the neighborhood into a very expensive gentrified zone. In the late 80s and 90s urban development is characterized by a high degree of privatization of space as well as by militarisation; the ordinary Israeli presence slim and there is an attempt to populate the city center with tourists (hotels) and the urban wealthy who arrive and depart in their cars but never really use the area (see figure 5). Another planning mechanism that shapes Jerusalem and its surroundings since 1967 is the implementation of infrastructure; beyond its unequal distribution, it dramatically changes the cognitive map of the city and links the periphery to the center (see figure 6).

To sum up, I would like to return to my argument and to highlight the way in which planning in Jerusalem shoved aside the essence of urban existence - this is the everyday life in the city. Indeed in my vision of Jerusalem I would suggest to celebrate the everyday and to use it as a basis for producing a new urban future which is alternative to the present.

\*\*\*

Let me propose to adopt the Lefebvrien approach for the Right to the City, which goes beyond the allocation of resources and it demands freedom, the right to be socially included, the right to maintain individual and collective way of life and the right to

participate in decision making (Lefebvre, 1991; 1996). Based on Marion Young (1990; 1998) I would also mention the concept of differentiated citizenship that enables to accept the other as an equal member in a democratic society. This is one of the expressions of the politics of difference which demand the removal of apparatuses that aim to produce a "collective homogeneity" and by so doing to unrecognize the needs of specific (and often powerless) communities. On the basis of this I would suggest a visionary planning model which defines two categories. (a) Universal planning needs: in this situation different communities get the same equal planning respond, in terms of infrastructure, employment and urban services. (b) Differentiated planning needs: here different communities get different planning respond according to their ethnic or cultural characteristics (see figure 7). Indeed, following Sandercock (1998) let me suggest that my proposed vision is a normative one that will enable the existence of difference without exclusion. Hence urban planning and policy cannot express the needs and interest of one group. Rather, the diversity of needs, sentiments and visions of the different communities in the city - even if they do not participate or integrate into the hegemonic group.

Let me now suggest a planning scale: The everyday life scale which is identified through the less heroic - yet important - urban sites that demand attention and creative planning approach for example:

(a) The domestic: Illegal construction in East Jerusalem, Housing districts, Haredi neighborhoods; (b) The micro daily routines: Commercial activities, Education; (c) The interfaces: Road 1, Hadassah Hospital; (d) The forbidden: the wall; (e) The resisting: spaces of protest such as Paris square where Women in black protest (see figure 8).

However, such vision demands the reorganization of urban governance. Here, following Yiftachel and Yacobi (2002), I propose to define the entire Jerusalem/Al Quds metropolitan area as a distinct political unit under shared Israeli and Palestinian sovereignty. (It will stretch between al-Birrya in the north, Ma'aleh Adumim in the east, Beit Jalla in the south, and Mevaseret Zion in the west about half Jews and half Palestinians). The area will be placed under joint Israeli and Palestinian sovereignty and managed by a Metropolitan Authority headed concurrently (or alternatively) by a Palestinian and an Israeli. The Capital Region Authority is envisaged as a "thin" political institution. Its Assembly will consist of representatives from the region's local governments and from the Israeli and

Palestinian ministries. Its main staff will be professionals in the fields of engineering, planning, transport, and environment. The urban region will include two capital districts, which will host the Palestinian and Israeli government quarters. The Israeli government zone will remain in its place while the location of the Palestinian district will be chosen by the Palestinian people and the Al Quds community (Some possibilities include the Shaych Jarrakh or Wadi Joz). The city as a whole will be mutually recognized as a state capital by both Israel and Palestine. This will guarantee the rights of both peoples in the city and slow the disastrous demographic and geographic competition between Israelis and Palestinians that has gone on since 1967.

The name “Capital Region” aims to evade the religious, historical, and political mega-importance attached to anything associated (whether historically or by means of symbolic manipulation) with “Jerusalem” or with “Al Quds”. By so doing I hope to create a mainly administrative and professional entity that will govern the city’s everyday affairs and future development without constant reference to heroic or tragic national narratives or to sacred religious and historical sites. As a parallel step, the proposed framework will define a small area, including the Old City and its immediate surrounding area, as “Holy Jerusalem/ Al Quds.” This area of about three square kilometers will be the only locality in the metropolis to carry the names “Jerusalem” and “Al Quds.” This will be historically credible in the eyes of many, as the area in and around the Old City truly reflects the location of the sacred and cherished Jerusalem/Al Quds to which so many Jews, Muslims, and Christians have developed special bonds.

Under this proposal the small area designated “Holy Jerusalem/Al Quds” will be declared as existing under “Divine ownership” and be managed by an international, interreligious “Holy City Council” consisting equally of Christian, Muslim, and Jewish representation. It is expected that the area will be largely preserved and hence face relatively little redevelopment pressure (see figure 9).

Returning back to the focus on everyday life in the city, a key player in this model is the tier of local municipalities, where most urban governance will take place. This part of the urban governance structure will form the backbone of the region’s communal, local, and urban planning management; focusing on the differentiated planning needs. Whereas the umbrella Capital Region Authority will be made up mainly of professional experts and the Holy City Council of religious figures, the local municipalities will perform the

full range of urban governance functions, including local planning, education, culture, housing, economic development, environmental control, and other daily procedures of urban democracy.

The special status of the Capital Region Authority will be further expressed in its autonomy in the area of universal planning needs such as infrastructure, metropolitan transport, and environment. In order to diffuse potential tensions between the Israeli and Palestinian states and the city's municipalities, the Regional Authority will concentrate on professional matters, overseeing the smooth functioning of the region's urban systems. It will have its own set of "ministries" for environment, planning, transport, infrastructure, and the like, as well as a Capital Region police force.

The Capital Region Authority will not draw on local taxes but will be funded equally by the Israeli and Palestinian states. A special long-term fund should be established for the purpose of "affirmative development," that is, development which aims to reduce inequalities. The Jerusalem/Al Quds area is rife with disparities, most notably between Jewish and Palestinian neighborhoods but also between the wealthy and the poor portions of each national community. This special "affirmative development" fund, which may be drawn from international sources, is imperative for the improvement of Arab-Jewish relations. The effects of decades of neglect and discrimination that have left the city's Arab areas in a grave state of disrepair and underdevelopment must gradually be rectified. The fund will also enable the city to increase residential opportunities for its Palestinian residents, who have been highly constrained by Israeli policies. This will be achieved either by constructing new Arab neighborhoods or by compensating Arabs for property lost through unilateral confiscation or expropriation.

#### REFERENCES

- Crinson, M., (1996), Empire Building - Orientalism and Victorian Architecture. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, H., (1991). The Production of Space. Oxford, U.K & Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, H., (1996). Writings on Cities,. London: Blackwell.
- Sandercock, L., (1998). Towards Cosmopolis. Wiley.
- Yacobi, H., (2003). "The Architecture of Ethnic Logic: Exploring the Meaning of the Built Environment in the "Mixed" City of Lod - Israel ". Geografiska Annaler, p.p.: 171-187

- Yiftachel, O. and Yacobi, H., (2002). "Planning a Bi-National Capital: Should Jerusalem Remain United?". Geoforum 33, 137-145.
- Young, M. I., (1990). Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, M. I., (1998). "Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of Universal Citizenship". In: Shafir, G., (ed.), The Citizenship Debate - A Reader. University of Minnesota Press. pp.: 263-290.



Figure 1: The Italian Hospital, Jerusalem



Figure 2: Kendall's scheme



Figure 3: Jerusalem frontier, Housing block at the edge of Musrara



Figure 4: the Knesset in the National Compound (Kiryat HaLeom)