

### 3. CASE STUDIES

Some people think that urban structures, like living creatures, organize spontaneously, leaving little room for outside intervention. Others agree that to cope with the challenge of the problem at hand, we have to “reinvent Jerusalem”.

In our project the wish to reinvent Jerusalem was balanced by a search for organizational patterns prevailing elsewhere, and how problems similar to those of Jerusalem, have been tackled there. To this end the team had recourse to other case studies mostly those conducted by the “*Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies*, Rotterdam, August 1996.” (See Appendices 1 and 2 ). Each of the solutions in these cases evolved to fit a specific environment which differs from that of Jerusalem. We have made an effort to describe the specific environment of each solution in a generic way and to produce a typology of environments, one relevant to our problem of the environment of Jerusalem.

In framing this typology we have asked how each environment with its specific solution, differs from that of Jerusalem; how a particular solution is applicable to Jerusalem; what dimensions Jerusalem’s environment must be altered to adapt a given solution. By describing the context of each particular solution we were able to identify the difficulties and opportunities of transferring organizational technologies from one environment to the other.

Our next step was to untie the linkage between the solution and the peculiarities of the specific environment so as to adapt it to that of Jerusalem. We have assumed that complete organizational setups are more dependent on their environment dependent than their components and we use these various organizational techniques as the raw material from which to tailor solutions to Jerusalem’s problems.

## 1. ORGANIZATIONAL SETUP

**SOLUTION:** State and city are sacrificing part of their power to empower the metropolitan “roof municipality” and the boroughs to run the city at the macro and micro levels.

**CASE:**  
**Rotterdam**

**ENVIRONMENT:** Nowadays the conflict between the communities and the city take turn on two megatrends. Peace, following two major wars in one century, gave birth to the EEC. The EEC has deprived member states of their power to determine the permeability of their borders. In an environment of nearly free movement of people, merchandise and capital across borders, competition between cities has begun replacing competition between states. It centers on the location of the advantages which determine the economic strength and welfare of society. This trend coexists with another: “the rise of community power”. People have begun to reject the alienation of big city life and to seek group identity, social interaction and involvement in local politics. Rotterdam serves as a hub for western Europe and as such it competes in the “big-guys-game”. On the other hand the people in Rotterdam’s quarters, suburbs and satellite towns, want to pursue their own “small-town life.” This is a European expression of a world wide conflict stemming out of globalization. Identification of these contradictory trends and the assessment of their potential influence on Rotterdam has led the local people, as well as the central government, to search for a new organizational setup; wherein the metropolitan “roof municipality” runs “the big things” while the boroughs will run the local ones. In this setup the central government and the city of Rotterdam will step back a little, and make room for a metropolitan “roof municipality” and also for the local city boroughs and quarters and for the suburbs and satellite towns to run their own affairs. This change is still in the making and its outcome remains to be evaluated.

**SOLUTION:** An organizational metropolitan area spread over two or three states.

**CASE:** **Basel (Switzerland, Germany, France)**  
**Geneva (Switzerland, France)**

**ENVIRONMENT:** A prolonged peace between the states and an extended experience in running a multilingual, federal state.

**SOLUTION:** A capital city with the status of state within a federal nation.

**CASE:** **Washington D.C.**  
**Berlin**  
**Canberra**

**ENVIRONMENT:** A capital city in a federal state holds the seed for conflict. A solution was found in USA early on and in Berlin in the context of major changes at end of the cold war following the fall of the Berlin Wall.

**SOLUTION:** A city divided into two urban systems, separated by an impermeable border, run by two municipalities which do not relate one to the other.

**CASE:** **Nicosia**

**ENVIRONMENT:** Two different peoples live within one city, each in its own area. They speak different languages, adhere to different religions and share a long history of hostility and belligerency. The rest of Cyprus is likewise divided (as are Turkey and Greece). There is no Archimedean pivot to help Nicosia break this stalemate.

**SOLUTION:** A divided city reunited

**CASE:**

**Berlin**

**ENVIRONMENT:** The city was divided by a wall which served as an impermeable border. The two parts of the city and the two states around it are made up of the same people, language, history and culture. The nature of the conflict was political and ideological. The conflict originated as part of the Cold War which lasted for nearly two generations. Reunification began through the political development of the collapse of the Soviet Union. It stirred the reunification of Germany, culminating in a rebuilding of Berlin as the nation's capital.

**SOLUTION:** A special pattern of power structure and power sharing helps, a city divided by language to work in one system.

**CASE:**

**Brussels**

**ENVIRONMENT:** Two communities live in the same city, each speaking its own language. These groups live in separate areas within and around the city, and the border between them is completely permeable. Their discord revolves around language, as it does throughout Belgium. This conflict has long been peacefully contained within the political arena.

**SOLUTION:** Peace starts at the bottom, stitching a divided city together through local community projects

**CASE:**  
**Belfast**

**ENVIRONMENT:** The two population groups share a same culture and speak the same language. The conflict is about religion and politics, but it has found expression in a series of acts of belligerency. Its persistence has caused it to perpetuate itself. The conflict extended into all of Northern Ireland, indeed into the even larger sphere of Ireland and Great Britain. But this violence is now fading. What is left is the hostility between people, some of whom live in the same neighborhoods within Belfast. Their borders are set literally by high fences at times separating people in the same street. Despite their continuing, heated conflict both groups use the same city center along with other components of a single urban system. The idea of community projects was meant to reduce the remnants of hostility.

**SOLUTION:** City state. A city enjoying political sovereignty but interacting intensely adjacent countries.

**CASE:**  
**Singapore**

**ENVIRONMENT:** Singapore serves as a hub for neighboring Indonesia and Malaysia (not unlike Rotterdam). These service are not limited to physical transport and handling. For its neighbors, Singapore is a “hen laying golden eggs” while Singapore derives its resources mainly from its larger neighbors.

**CASE:**  
**Hong Kong**

**ENVIRONMENT:** Hong Kong is a “mega-translator.” It translates from English to Chinese and from capitalism to communism. The border between Hong Kong and China is very permeable and the Chinese province Guangdong across the border (50 millions strong) can be seen as Hong Kong’s metropolitan area. Here again a city-state (of sorts) derives its power and its room to maneuver from its symbiotic relationship with a much larger neighbor next door.

### 3.2 ORGANIZATIONAL TECHNIQUES

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Dedicated Service Organizations</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Metropolitan Sewage Authority in Tel-Aviv</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Overall Metropolitan Municipality</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Greater London</b> <b>Berlin</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Outsourcing of Urban Services to the Private Sector</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Garbage Collection in Ramat Gan</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Private-Public Partnerships</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Industrial Parks in USA</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>A Three tier Organizational Pattern Providing Urban Services such as Transport, Water and Sewage Disposal</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Water Distribution and Sewage Collection in Ramalla</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Planning Doctrine</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Holland's "Green Hart within the Rand Stad."</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>	<p>A relatively small densely populated country with a strong tradition of central planning and a relatively strong agricultural sector. Planners use the doctrine to keep green areas around and between the urban sprawl. This planning doctrine, in place for about two generations serves as a "planning constitution" which helps to contain cities within specified bounds of area and population.</p> <p>The Rand Stad is a very densely populated region where four cities—each with its own a specialization--serve as focal points of a single megalopolis.</p>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>A Metropolis Whose Area Spreads Across National Borders and where</i></li> <li>2. <i>The borders are more permeable to the people of this metropolis The metropolitan airport is open to both sides of the border.</i></li> </ol>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Basel</b> <b>Geneva</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Two or Three Tiers of Organization in a Metropolitan Area</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Quarters, Satellite Towns or Districts</i></li> <li>2. <i>City or Metropolis of Cities</i></li> </ol>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Berlin</b> <b>Brussels</b> <b>Rotterdam</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Specialization in Running Urban Services in a Metropolis According to the Following:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Area-related Services</i></li> <li>2. <i>Person-related Services</i></li> </ol>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Brussels</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Specialization in Cross-border Services. Cross-border Function to-Belong to the Organizational Tier Within These Borders.</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Federal Roads in the USA</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Varying Degrees of Border Permeability.</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Nicosia</b> <b>Berlin: Before and After the Wall</b> <b>France and Germany</b> <b>Germany and Poland</b> <b>USA and Mexico</b> <b>Maryland and Virginia in the USA</b>

<b>TECHNIQUE</b>	<i>Planning Cooperation and Trans-boundary Regionalism</i>
<b>CASE</b>	<b>Germany – Poland</b>
	<b>USA – Mexico</b>