

1. SUMMARY

Through its long history Jerusalem has changed hands, was destroyed and rebuilt many times. Each ruler left prints in stone, building, temples and graves that shaped the city. In 1948 the city was divided - the western part under the rule of Israel and the eastern part under the rule of Jordan, and since 48 Jerusalem is the capital of Israel. Since 1967 the two parts of the city have been under Israeli rule. The new municipal boundaries enclose about 70% Israeli and 30% Palestinian population. The Palestinians regard Jerusalem as the capital of the future state of Palestine¹.

A working team of professionals, Palestinians and Israelis, was convened to think about Jerusalem in the context of an ongoing peace process.

The mission assigned to the team was “Planning Jerusalem in peace”, where “planning” stands for strategic planning, and “in peace” can be understood as peace between peoples as well as between the parties within the team. This team differs from an “ordinary” urban planning team in the sense that :

- A. It is composed of experts from two peoples: Israelis and Palestinians. These experts have different cultural backgrounds - a history of war stands between them - and there is a sense of discrimination on the Palestinian side.
- B. The experts who constitute the planning team bring to the project different perspectives from a professional and personal level.
- C. To handle the complexities inherent in Jerusalem, the planning team included experts from different disciplinary backgrounds. Architects, city planners, economists, political scientists and historians. Each uses a distinct disciplinary language, relies on different sources of information and approaches the planning process from a different vantage point.

¹ In this report the words “Palestine” and “State” are referred to what ever political identity will the Palestinians get at the final agreement.

Ideas about the essence of a city vary according to the school of thought. Still, we all agree that the city is a place of interchange of different kinds (cultural, economical and social). It is the physical frame for human activities of different sorts, and it is a system which provides certain services to its citizens.

We see Jerusalem as a city which plays different roles for different “stakeholders”. For example: a “world city” for everyone, a host for the capital of one or two peoples, a holy city for three religions, a center for the communities around it, and the provider of services to its citizens.

Jerusalem serves as a political, religious, and historic symbol for its people as well as for people all over the world. Its earthly roles and its symbolic roles produce the following dilemma: “If all the symbols above the ground and beneath it should be kept intact, then it will be hard for the city to expand and to provide the necessary services to its citizens”. On the other hand if the city development will disregard its symbolic roles, Jerusalem will stop being the provider of governmental and cultural services as well as being a tourist attraction, and this will seriously undermine its economy. Thus, in Jerusalem, symbols and earthly life are at once conflictive and complementary.

In our task we found use to see Jerusalem as “a system which has to provide services to its citizens” and has to be a center for the communities around it.

The planning team tried to see Jerusalem from the perspective of the citizen’s eye and to focus on the practical aspects of the city. By dealing with practicalities rather than with symbols we hope to reduce the weight of loaded political problems. Our underlying ethos has been the belief that if we deal with practicalities then the task of dealing with symbols (which will be left for the political negotiations) will become somewhat easier.

As our work progressed, the problem which the project has to challenge was crystallized and defined as: “How can two peoples, who live in Jerusalem use the same city system, peacefully and efficiently?”. This definition gave the planning project the following guidelines :

1. To aim not at an ideal city, but at a Jerusalem for two peoples to live in peacefully.
2. To produce an agreed-upon set of various alternative plans.
3. These alternatives were designed to satisfy the criterion of “efficiency of the urban system” as well as that of “less friction between the two peoples who live in the city.”
4. The project refers to all aspects of the urban system: content, shape, and organization.

The plans produced by the project were designed to fit the environment prevailing in and around Jerusalem: To fit, not the environment exists in Jerusalem today, but the environment that will prevail, should peace replace hostility between Israel and the Palestinians. It will find expression according to the varying dimensions of that peace: Whether “hot” or “cold,” whatever the degree of permeability of the borders between Palestine and Israel, and the room the two states may allot for Jerusalem to manage itself. A combination of these parameters will determine each specific scenario, with more than one imaginable. For example: a “cold peace” and impermeable borders with the two states governing nearly everything in Jerusalem; or a “warm peace” between Israel and Palestine, where people and commerce pass through the borders between them, and Jerusalem governs its urban matters by itself. In the light of these scenarios the team has designed alternative solutions to the above-stated problem. The alternatives produced by the team are as follows:

Alternative I

Urban system: Metropolis

Separation and permeability: No single border separates between the two populations, but there is a border which encircles the metropolis while other borders encircle local communities (villages, quarters, suburbs and satellite towns) within the metropolis.

The borders of the local communities permit a crossing for everything except the residents themselves from the Palestinian communities to the Israeli. The permeability of the borders encircling the metropolis will be the same as the permeability of the border between Israel and Palestine.

Specialization: The two municipalities will be in charge of providing person-related services to each of the two populations. Boroughs of the local communities will be in charge of providing place-related services which have an impact on the local environment (in the broad sense of the word). The overall metropolitan municipality will be in charge of providing cross-border services of the kind indivisible to local communities, or impacting the entire metropolitan environment. The municipalities or the boroughs could out-source services to the private sector.

Power structure: Borough governments will be elected by their resident citizens. The two municipalities will be elected by the citizens of each group. The overall metropolitan municipality will be elected by the boroughs and by the two municipalities.

Alternative II

Urban system: Metropolis

Separation and permeability: The border crosses Jerusalem with the Palestinians to one side and Israelis to the other. This border will permit crossing to virtually everything, except the residents. The permeability of the border that encircles the metropolis will be the same as between Israel and Palestine.

Specialization: Two municipalities, one for the Israeli side and the other for the Palestinian, will be in charge on providing services which are not cross-border or which are not indivisible (considering the size of the city) or yet which do not impact the metropolitan environment. The boroughs of the local communities will be in charge of providing services which have an impact on the local environment. The boroughs and the municipalities will out-source services to the private sector; and the private sector will be invited to provide proprietary services to individual citizens.

Power structure: The overall municipality will be elected by the two municipalities.

Alternative III

Urban system: Two Cities

Separation and permeability: A separate border between the two cities also encircles each of them. The border permits a free crossing of goods and a controlled crossing of labor.

Specialization: The two cities and the bordering local communities will be in charge of providing all services except those exceeding their means.

According to their size the two cities and the local communities will cooperate in providing such services as are indivisible or which cross borders. They will out source these services to the private sector.

Power structure: Each of the two cities will have a municipality and the suburban villages and satellite towns will have boroughs. The management of the service providers will be appointed by the city's satellite towns and villages.

Alternative IV

Urban system: City

Separation and permeability: A border crosses Jerusalem so that the Palestinians are on one side and the Israelis on the other. This border permits the crossing of everything except residents. A border will encircle the city and the permeability of this border will be the same as that between Israel and Palestine.

Specialization: Each of the two cities will be in charge of providing all the services that they desire and can provide efficiently. Services which are indivisible or cross-border or which have an impact on the metropolitan environment will be under the responsibility of the overall municipality. It will be in charge of providing such services to the two cities as well as to the boroughs, surrounding suburbs and satellite towns around (if they so desire). The municipalities and the boroughs will out-source services to the private sector.

Power structure: Each of the two cities will have a municipality which will be elected by the citizens according to place of residence. The overall municipality will be elected by the two municipalities and by such boroughs as will choose to participate.

These alternatives were designed to reach the maximum of efficiency in the urban system with the minimum of friction between the populations within it. They were designed as coherent, feasible alternatives to fit the specific environment of Jerusalem. The set of alternatives produced by the team demonstrates the trade-offs between efficiency and friction on the one hand, and the differences of opinions between the team members on the other hand, and, on the other, the differences of opinion among members of the team.

The product of this planning effort is not an agreement between Palestinians and Israelis about a city master plan for Jerusalem, but a variety of alternative solutions for the city's problems. The outcome is stored on a database organized to help potential users to choose the desired alternative or to design an alternative of their own. Users can follow this projects planning approach and use the planning tools developed here to add alternatives of their own. In this sense this planning exercise is not an end, but a point of departure for a process of "planning while negotiating".

The chart's larger spots are suburbs and satellite towns around the city, the smaller spots are villages and quarters within it. The blue color symbolizes one people, the green the other. Lines symbolize borders -- of the city or of two cities, or of quarters, villages, suburbs and towns or clusters thereof, and also the borders of the entire metropolis. Chart 2.0 serves a kind of empty form in which the user can draw his own version of a border-scheme while charts 2a, 2b,...2j present the various schemes produced by the team. Table 0 condenses the information presented in the several versions of chart 2.