

5. DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM AND SPECIFICATIONS OF THE SOLUTIONS

5.1 REDEFINING THE PROBLEM

In the case of Berlin where the two sides, while sharing the same language, nationality and culture, were divided over ideology and politics, the problem was “a divided city” and the solution was reunification. Even there this solution had to be fortified at both ends by giving Berlin the special status of a state within the German federation and by giving some autonomy to the districts of the city. These organizational techniques were used to restrain the differences still existing between the eastern and western parts of the city.

In the cases of Basel and Geneva, we find people who speak different languages, belong to different nations and live across national borders though in the same metropolitan area. Here the problem and its solutions were necessarily different. These people want to keep their separate linguistic, national, religious and political identities, but they also wish to maintain the common urban identity of a metropolis, one that does not negate their other identities. In this environment the problem was “national borders.” This was resolved through a special permeability for all the people of the metropolis.

As shown in our case studies, different solutions have been evolved for different environments. This knowledge has helped us define the desirable solutions we seek for Jerusalem.

Aware of Jerusalem’s specific environmental features, we did not define the project’s problem as “How to reunite Jerusalem in the way they have done it in Berlin”, but rather “How will the two peoples living in Jerusalem use the same city system peacefully and efficiently”. In solving this problem we did not assume the two peoples share much love or like goals or that they speak a same language, live in the same neighborhoods or acknowledge the same nationality. All that we need assume is that most of them want peace and

appreciate the qualities of urban life. These assumptions underline the discussion in the following chapters.

5.2 THE TYPE OF SOUGHT-FOR SOLUTIONS

The two peoples living in Jerusalem are engaged in a vicious cycle of hostility. Such a situation might lead us to think that full separation is the one medicine to let them escape this cycle. But separation has its own price. It would badly hamper the quality of urban services and the efficiency of the urban system.

Full separation and full integration are not the only available options. In-between variations can also be found. Using our 'SBS' method for generating alternatives we have explored a variety of feasible alternatives and have identified the trade offs between efficiency and friction which exist in this unusual urban system.

For example, friction can be reduced by designing borders that will let people live in homogeneous neighborhoods. Efficiency can be enhanced through the permeability of borders, permitting interaction of Israelis and Palestinians at work, in commerce and in the provision and utilization of urban services. Borders schemes and border permeability indicate desirable border patterns.

Considering the problem of friction, we can design the provision of services so that each of the two peoples will, as much as possible, "mind its own business." The key to this lies in the specialization of the agents who provide the services.

Instead of a government where one of the parties monopolizes all the power, the structure can be arranged in a way to let the two populations share power.

Synchronizing power structures through specialization and borders patterns will make for a Comprehensive Feasible Coherent Alternative (CFCA). Should this alternative fit the specific environment of Jerusalem, then it will reduce

friction between the two peoples and provide all citizens with high quality services at low costs.

REINVENTING JERUSALEM

The comparison of Jerusalem's environment with that of other cities, sharing similar problems might lead us to conclude that ours is the toughest problem of all.

Three different approaches have been suggested to cope with this formidable problem.

1. To reinvent Jerusalem
2. To borrow one of the available solutions
3. To tailor a solution to Jerusalem's specific environment from fragments of other extant solutions.

We are herewith trying to walk the thin rope between the first and the third approach. The SBS method used here for planning urban organization proceeds as follows:

4. Describe the system and its components
5. Disassemble the organizational set-ups, found in other case studies into their elements – their organizational techniques.
6. Develop a database which includes organizational set-ups as well as organizational techniques.
7. Pick one technique for each component of the system to reassemble a new organizational set-up.
8. Repeat this procedure to get a variety of organizational set-ups
9. Evaluate each of them.
10. Select a set of two to three organizational set-ups.

Note:

A new set-up is one that differs in at least in one technique from an existing one

COHERENT FEASIBLE ALTERNATIVES

In 'SBS' the user assembles alternative from "ready-made bricks". Using this method, each team member looks for coherence, feasibility and fitness for the

recipient environment of each of the alternatives. For example, the “brick” of *“two cities not on talking terms”* does not go along with the brick *“permeable borders”*. Not all coherent alternatives are technically or economically feasible. For example the brick *“separation of the sewage system”* can be coherent with the brick *“two separate cities”* but it will be economically infeasible in the environment of Jerusalem

EVALUATION AND SELECTION

Having coherent feasible alternatives does not mean that all of them will be used for further planning or negotiating. Some very similar alternatives can, for the sake of simplicity, be treated as one. Some complement others, and so may be merged into one. Alternatives found inferior were screened out. An alternative is inferior if another alternative in the set surpasses its standards. For the rest, evaluation will proceed in accordance with the following criteria:

CRITERIA

The ‘CFCA’s were evaluated in the light of future scenarios and assessed qualitatively as follows:

- A. Quality of the services the citizens will receive
- B. Efficiency of the system.
- C. Fairness of service provision
- D. Friction between the two parties.
- E. Resilience.
- F. Sustainability.

Political acceptability.

After all this representing, merging and screening and selecting we arrive at a set of ‘CFCA’s (Coherent Feasible Comprehensive Alternatives) which will clarify the tradeoffs of the system and the differences of opinions among the members of the team.

DYNAMICS

We have started out by assuming that solutions have to fit the specific recipient environment. But that does not mean that the introduction of a new solution will leave the environment unchanged. We expect a dynamic

interaction between the solution and the recipient environment, and we assume that as we go from the first to the second and then the third sphere there consequently develops a gradient of asymmetry. In the first sphere, the interaction will be more or less symmetrical, that is, the recipient environment will influence the solution while the solution influence the environment In the third sphere the interaction will be asymmetrical, with the environment influencing the solution rather more than being influenced by it. This holds true as long as there is a trend toward peace. History has taught us that in this fragile region a conflict in the first or second sphere can at times ignite war in the third.

RESERVATIONS

We hope that we had found some alternative solutions located somewhere between integration and separation which, with a little bit of luck, might help to get Jerusalem out of its vicious circle. We say “with luck” because, unless they are put to trial, no one can guarantee how any of these solutions works. On the other hand we know assuredly that the alternative of “stay-where-you-are” will simply not “deliver the goods” This only encourages our search.