

Unity and Diversity:
Urban Planning for Multiculturalism

Lauren Schwetz

April 2005

Contemporary Perspectives

Unity and Diversity: Urban Planning for Multiculturalism

A trend toward increased cultural diversity is changing the relations within our global community. We live in a time of increased globalization, where national boundaries are challenged and blurred. Nations are becoming more culturally diverse, and the interaction of cultures is becoming more prevalent. A balance needs to be reached between unifying societies and respecting the diversity of cultures within the society. “Unity without diversity results in cultural repression and hegemony. Diversity without unity leads to Balkanization and the fracturing of the nation-state (Banks 2004).” Cultural conflicts are extending beyond national boundaries, and becoming an international issue. Understanding cultural differences and establishing a sustainable societal environment should become a main goal of international concern. Through urban planning, nations could unify their steadily diversifying communities, and promote cultural understanding. In countries such as Israel, diversity has become a problem leading to major conflicts that have extended beyond the borders of the country. The cultural and religious diversity of Israel due to immigration has begun challenging urban planning to resolve the cultural conflicts. Through a better understanding of the unique urban fabric of the cities, Israel will be able to achieve unity and diversity by supporting the diversity of the communities. Through dedicated urban planning, countries such as Israel will be able to minimize cultural and international conflicts and support the increasing diversity of their communities.

Cultural diversity could facilitate many opportunities within communities.

Unfortunately, social understanding of the diversity of the world has not caught up to technological interconnectivity. Cultural education is far behind the trend towards globalization. Through urban planning, people could be encouraged to learn and interact with people from

different backgrounds. Many cultures are so strong in their beliefs that cultural conflicts seem insurmountable. Disputes that involve the cultural and religious beliefs of both sides often make the resolution of the conflicts seem unattainable. Religious wars have always occurred, such as the Israeli/Palestinian dispute, but more recently, the conflicts have turned to power disputes. Sovereignty issues arise, as well as land disputes. Both sides want control of the land, and while they often want to create a better relationship between the two cultures, they do not want to compromise on political terms. By providing opportunities for different groups to maintain their diverse cultures, while unifying the sense of belonging to a nation, urban planning can be utilized to bring communities together.

Moving Towards Cultural Diversity

Cultural diversity within nations is becoming a prominent trend in the global arena. Other trends, such as globalization and immigration are contributing to this development. Globalization is linking people in ways that were not previously possible. Because of this and increasing immigration, the world is becoming more culturally diverse, but migration has begun to exceed the extent of our cultural education. Considering less than ten percent of the world's 191 nations are ethnically or racially homogeneous (Harris 1996), it is imperative to guide the interactions and relationships between people of different backgrounds that occur because of migration. By supporting the trend towards the diversity of cultures in our nations, as well as encouraging a national and global unity, we could minimize cultural conflicts, and support a multicultural world society.

Globalization is paving the way for a growing network that is linking the many diverse cultures of our world. It is changing migration, making it much easier to take advantage of economic opportunities in other countries. Lower travel costs as well as new technology in information and communication have made migration much more viable (Doyle 2004). With the ease of migration, nations are becoming more diverse and people are not living within completely homogeneous cultures. As nations become increasingly interconnected, differences in beliefs become more prevalent. Globalization provides people with more information about other cultures and introduces conflicting values. Rapid advancements in technology allow us to interact socially, politically, and economically with other nations (White 2004), breaking down the borders that kept us isolated from one another. With technology, corporations tend to ignore national boundaries, and create networks that disregard politics. Unfortunately, social

understanding of the diversity of the world has not caught up to technological interconnectivity. Cultural education is far behind the trend towards globalization.

Migration between nations works to break down the national borders. It spreads the diversity of cultures, and leads to questioning the political divides. Since World War II, nations have dealt with cultural diversity due to an increase of immigration. Groups from former colonies of western European nations immigrated to Europe to capitalize on labor demands and to improve their economic status (Banks 2004). Immigration is common between many countries worldwide and occurs mainly for economic reasons, as people from developing countries move to industrialized nations (Harris 1996). In 2000, 150-175 million people lived outside their country of birth, which is double the amount in 1965 (Doyle 2004, Martin 2001). International migrants can be categorized generally as labor, family, or refugee (Doyle 2004). Refugees often are escaping religious persecution, wars, political turmoil, and natural disasters (Dinnerstein 2005). Absorbing these new and diverse cultures into a society that was relatively stable raises questions on how to integrate immigrants into the societal structure. The increase in migration and immigration facilitates the spread of diversity.

The trend toward increased cultural diversity in nations around the world often results in aggravating cultural conflicts. With globalization, cultural conflicts have become more prominent in international affairs. In 1992 alone, there were many cultural conflicts around the world that gained international attention due to the media coverage (Castles and Miller 1). The Los Angeles riots, the neo-Nazi attacks, the Yugoslavian wars, as well as the Israeli/Palestinian conflicts all caught international attention (Castles and Miller 1-2). Stephen Castles, Director of the Centre of Multicultural Studies at the University of Wollongong in Australia, and Mark J. Miller, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Delaware believe that all of

these conflicts are due to mass international population movements as well as the problems of diverse cultures living together in one society (2). They emphasize the growing number of countries that have experienced immigration, and with the increasing trend of migration comes the increased cultural conflicts (5). Cultural conflicts have extended the national borders and are impinging on global peace. When conflicts result in displacement of people, sovereignty is overlooked on the behalf of the victims (Martin 2001). Countries are motivated to step into the conflict in order to insure global peace. Many cities struggle with a growing ethnic, religious, and cultural diversity. Scott Bollens, professor in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at the University of California, Irvine, points out that these conflicts are often historically based in disparate ideology, ethnicity, and nationalism (Bollens 2002). These are often issues that nations cannot change, but instead they should work toward creating a society that unifies as well as respects the diversity of its citizens. James A. Banks, director of the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington, Seattle, believes that the world's greatest problems come from groups being unable to collaborate and solve problems (Banks 2004). People with differing morals, cultures, and histories are encountering each other due to globalization, and they are socially unprepared for living together within the same nation. Part of this problem is a result of beliefs that the cultures have held for centuries and are indisputable. The emotional connection that people have to their beliefs and religions make it a nonnegotiable matter. Today, people are exposed to cultures that are they are unfamiliar with, and that they do not understand, and these misunderstandings instigate cultural conflicts.

Although cultural diversity pertains to individual cases, it affects the global system as well. The interaction and mobility between nations is raising the need for global compromises. Recently scholars have begun to believe that “society [is] in [an] evolutionary movement toward

organizing humankind into a unified global order (White 2004).” Decisions made by nations are increasingly affecting the interconnected international system. Because of globalization, nations can no longer declare sovereignty with the intention of ignoring the global impact of issues. Unfortunately, globalization creates tension in the international system due to international differentiation (White 2004). These differences impede the aspiration of a unified global order, and create global conflicts.

The global history of the solutions to cultural conflicts seems to reflect the positions adopted by the United States. As a model of cultural diversity, other developed countries looked to the United States for resolutions to immigration policies. Prior to the 1960s, the United States adopted the position of assimilation with immigrants. At this time, many nations believed that because of increasing globalization, nations would share a common culture (Banks 2004). Integrating immigrants into the mainstream culture of a nation “provide[s] for the equality of all individuals” and allows “minority and majority groups [to] merge into some total societal unit (George 2004).” This allows nations to accept diverse cultures into the society without disrupting the national unity. Assimilation allows nations to maintain a status quo, but it does not recognize the background of the groups immigrating to new nations. The ethnic revitalization movement of the 1960s and 1970s in the United States provided a new response to diversity in the global system. It was a response to the disregard for the unique diversity of societies (Banks 2004). By creating a nation where all groups were required to share one dominant culture, people are pressured into sacrificing their original culture in order to participate in the national culture (Banks 2004). Immigrant groups lose their connection to their own background, stepping into an unfamiliar culture, where they are not comfortable. Groups

often derive pride from family and cultural traditions, and by asking them to put their culture aside, nations began to receive criticism from people affected by this way of thinking.

One alternative to assimilation is multiculturalism, a method triggered by the civil rights movement of the United States. Multiculturalism “acknowledges racial and cultural differences in a society and encourages their sustenance and expression as constituent elements of a national social order (Qadeer 1997).” It encouraged societies around the world to recognize the economic, political, and cultural needs of individuals and groups. Immigrants wanted their histories and cultures reflected in the national culture, and they wanted the right to maintain parts of their own culture while enjoying citizenship rights (Banks 2004). In a multicultural society, each group is “tolerated and protected within a system of political equality, yet free to practice it[s] own traditions, language, customs, and lifestyle (George 2004).” Advocates hoped multiculturalism would achieve a society equally accepting of all racial and ethnic groups, where they could practice their cultures and traditions openly. Unlike assimilation, multiculturalism respects the diversity of society, while unifying groups and creating a cultural democracy.

However, even more recently, multiculturalism is being challenged. Because of global conflicts, people are questioning whether multiculturalism is merely an ideal, and they are pointing at it as a challenge to national security. Paul Gilroy, professor of sociology at Yale University, says that because of the “war on terror,” multiculturalism is no longer trusted in the West (Gilroy 2005). It is now questioned whether we can even live together across cultural, ethnic and religious divides (Gilroy 2005). Australia expresses this same view against a Multicultural Victoria Act, which promotes cultural diversity. Some people believe this Act promotes more division, even tribalism, and that they should turn back to assimilation (Bolt 2004). A letter to the editor of *The Express* states that, “some of the people we have so freely

given right of residence and passports to will not integrate into our culture, but will instead cause us to adapt to theirs (Bastier 2004).” These calls to revert to assimilation are a response to the war on terrorism. Multiculturalism is being questioned and is raising distrust within nations.

Living together in the increasingly diverse societies would require an understanding of the other cultures. Ignorance of other cultures often fosters unfounded conflicts. Cultural education is a necessity in our increasingly interconnected world. James A. Banks says that nations should “provide opportunities for different groups to maintain aspects of their community cultures while building a nation in which these groups are structurally included (2004).” This requires a balance of diversity and unity, the main goal for minimizing cultural conflicts (Banks 2004). The more the world opens up to migration, the more people from different nations will be encountering cultures that they do not understand. Education of other cultures, religions, and ethnicities could lead to an understanding and acceptance of them. White quotes Kenneth A. Tye, saying, “Our populace [of the United States] and leaders will need attitudes and behaviors that recognize and promote interdependence and cooperation among nations. However, getting this fact understood in a society based upon individualism and competition is not easy (White 2004).” Nations should promote cooperation between as well as within nations. Supporting societal divisions or attempting to assimilate all cultures will not encourage harmony. By supporting pluralism, “a cultural/structural arrangement in which each racial and ethnic group is tolerated and protected within a system of political equality, yet free to practice it[s] own traditions, language, customs, and life style,” we can promote the understanding of other cultures, and therefore facilitate a global society. Encouraging national and global unity will enable nations to minimize cultural conflict and support a multicultural

world society (White 2004). With proper planning and education, our international system can become a multicultural society where the needs of the people are recognized and addressed.

Planning for Diversity

With the demographics of our world changing rapidly, nations need to find ways to deal with the negative effects of cultural diversity. By taking advantage of the benefits of cultural diversity, our nations can benefit from the varying backgrounds of citizens. Due to misunderstandings, cultural conflicts seem to escalate with increasing cultural diversity, but with proper planning, conflicts can be minimized. Because most of the diversity and interaction between people of different backgrounds occurs in urban areas, with proper urban design, cities can improve relations and cultural understanding among the people. Scott A. Bollens, a professional in the urban planning field, believes that “planners... are responsible for coping with the manifestations of supra-urban forces” (Bollens 2002). The job requirements of urban designers are being expanded to include a better understanding of the people the city serves. Cities shape the lives of the citizens, and through dedicated urban design, planners can take advantage of cultural diversity in order to minimize conflicts.

Urban planners are an integral part of architectural design today, and they are now bearing the responsibility of defining social relations within the city. Encarta describes an urban planner’s job as “the planning of the physical and social development of a city through the design of its layout and the provision of services and facilities (“Urban Planning”).” Beyond designating the required spaces, urban planners now need to consider the background, culture, and beliefs of the people. Because cities are composed of people who practice different rituals and believe different things, planners are expected to know much more about the population. Small issues, such as the customs of using trees, can create conflicts within a city. Mohammad A. Qadeer, professor in the School of Urban and Regional Planning at Queen’s University in Canada, describes a scenario where trees are disputed according to differences in backgrounds

and beliefs (1997). Although Toronto has strict laws that prohibit cutting down trees, the diverse population is not all benefited by this law. Italians and Portuguese like to keep trees short to allow a view of neighbors, Anglo-Saxons want trees to be tall and leafy, blocking views to and from neighborhood houses, and Chinese believe trees in front of a home bring bad luck. Accommodating for all preferences is difficult, and it requires an understanding of the social diversity of the city.

It is extremely difficult to design for cultural diversity. In homogenous societies, a planner would need to have a thorough understanding of the social aspects, beliefs, history, and relations of the native people. This is difficult task when the backgrounds vary and the beliefs are conflicting. The growing ethnic and racial diversity requires individual solutions for each scenario. Bollens admits that it is hard to design for cultural diversity, and “the politics of conflict is hard to relate to urban design” (Bollens 2002). The main goal should now be to balance unity and diversity, and this requires an intimate understanding of the interactions of the various cultures.

In order to balance unity and diversity, planners must consider the way that public spaces influence and shape a community. According to James A. Banks, they should “provide opportunities for different groups to maintain aspects of their community cultures while building a nation in which these groups are structurally included” (2004). The diversity of opportunities will also serve to enrich other cultures as well, and participation in these opportunities by everyone in the communities will foster a better understanding of each other. In the past, planning has been criticized for being insensitive to the population, particularly the minority groups (Bollens 2002). This oversight, while it may go overlooked by city planners, could encourage resentment. It also shows a lack of understanding of every group in a community.

Traditionally, education of urban planners has not encouraged social understanding; however, relationships of people are integral to the success of a planning strategy. Bollens says, “Often planners confronting an ethnically or racially fractured public interest use professional coping skills that distance them from the core issues” (2002). The engineering and practicalities of planning have been stressed in education, and while necessary, it is not all that is relevant. A general understanding of how communities interact is vital to the success of planning. Understanding the specifics of each case is important, and while the technical aspects produce designs, the social aspects make them work.

Urban planning in a culturally diverse nation is very difficult, and it requires the consideration of all groups involved. “The effectiveness of urban planning is assessed by its responsiveness to citizens’ needs and goals,” while, “the responsiveness of urban planning depends on its ability to accommodate citizens’ divergent social and cultural needs and to treat individuals and groups equitably in meeting those needs” (Qadeer 1997). This type of planning is more a juggling act of diverse needs than a rational urban plan of the past. There is no solution that is universal to all urban areas. Qadeer suggests that by including minorities as well as majority groups on decision-making bodies, all perspectives of the community can be considered (1997). The urban planner must consolidate opinions and produce a rational plan, but the involvement of the community is beneficial. When designing private spaces, the diversity of options should reflect the diversity of the community. All citizens must be provided for and have equal access to residences that meet their specific needs.

Bollens describes four planning strategies that are typically used by cities with a divided population or a history of cultural conflict. The *neutral urban strategy* distances itself from issues of ethnic identity, power inequalities, and political exclusion (Bollens 2002). No

consideration is given to the diversity of the culture and the origin of the conflicts. The second plan is a *partisan urban strategy*, where an empowered ethnic group's values are provided for and has superiority over a disenfranchised group (Bollens 2002). This is often employed with the same goals as assimilation, but it does not consider the tension created in the population. The third plan is an *equity strategy*, where primacy is given to ethnic affiliation in order to decrease intergroup inequalities (Bollens 2002). The last solution is the *resolver strategy*, which seeks to connect urban issues to the causes of urban polarization, including power imbalances, competitive ethnic group identities, and disempowerment (Bollens 2002). This solution is the most individualized approach, and considers the diversity of the community above all else. While there may be benefits to all approaches, and one approach is not universally applicable, each individual situation requires consideration. The resolver strategy certainly addresses the most about how a community interacts, and what creates the conflicts within the community.

An excellent solution to addressing the individual needs of a community is presented by Leonie Sandercock, professor of urban planning and social policy at the University of British Columbia. She suggests that *therapeutic planning* will give the best consideration and understanding of a community through community organization and social planning (2004). By bringing people together, it allows them to work to understand their differences, work through them, and it gives the urban planners the pertinent information required to design in diverse communities. Through "multicultural conversations" (Sandercock 2004), communities become involved in their own urban plans and begin to understand the complexities of designing. They also are exposed to and educated on the diversity of the people in their community, providing a better understanding of the varying needs. Sandercock suggests that the therapeutic approach provides "something beyond a merely workable trade-off or band-aid solution" (2004). It is a

way to truly integrate the needs of a community. By recognizing cultural diversity, urban planning could be a successful way to improve cultural understanding within communities.

Uniting Diversity in Israel

The cultural and religious diversity of Israel due to immigration is challenging urban planning to resolve cultural conflicts within communities. Through a better understanding of the unique urban fabric of the cities, Israel will be able to achieve unity and diversity by supporting the diversity of the communities. Illustrated through two communities, I will outline current attempts at urban planning in Israel. The Arab-Israeli conflict has initiated planning strategies in Jerusalem, aimed at segregating communities and building physical barriers to separate Palestinians and Jews. An experimental community in Kiryat Gat works to support cultural diversity due to immigration of Jews from around the world as a result of the Law of Return. Two opposing techniques of dealing with diversity provide different views of controlling cultural conflict within nations as well as the global community.

Creating a Jewish state within Palestine had been a goal of the Jewish people long before the creation of the state of Israel. Zionism, the reuniting of the Jewish people in Palestine, encouraged large numbers of Jews to immigrate to Palestine, already an Arab nation (“Arab-Israeli Conflict”), and a colonial possession of Great Britain. In 1917, the British promised a Jewish nation, a declaration that instigated immediate conflict (“Arab-Israeli Conflict”). During the Holocaust, six million Jews were killed, leading to the creation of Israel (“Israel”). Due to World War II and the Holocaust, Israel declared its independence from the British and the Palestinian nation, and the state of Israel was created in 1948 (“Israel”). Because of the founding of Israel, Palestinian Arabs fled the newly created nation, for the security of neighboring countries (“Arab-Israeli Conflict”). During the initial wave of immigrants fleeing the concentration camps between 1948 and 1961, nearly a million European refugees entered Israel (Marans 2004). Subsequent waves came from North African, Middle Eastern, and Asian

countries (Marans 2004). Jewish people emigrated from 103 different countries, speaking 70 different languages, and creating a very diverse population in the new nation (“A Country Study”). Most of the new immigrants were Jewish, due to the Law of Return, created in 1950, stating that every Jew has the right to reside in Israel (“A Country Study”). Despite this commonality of religion among the immigrants, cultural differences existed between the American, European, North African, Middle Eastern, and Asian Jews, such as the vast difference in economic stability (Marans 2004; “Israel”). There were also religious divides within the population, resulting from the varying forms of practicing religious and secular Jews (“Israel”). Despite the initial assumptions of a Jewish nation unified under one religion, the population was very diverse from its foundations.

Israel lacked friendly relationships with its neighboring nations as well. During the Arab-Israeli war of 1948-1949, Israel claimed Arab land, and defeated Arab forces in Egypt, Transjordan (Jordan), Syria, Lebanon and Iraq (“Arab-Israeli Conflict”). In the six-day war of 1967, Israel attacked Egypt, Syria, and Jordan due to the call for war from these and several other Arab states (“Arab-Israeli Conflict”). Israel demolished the armies and air forces, and gained control of the West Banks, the Sinai Peninsula, and the Gaza strip, as well as all of Jerusalem. This conflict caused a second wave of Palestinians to leave Israel (“Arab-Israeli Conflict”). Other conflicts have shaped the interactions that Israel has with its neighboring nations, widening the divide of international relations. Along with the international conflicts, there have been incidents of conflicts among the population of Israel, usually between the Jewish and Palestinian people. Conflicts include demonstrations, Palestinian crowds throwing stones, Israeli soldiers shooting citizens, suicide bombers, and excessive violence (“Israel”). Cultural and religious conflicts increase the tension within cities where diversity is highest.

Efforts to resolve conflicts include the Madrid Summit in October 1991 between Israeli, Lebanese, Jordanian, Syrian, and Palestinian leaders to discuss the notion of “land for peace” and the Oslo Accords, which led to significant breakthroughs in the peace process (“Israel”). During the Interim Agreement in 1993-5, Israel and Palestinian Liberation Organization signed the Declaration of Principles in order to transfer authority from Israel to Palestinian authority (“Israel”). The Wye River Agreement in 1998 was a step toward permanent status negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians, while Camp David in 2000 was an attempt to settle the dispute over land between Israel, Palestine, and Egypt (“Israel”; Snow 95). The peace process has a long way to go, and it is still not certain that any of the steps already taken have been beneficial. The conflicts subside and resume, and peace seems attainable and then slips away.

Ongoing immigration into Israel continues to fuel the tension. Twenty thousand Jewish Ethiopians immigrated to Israel in 2003, and many critics said the budget just would not allow the integration needed (Mojon 2003). It is suspected that many of the immigrants are directed into Palestinian territories as a strategic move to maintain control on the area, yet this leaves immigrants feeling segregated from the Jewish population (Mojon 2003). In 2004, Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat died, and the new leader, Mahmoud Abbas called for an end to the suicide bombings (“Israel”). By Mid-February of this year, Israeli and Palestinian leaders announced a cease-fire (“Israel” (February 2005)), but it is yet to be seen if this will be affective. Despite government efforts toward peace, cultural conflicts continue within the nations and cities.

Further aggravating the situation is the disproportionate distribution of land within Israel (Bollens 2004). One plan proposed by Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, is for Israel to retain control of over sixty percent of the West Bank, land promised to the Palestinians, returning only forty percent (Isaac and Rizik 2002). This would deprive Palestinians of most of their

agricultural and grazing lands, while further fragmenting the West Bank into 64 communities (Isaac and Rizik 2002). By breaking up the continuity of the Palestinian community, Israel would cause further conflict in a disjointed population. It would eliminate the possibility of creating a Palestinian state, and leave Israel with sovereignty over the area. The debate has become whether Palestinians would be better served through autonomy over schools and local police, or whether they should gain full independence (Snow 100). If the nation is disconnected, it makes it harder for the Palestinians to pull together to form a nation of their own. The Israeli settlements in the West Bank create tension among the population, escalating conflicts (Snow 100). According to Jad Isaac and Majed Rizik, the two goals for the land are to expand and separate from the Palestinian population (2002). All urban design in Jerusalem is currently tied to political means. Settlement growth in annexed land is intended to create blocks of Israeli populations that separate Palestinian towns and villages into regions, preventing a unified Palestinian state.

Another strategy has been to build by-pass roads in Palestinian territories that link Jewish settlements to military camps and central Israel, while avoiding Palestinian areas, but these roads serve to alienate the communities and they deprive farmers of agricultural land (Isaac and Rizik 2002). They limit development in Palestinian areas and destroy ties between the communities, as well as destroying the economy in these communities. These politically motivated acts further serves to separate the Palestinian and Israeli people, inhibiting peace efforts. In the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, there are incentives offered for Israelis willing to settle in the isolated communities (Isaac and Rizik 2002). By offering 7-10% tax exemption as well as money for communities, protection and individuals, Israeli officials encourage Israelis to segregate the Palestinian people. Israel has also limited access to water and land in Palestinian communities,

causing detriments to the agriculture and economy (Isaac and Rizik 2002). None of these efforts assists the peace process, and while it can be argued that it protects the Jewish communities while providing security, it only serves to aggravate cultural conflicts within Israel and the annexed areas. Within Israel, religious diversity leads to conflicts; the imbalance in religion is broken into 80% Jewish, 15% Islamic, 3% Christian and 2% other religions (“Israel” 2005). The immigration of Palestinians threatens Israel’s status as a Jewish state, which is a concern for the Israeli leaders (Snow 102). The religious conflicts within communities are often due to the religious prejudice and misunderstandings.

A particularly significant religious and cultural conflict has been dividing the city of Jerusalem. A holy city to the Jewish, Christian, and Islamic religions, this area is highly charged with emotion for the people who vie for control. The main conflict is that the Muslim people will not accept total Israeli sovereignty over Jerusalem, and Israel will never accept total Muslim sovereignty (Snow 96). Scott Bollens quotes Ehud Olmert, Jerusalem mayor, saying, “When you debate the control of Jerusalem, you debate not just the present and the future, but also the past” (2001). Jerusalem has a long and very significant past for many cultures, religions, and nations. Many diverse groups of people feel that the city is a key part of their history, and therefore do not want it under the control of another group. Debating religions and cultures does not allow people to be pragmatic, and instead their beliefs shape the conflicts. Jerusalem is a “polarized” city, according to Scott Bollens, who describes urban polarization as “cases where ethnic and nationalist claims combine and impinge significantly and consistently on distributional questions at the municipal level” (1998). Management of Jerusalem is impeded by the ongoing conflict between Israeli and Palestinian people. Through urban planning, conflict within the city of Jerusalem may be minimized or resolved.

Scott Bollens describes Jerusalem's current urban planning strategy as a partisan strategy: "empowering one ethnic group's values and authority, while rejecting the claims of the disenfranchised group" (2002). Currently the Jewish people maintain sovereignty over the city, justified by a 72% Jewish advantage to 28% Arab population (Bollens 2002). Because of this, Arabs are not involved in urban planning or management. Although Arabs represent 28% of the population, they never received more than 4% of the development budget. This inequality disadvantages the Arab people, while discouraging any type of resolve to the cultural conflicts. The Jewish majority also allows for Jewish control of the city council and mayor's office (Bollens 1998). While the needs of the Arab people continue to be ignored, the polarization within the city will not be resolved.

The goals of the Department of Local Planning in Jerusalem have further served to divide the city. The partisan strategy has been applied to all development in the city. The goals since 1967 have been:

1. "to extend the Jewish city geographically and demographically"
2. "to control the heights for military security, requiring that Jewish neighborhoods be built on strategic hilltops or in areas needed to secure hilltops"
3. "to reconnect the formerly partitioned areas- for example, by building a Jewish development bridge from western Jewish Jerusalem to eastern Mount Scopus"
4. "to build Jewish neighborhoods so that division of the city in terms of political control and sovereignty would never again be possible"

By using their citizen majority, the Jewish Israelis are able to control the urban planning of Jerusalem. Their goals serve to break up the Palestinian communities, and weaken their power. In Jerusalem, the segregation reaches all activities, from business districts, public

transportation systems, and educational and medical facilities (Bollens 2001). According to Nehemia Friedland, a specialist in terrorist situations and a professor of psychology at Tel Aviv University, “tension increases when identity boundaries become fuzzy and permeable. Thus, in Jerusalem, there must be a clear demarcation of the Jewish and Arab parts of the city in order to maintain identity boundaries, with ethnic symbols and segregation condoned as ways to build and reinforce group identity” (quoted in Bollens 2001). Instead of building up the city, this type of planning has further served to divide the city, and it encourages conflicts within the city. The two different cultures have no structured interactions, and therefore do not understand each other, leading to cultural prejudices. Israeli planners that Bollens interviewed were almost all aware of the segregation reinforced through their planning strategies (1998). Bollens quotes I. Kimhi saying, “We planners have harmed the co-existence of the two nations and peoples. If planned the right way, then both nations can develop here in Jerusalem” (1998). Bollens notes that the partisan strategy is ineffective as a planning technique, because its success is based on creating conditions of domination and subjugation, which leads to urban and regional instability, further loosening Israel’s control of the city (2001).

One of the motivating factors of urban planning in Jerusalem is to promote self-confidence within the Jewish people who have been historically repressed. By establishing large Jewish communities in the contested areas, mainly east Jerusalem, planners hope to promote safety and self-confidence (Bollens 2002). This type of planning reinforces the self-confidence of one group, but destroys the communities of the underprivileged group. Israel has attempted to restrict growth of Palestinian nations, further preventing any strengthening of their people as a whole within Jerusalem. They limited development through land expropriation, restrictive environmentally-based “green area zoning”, road construction that fragments Arab

neighborhoods, “hidden guidelines” within Israeli plans that cap building volume in some areas, and the intentional absence of urban planning in Palestinian areas (Bollens 1998; 2001). Support is encouraged through planning for the Jewish communities, yet the Palestinian communities are restricted. The Israelis do not see a unified city for Jerusalem unless it is a Jewish city. They will never accept Palestinian control in any form.

Israel, with its extensive immigration from its creation until today, has dealt with cultural conflicts in many urban areas. Urban planning has become a vital solution to the conflicts, whether through the partisan strategy that Jerusalem adopted, or through other urban planning strategies. The ultimate goal is to structure the interactions of all the cultures and religions represented in the cities. One example of an effort to support the diversity of the city was an experiment by Artur Glikson, an architect-planner and writer. His idea was to create a neighborhood where life would be stimulated by the diversity of its residents (Marans 2004). Supporting the diversity, and including all cultures and religions strengthens the community as well as the nation. Glikson developed a neighborhood within the city of Kiryat Gat in 1950, and he thoroughly analyzed the society in the city and based his design on the results. Glikson’s goal for the city was to integrate different population subgroups, impart education and to advance social mobilization within society (Kallus 2004). Education of the diverse cultures within the city is important to achieving peace. When people understand the cultures and practices of each other, they are more likely to accept the diversity, and build on their relationships.

After the creation of Israel, and with the Law of Return, Israel faced the need to provide shelter for the new immigrants. They launched programs to build towns, which were based on European urban planning strategies, with low-density housing and extensive open spaces (Marans 2004). These strategies were not appropriate for Israel because they were too costly, and they

did not provide efficient access to the commercial areas. They did not consider the social and cultural aspects of town planning, or the differences of immigrants from different parts of the world. The government's policy of assigning housing units to new immigrants was initially to assign by country of origin (Marans 2004). This created segregation within communities, much like the segregation enforced in Jerusalem between Jews and Palestinians. The economy was also unable to support the integration of immigrants, many of whom needed government support. The biggest problems were immigrant absorption in these urban spaces as well as social relations among the diverse population (Marans 2004). The goal became to "construct a socially-integrated unit, initially comprised of immigrants from North Africa, Europe, and the Americas, together with veteran Israelis" (Kallus 2004). By welcoming all Jewish people into the nation, Israel opened the nation up to diversity that threatened the internal structure of the nation. The cultural differences of the Jewish people who immigrated to Israel were very different from the conflicts between the Palestinians and the Israelis, but through urban planning, all groups could benefit from the diversity.

Artur Glikson's approach to urban planning was a truly regional design, unique to the local circumstances (Kallus 2004). He was able to achieve an architecture that was truly responsive to the local conditions in Kiryat Gat through a careful analysis of the city (Kallus 2004). The urban planning of western countries proved to be unsuccessful in Israel, so Glikson's regional approach was a unique solution to the diversity due to immigration. Glikson was able to analyze the city on many levels, environmental, social, political, and economic, illustrating the need for urban design in polarized cities. Glikson strove to create an environment that would "rehabilitate, educate and enroot the new settlers in their new homes" (Kallus 2004). Glikson conducted regional surveys in order to understand the complex relations between human actions

and the environment, regional landscape, people's economic activity and their cultures (Marans 2004). The surveys conducted for Kiryat Gat included an (1) economic study, (2) new construction techniques, (3) exploration of residential density patterns and potential for diversifying dwelling units, (4) demographic study to estimate the number of different family types, and a (5) social survey to examine attitudes and social relations among families (Marans 2004). These surveys were used to develop a range of dwelling types that satisfied the cultural and familial requirements. Glikson also used the surveys to explore immigrant attitudes and determine optimum spatial relationship between families (Marans 2004). By teaching them about each other, and providing an environment where they felt comfortable instead of feeling the need to defend their culture and religion, peace is more easily attainable.

Glikson's community consisted of six interconnected sub-units with well-defined open space for social contacts, structuring the way people meet each other. These spaces became community nuclei, connected by walkways, while two axes connect the units to the town center, recreation area, and commercial districts. A school complex at the center of the neighborhood encourages community use after school hours, which was the first attempt to plan for the multiple uses of educational facilities (Marans 2004). Another important goal of Glikson's scheme was to bring people together by reducing the use of the automobile. By positioning the community close to the commercial center of Kiryat Gat, he hoped to promote informal contacts among diverse populations. He created a network of interconnected greenways that linked neighborhoods (Marans 2004). These informal lines of communication encouraged growth within the community. By manipulating encounters, but not structuring them, they become less politically charged and more neighborly associations. Robert W. Marans says that "in a country where the melding together of different population groups was a national goal, Glikson's

experimental neighborhood represented the first attempt to deal with social integration and change through housing policy” (2004). As a tool to shape the community, urban planning can reduce cultural conflicts by creating spaces for people to interact on a local level.

In 1965, a year after the neighborhood was completed, a survey was conducted to analyze the success of the project, and it was concluded that progress was being made toward an integrated community (Marans 2004). Their basis for the success was the positive responses toward social integration in the community. It was more common in the experimental community than it was in other parts of Kiryat (Marans 2004). The second survey was conducted ten years later, and while the interactions among neighbors were very high and the residents were more satisfied with the neighborhood, half of them expressed a desire to move (Marans 2004). In theory, the community was very successful, but it remained the lowest in Kiryat Gat in socioeconomic status, and retained low real estate values (Kallus 2004). The town began with a unique concept to build a community based on the diversity and needs of the people, and was successful in its goals to encourage interaction. It is possible the project would have gone even farther if it were able to keep moving people through the community as they were boosted economically. If the area and community was displayed as a positive, active community, it would have become more than a stigmatized “public housing project” populated by immigrants (Kallus 2004), it would be a place to grow and an important step to becoming part of the nation of Israel.

An important concept to take from Glikson’s experimental community is to plan cities with the idea that plans occur incrementally, and that the plan should be assessed according to the specific area and people it is serving. The findings of the evaluations could be used to modify urban planning in order to build the community (Marans 2004). While the situation of

Kiryat Gat is unique to its area and diverse population, the ideas of building, evaluating and planning a community are universal. It is important to understand social, cultural, and geographic context during the early stages of the design process (Marans 2004), as well as evaluating the constantly changing community throughout its evolution.

Scott Bollens recognizes that in the past, planning has had “little to do with the realities of current struggles around racism and poverty” (2002). These issues work to tear communities apart, and without addressing them, even the most well thought-out design will eventually be unsuccessful. Planners overlook moral and socially negative aspects of urban design (Bollens 2002), and instead they rely on practical and professional solutions. The traditional ideas of design no longer apply to our increasingly diverse urban areas. With the rising trend of cultural diversity in our cities, it must become a major part of the plan of a city. Bollens says that, “the goal of [urban] policy should not be integration per se, but a ‘porous’ society, where diversity can co-exist and communities are free to interact, if they chose” (2002). By letting the interactions to casual exchanges, the political conflicts are distanced from the local situations. A balance of unity and diversity should be the ultimate goal of urban planning. Donald M. Snow recognizes that the decision to break Jerusalem along the physical boundaries according to communities establishes separate jurisdictions, but the sovereignty issues of the city remain (107-8). The source of conflicts has not been addressed, only avoided. The misunderstandings and resentment still exists within the community, preventing two groups to co-exist. The ultimate goal of city leaders and policymakers should be to “emphasize not only the spatial layout of cities, but also be keenly aware of the complex social-psychological and identity needs of diverse ethnic groups within the urban region” (Bollens 2001). Distance from the communities and people does not achieve a successful urban plan. Designers must become

involved in each unique situation in order to understand the possible solutions to the design.

Every case should be addressed with an understanding of the people and places involved.

Conclusion

Cultural diversity is changing the way that people understand themselves and their communities. Instead of looking at other nations as different, now people look at their neighbors as different. Through education, communities could facilitate better relations among the people. By understanding the beliefs and backgrounds of people in the community, they will understand what makes them unique, as well as why they are not quite as different as they may think. Communities need to foster connections among neighbors, and encourage the understanding that will achieve a balance of unity and diversity. Through urban planning, it is possible to unify communities as well as cultures without losing the unique identity of the people.

Migration breaks down national borders, bringing communities in contact with people from many different backgrounds. Cultural diversity within nations is increasing, bringing with it new cultural conflicts between and within nations. These conflicts work to break down the ties between nations, and destroy hope for a global peace. Solutions such as assimilation and multiculturalism work toward understanding how to minimize cultural conflicts, but more effort needs to be made to educate people on the backgrounds of their neighbors. Without an understanding of the beliefs of other people in communities, it is difficult to solve cultural conflicts.

Urban planning is growing in popularity as a way to resolve cultural conflicts and deal with cultural diversity in communities. The requirements of urban planners have now begun to encompass a greater understanding of the people and communities. By understanding the people, as well as the way they interact, planners can guide the interactions in the community. Providing opportunities for different groups will support the unique diversity of every community and enrich the community as a whole. Viewing each community as a unique

situation allows specific solutions to be considered. The urban design should match the demographics of the people.

Urban design guides the interactions of the people within the communities through the physical plan of the spaces. Cities such as Jerusalem and Kiryat Gat in Israel are excellent examples of two efforts to guide relations among diverse communities. Surveys of the population provided an accurate description of the interactions as well as the requirements of the people in Kiryat Gat. While the urban planning of Jerusalem was purposely distant from unique situation of the city, Artur Glikson achieved a design unique to the people of the community in Kiryat Gat. In Jerusalem, physical barriers restricted the interaction among residents, while in Kiryat Gat, the community was encouraged to interact through the well-planned walkways. The walkways in the community became places for people to begin to communicate and understand one another, without the rigid structure of government intervention. Integrated facilities also gave people a chance to gather informally. On the other hand, Jerusalem will most likely always have the cloud of conflict hanging over it, and government intervention is inevitable. While the Jewish Israelis and Palestinians express desire for peace, the strength of the conflict necessitates segregation.

By designing for a growing and changing community, and designing for the unique demographics of the people, urban planning can support the unity as well as the diversity of a city. It can teach people about each other, and provide an informal stage for everyday interactions. With the increasing diversity of our nations, we need to consider ways to promote understanding within communities as well as internationally.

Works Cited

- Banks, James A. "Teaching for Social Justice, Diversity and Citizenship in a Global World." *The Educational Forum* 68 (2004): 296-305. *WilsonWeb*. 3 February 2005 <<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>>.
- Bastier, Paul. "Damage to Our Culture is Price of Multiculturalism." *The Express* 22 December 2005: 46.
- Boal, Frederick. "Urban Ethnic Segregation and the Scenarios Spectrum." Lincoln Institute of Land Policy Conference Paper. 2001.
- Bollens, Scott A. "City and Soul: Sarajevo, Johannesburg, Jerusalem, Nicosia." *CITY: Analysis of Urban Trends, Culture, Theory, Policy, Action* 5, 2 (2001): 169-187. 27 March 2005 <<http://www.usembassy.at/en/download/pdf.bollens1.pdf>>.
- Bollens, Scott A. "Urban Planning Amidst Ethnic Conflict: Jerusalem and Johannesburg." *Urban Studies* April 1998: 729. *ProQuest*. 16 March 2005 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.
- Bollens, Scott A. "Urban Planning and Intergroup Conflict: Confronting a Fractured Public Interest." *Journal of the American Planning Association* Winter 2002: 22-42. *WilsonWeb*. 21 January 2005 <<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>>.
- Bolt, Andrew. "Diverse but Divided." *Herald Sun* 8 December 2004: 19.
- Castles, Stephen and Mark J. Miller. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. New York: Guilford Press, 1993.
- Cohen, Shaul. "Arab-Israeli Conflict." *Microsoft Encarta Online Encyclopedia* 2005. 22 January 2005 <<http://encarta.msn.com>>.
- "A Country Study: Israel." *Library of Congress* 1 October 2004. 22 January 2005 <<http://memory.loc.gov/frd/cs/iltoc.html>>.

Dinnerstein, Leonard, and David M. Reimers. "Immigration." *MSN Encarta*. 18 February 2005
<<http://encarta.msn.com>>.

Doyle, Michael W. "The Challenge of Worldwide Migration." *Journal of International Affairs*
57 (2004): 1+. *ProQuest*. 17 March 2005 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.

Fuller, Graham E. "Redrawing the World's Borders." *World Policy Journal* Spring 1997: 11-
21. *WilsonWeb*. 17 February 2005 <<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>>.

George, Douglas, and George Yancey. "Taking Stock of America's Attitudes on Cultural
Diversity: An Analysis of Public Deliberation on Multiculturalism, Assimilation and
Intermarriage." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* Winter 2004: 1-19. *WilsonWeb*.
3 February 2005 <<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>>.

Gilroy, Paul. "From a Colonial Past to a New Multiculturalism." *The Chronicle of Higher
Education* 7 January 2005: 7. *LexisNexis*. 17 February 2005
<<http://www.lexisnexis.com>>.

Goonewardena, Kanishka, Katharine N. Rankin, and Sarah Weinstock. "Diversity and Planning
Education: A Canadian Perspective." *Canadian Journal of Urban Research* 1 (2004):
1+. *ProQuest*. 20 March 2005 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.

Gopnik, Adam. "Olmsted's Trip." *The New Yorker* 31 March 1997: 96+.

Harris, Philip R. "Diversity in the Global Work Culture." *Equal Opportunities International*
1996: 36. *ProQuest*. 17 March 2005 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.

"Israel: Political Conditions." *Country Watch* January 2005. 20 January 2005
<<http://www.countrywatch.com>>.

"Israel: Political Conditions." *Country Watch* February 2005. 31 March 2005
<<http://www.countrywatch.com>>.

- Kallus, Rachel. "Humanization of the Environment: Glikson's Architecture and the Poetic of the Everyday." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* 21 (2004): 152-170. *WilsonWeb*. 28 March 2005 <<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>>.
- Marans, Robert W. "Neighborhood Planning: The Contributions of Artur Glikson." *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research* Summer 2004: 112-124. *WilsonWeb*. 26 February 2005 <<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>>.
- Martin, Susan F. "Heavy Traffic: International Migration in an Era of Globalization." *The Brookings Review* Fall 2001: 41. *ProQuest*. 15 March 2005 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.
- "Migration." *MSN Encarta*. 17 March 2005 <<http://encarta.msn.com>>.
- Mojon, Jean-Marc. "Controversy as Israel set to welcome 20,000 new immigrants from Ethiopia." *Agence France Presse* 17 February 2003. *LexisNexis*. 20 January 2005 <<http://web.lexis-nexis.com>>.
- "Palestinians killed in Gaza raids." *BBC News* 13 January 2005. 4 February 2005 <<http://news.bbc.co.uk>>.
- Qadeer, Mohammad A. "Pluralistic Planning for Multicultural Cities." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 63 (1997). *ProQuest*. 20 March 2005 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.
- Sandercock, Leonie. "Towards a Planning Imagination for the 21st Century." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 70 (2004): 133+. *ProQuest*. 20 March 2005 <<http://proquest.umi.com>>.
- Snow, Donald M. *Cases in International Relations: Portraits of the Future*. New York: Longman 2003.

White, Stephen R. "Educating Toward Future Globalization: A New Societal Myth and Pedagogic Motif." *Educational Foundations* 18 (2004):71-96. 3 February 2005
<<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com>>.