

# Whose City is it? On Urban Planning and Local Knowledge in Globalizing Tel Aviv-Jaffa

TOVI FENSTER & HAIM YACOBI

**ABSTRACT** *This article focuses on the variety of images, perceptions and social constructions about a city articulated by the different 'actors' which use and shape globalizing urban settings. The actors in focus are mainly the planners (representing the authoritative aspects of planning and city management) and the residents of the city (those who enjoy or are adversely affected by different planning visions and projects). Planners mainly use their professional knowledge, which they obtained from formal education. Residents built up their perceptions and images of the city in a more intuitive way, from their daily routine practices in the city. Following this, the article explores the intricate and sometimes complicated relations between the various types of knowledge involved in the planning process with the aim to find out whose perceptions of the city are incorporated in the planning processes. Focusing on knowledge as a base for formulating cityscapes stems from a personal position and experience as planners, as members of a planning team, nominated by the Tel Aviv Municipality to devise a 'new strategic plan' for the Central Bus Station (CBS) area in the city. The article begins with a short introductory background, describing the social and economic situation of Jewish residences and non-Jewish labour migrants of the CBS area in Tel Aviv. It then outlines some theoretical frameworks regarding the different perceptions of this area by the different 'actors' involved in its production. The article concludes with some insights regarding the ways that globalizing cities are planned and managed.*

*Keywords:* Globalization; working migrants; urban narratives; Tel Aviv

## Introduction

We need to see our city as the locus of citizenship, and to recognize multiple levels of citizenship as well as multiple levels of common destiny, from the city to the nation to trans-national citizenship possibilities. We need to see our city and its multiple communities as spaces where we connect with the cultural other who is now our neighbour. (Sandercock, 1998, p.183)

In the above quote, Leonie Sandercock calls for a re-conceptualization of urban utopia, which reflects the very dramatic changes that globalized cities are witnessing. This vision is at the core of this article, which aims to examine urban planning and city management in the age of globalization from a critical point of view. More specifically, this article focuses on the multiple layers of knowledge articulated by the different 'actors', which use and shape globalizing urban settings. The actors in focus here are mainly the planners—representing the authoritative aspects of planning and city management—and the residents of the city,

*Tovi Fenster, Department of Geography, Tel Aviv University, Israel. Email: tobiws@post.tau.ac.il. Haim Yacobi, Department of Politics and Government, Ben Gurion University, Israel. Email: yappan@zahav.net.il*

those who enjoy or are adversely affected by different planning visions and projects. Actors involved in shaping global urban spaces each possess multiple layers of knowledge, on which each of them base their everyday actions. Generally distinctions can be made between the planners' professional knowledge, which they obtained from high education as well as from their practice, and the residents' local knowledge, which is based on their intuitive perceptions and images of the city, derived from their daily routine practices in it. As will be noted later in the article, this dichotomy between expert knowledge and layman's knowledge is not so sharp, and as the analysis in this article will show, both professional or expert knowledge and residents' daily knowledge intermingle when it comes to issues such as the role of planning or perceptions of the 'other'.

Following this, the article focuses on the intricate and sometimes complicated relations between the various types of knowledge involved in the planning process in order to find out whose knowledge is incorporated in it. It particularly focuses on the notion of knowledge in order to analyse the extent to which various types of spatial understanding are transformed into plans and policies in the city. It is important to note that focusing on knowledge as a base for formulating cityscapes stems from our personal position and experience as planners—members of a planning team nominated by the Tel Aviv Municipality to devise a 'new strategic plan' to the Central Bus Station (CBS) area in the city. We worked in the area from the summer of 2001 until the summer of 2003, concentrating on the social and participatory aspects of the planning process.

In the course of the two-year planning process, we discovered that our 'role' was two-fold: as professional planners in the plan-making process, but also as researchers, who are aware of the multiple layers of knowledge and, in particular, are 'in charge' of voicing the local knowledge. This position enabled us to examine the sometimes arbitrary divisions between the professional vis-à-vis the local knowledge in a critical way, and to deconstruct the various voices that we came across in our work. It also enabled us to analyse how the different dynamics in the planning process result in various types of knowledge.

Theoretically speaking, this article is an attempt to explore the different levels of knowledge that emphasize the diversity of experiences in urban space in the age of globalization. It is in the age of globalization that cities become much more diversified spaces, which current planning practices find it more complicated to relate to (Fenster, 2002, 2004; Sandercock, 2003). The city's diversified nature in the age of globalization is also expressed in each 'actors' different images, perceptions and interpretation of the same world. As mentioned above, empirically the study will first explore the different sources of knowledge as a dichotomy, the professional knowledge as represented in the planner's discourses, and the local 'subjective' knowledge articulated by the different individuals and communities living in this area. However, as will be shown later, the dynamics and the intricacies between the various types of knowledge are not so binary as they seem at first, and the discussion and conclusion will elaborate on this point. With this analysis, the article returns to Sandercock's utopian vision and discusses the debate concerning the question of how the different ways of knowing of what it means to live in today's cities can be linked. These questions are examined looking at three main issues: (a) the role of planning in reshaping the CBS area as it is perceived by the different actors; (b) the meaning and the role of the 'other'<sup>1</sup> in urban daily practices; and (c) the discourse around whose knowledge is at stake in the plan-making process.

First, there is a short introductory background, describing the social and economic situation of Jewish and non-Jewish labour migrant residents of the CBS area in Tel Aviv. Some theoretical frameworks are then outlined with regard to the different perceptions

of this area by the different 'actors' involved in its production.<sup>2</sup> The article concludes with some insights regarding the ways that globalizing cities are planned and managed.

### **The Central Bus Station Area in Tel Aviv-Jaffa: A Place under Global Change**

Similarly to other globalizing cities in Europe and North America, global urban processes in Tel Aviv-Jaffa<sup>3</sup> are apparent both spatially and demographically, forming ethnic enclaves of 'invisible' urban inhabitants; these are the labour migrants that live and work in the city, some of them illegally. As in many other cities, such as Paris, Amsterdam, Barcelona, Brussels and Frankfurt (Castells, 1997; Moulaert *et al.*, 2003; Sassen, 1994, 1998; Schnell & Alexander, 2002), labour migrants tend to concentrate in downtown areas in the city, where rental prices are relatively low. At the same time, these areas are characterized by their degraded nature that becomes a signifier of social degradation as well.

In Tel Aviv, these trends manifest themselves in the CBS area, which is known for its commercial activities. Historically, this area had been constructed already in the 1920s as a housing district for the Jewish population of Tel Aviv. At the beginning of the 1930s when middle-class Jewish migrants arrived in the city from central Europe, this area started to attract light industry. Following the 1936 riots between Jews and Arab-Palestinians, more Jewish industry moved from Jaffa, which was then a Palestinian city, to Tel Aviv, which is known in Israeli parlance as 'the first Hebraic city'.<sup>4</sup> In 1937 Tel Aviv municipality officially declared the area as an industrial zone. However, despite this statutory definition, the district was also occupied by Israeli Jewish dwellers. In the 1950s and 1960s the most influential element in the area was the functioning of the CBS, which served as the largest transit area for public transportation in Israel, with more than 250 000 passengers passing through it per day. Around the CBS commercial activities developed, offering goods such as clothes and books, and entertainment such as cinema.

During the 1960s Tel Aviv Central Business District (CBD) had begun to develop northwards, leaving behind the CBS area. Businesses that were allocated in the area moved northwards and rental prices began to drop. In addition, the increasing numbers of privately owned cars in Israel reduced the use of the CBS area to a certain extent. Because areas in central cities do not remain a vacuum, some other activities, often less attractive for residential areas, found their way there. The sex industry and drug dealing became the norm in the streets and forced the more affluent population to leave the neighbourhood. At the same time the construction of the new central bus station had begun. This is a concrete mega-structure that was built over two decades, ignoring the existing the 1920s urban fabric that shaped the area. This 'efficient' new transportation machine did not improve the living conditions of the inhabitants; rather, it created environmental hazards and perpetuated the image of the area as a neglected slum. In addition, the official data shows that the socio-economic profile of the Israeli inhabitants in the area is in the lowest income bracket (Tel Aviv-Jaffa Statistical data, 1999).

Two significant waves of immigrants changed the social and spatial characteristics of the area: Jewish immigrants from the former Soviet Union, who arrived in the area in the beginning of the 1990s, and labour migrants, who started to dominate Israel's labour market from 1993 onwards.<sup>5</sup> These two groups were attracted to the area by the relatively low rental prices. Even though they left their mark on the demographic structure of the area, there is a major difference between the two groups, which stems from the Israeli migration policy and its citizenship laws. This policy is expressed in the law of return,<sup>6</sup> which is based on the Israeli conception of the nation state; while the law of return applies

to migrants from the former USSR, thus encouraging them to integrate within society and space, in contrast, the labour migrants are perceived as a threat to the Jewish nature of the state, and as merely a temporary trend that will vanish.<sup>7</sup>

The low level of urban services and the growing potential for social mobility<sup>8</sup> encouraged the Jewish migrants from the former USSR to leave the area the moment they could afford it. The labour migrants, on the other hand, lack citizens' rights and therefore have very limited mobility and opportunities to leave the neighbourhood. For them, this area offers most of the daily services they need: grocery shops, restaurants, laundries and money change facilities. Today, labour migrants dominate the area demographically. However, nobody can indicate their exact numbers in Israel or in Tel Aviv, as at least half of them are not registered.<sup>9</sup> According to a survey we carried out in 2002,<sup>10</sup> the number of labour migrants in the area was estimated at 12 500–15 000 compared to 5 000 Israeli inhabitants. It was also found that the labour migrants live in a more or less equal dispersion in the area and not in one part of the neighbourhood as we had estimated in the first stage of the research.<sup>11</sup> It is important to mention that these findings contradict the authorities' estimate of some 80 000 labour migrants in the area.

As will be discussed in detail later in this article, the relationships between the different communities that inhabit the area today are complex. Some of the Jewish residents, especially the elderly, see the labour migrants as the major cause of the problems in the area, while some of the young residents, mainly students and 'gentrifiers', see the potential in the mixed cultural character of the communities living in the area. It is no wonder that, in such a complex social and ethnic background, questions such as whose city is it and which sets of knowledge are we identifying in the planning process, and what are the dynamics between them occupied our mind when we worked on the planning team of the CBS area.

The following section will discuss the main theoretical aspects which are linked to the main themes of this article, namely: power relations and their expressions in urban planning and city management, with special reference to the inherent tensions between professional knowledge versus local knowledge.

### Urban Planning and the Production of Multiple Layers of Knowledge

The last two decades have induced changes in urban studies and literature, which re-focused on the urban setting as a central political, economic and cultural arena (see Sassen, 1991; Taylor, 2000; Tzfadia *et al.*, 2002). Many studies have been dedicated to the interrelated aspects of globalization processes and the spatial transformations which occurred in cities. Generally speaking, the economic dimension of globalization processes is a major field that has been analysed extensively. The literature points at the privatization and the withdrawal of the state as key conditions in understanding present urban reality. Linked to this globalization work is the growing body of literature that theorizes the socio-political landscape within cities, highlighting the dynamics of governmentality as well as the mobilization of 'bottom-up' social movements. Another line of debate explores the ethnic and national dimension of globalization, pointing at the efforts of different hegemonic groups to stabilize and preserve their superiority and presence within globalizing multi-ethnic cities (Tzfadia *et al.*, 2002).

Despite these new challenges introduced by globalization, only a handful of academic works are intent on making a link between current urban dynamics and planning as a prominent tool that shapes the physical and social landscape of cities (Forester, 1999; Healey, 1997). In most research, planning is still considered to be the 'rational' and positive

tool that capitalist modern societies use in order to organize space, distribute resources and balance different interests for the welfare of a given society. This view was highly criticized by various academics, who shed light on the 'dark side of planning' (Fenster, 2001, 2002; Yiftachel, 1994; Yiftachel & Yacobi, 2003), where planning operates structurally as a tool of social, political and cultural control. However, little attention was paid to the epistemological dimension; i.e. the power of 'professional knowledge' in planning (Fenster, 2004; Sandercock, 1998; Yacobi, 2003) and to the way in which such knowledge rationalizes power relations 'scientifically' and in an unquestionable manner in the name of economic efficiency, hygiene or urban order (Yacobi, 2003). Congruent to this critique some questions will be posed: How is professional knowledge produced, reproduced and formalized? What knowledge is appropriate for planning? And finally, whose knowledge is relevant for the act of planning?

Several researchers deal with these questions in the field of planning as much as in other areas of research in the social science. Sandercock deconstructs the notion of knowledge in her two books *Towards Cosmopolis* (1998) and *Mongrel Cities* (2003). In her analysis she highlights the principles of modernist planning as a creation of the Enlightenment period, which yielded the 'classic' or professional planning traditions, which claim to rationality and objectivity. "The six pillars of this heroic model can be restated succinctly here as rationality; comprehensiveness; scientific method; faith in state directed future; faith in planners' ability to know what is good for people generally, 'the public interest'; and political neutrality" (2003, p. 64).

Within two decades this tradition faced challenges from within as well as from without (Innes, 1995). It has been criticized as insensitive to the complexities of social change and to the metaphorical, sometimes hidden, meanings attributed to space. Some of the critiques of the Enlightenment include Schön's book *The Reflective Practitioner* (1983) in which he identified 'a crisis of confidence in professional knowledge'. Schön (1983) attributes this crisis to the ways in which universities and schools of planning are committed to a particular epistemology, what Ma Reha (1998) calls the 'Oxbridge knowledge'. These layers of knowledge were produced within Western universities and schools of planning by various disciplines mainly in Britain and in the USA, and spread all over the world as the ultimate authority of scientific knowledge in planning. In addition to the above critique, the age of global economy has exposed other challenges that the rational comprehensive planning model faces, such as the increasing involvement of local NGOs and organizations which advocate needs and desires based on multiple layers of knowledge. A series of alternative planning approaches arose from the 1960s onwards, trying to accomplish what the rational comprehensive model is missing in terms of a greater emphasis on local knowledge in the different planning stages. These alternative planning traditions focus on the 'users', the people who are supposed to be affected by the planning procedures. Their rationale is highly connected to the aim of creating a different body of knowledge or perhaps ideas needed for planning (Fenster, 2004; Sandercock, 1998).

In this context, mention should be made of Sandercock's discussion of the new 'epistemology of multiplicity' (1998) which means the acknowledgement of 'local knowledge', that of hearing and listening to the voices of the women and people of colour, people of different national, ethnic and cultural origins in the planning process. To initiate an approach which acknowledges this epistemology, Sandercock mentions "alternative methods of knowing, learning, discovering, including traditional ethnic or culturally specific modes: from talk to storytelling, to blues, to rap, poetry and song; and visual representations, from cartoons to murals, paintings to quilts" (1998, p. 121). This model

is based on qualitative, interpretative inquiry rather than on logical deductive analysis, and it seeks to understand the unique and the contextual, rather than make general propositions about a mythical, abstract planner. Forester's *Planning in the Face of Power* (1989) and *The Deliberative Practitioner* (1999) are other significant sources of this emerging field of exposing the multiple layers of knowledge in the planning process, and approaching these processes as communicative actions. Forester defines the planner's key activities as focusing on talking and listening, working in a more interpretative mode, seeking to understand the unique and the contextual rather than looking for general rules and practice.

But are the dichotomies of the two types of knowledge indeed so separate in reality? Is it an 'either-or' situation, or perhaps in many cases—including the case analysed later—such dichotomies are not so explicit, after all? In what follows, the two concepts will be analysed as two separate entities for the sake of examination. Later in the article, it will be seen that in reality the two separate types of knowledge intermingle and each side, the planners and the residents, show empathy and understanding to other sets of knowledge. As will be seen later, such juxtapositions between the different sets of knowledge depend on the planning approach and the role of the planner in the planning process.

Sandra Harding already points to the fact that all knowledge is local, stating that "all knowledge is local—modern northern scientific no less than the 'ethno sciences' of the other cultures. . . the major difference between the two types of knowledge is their power" (Harding, 1996, p. 444). Moreover, Harding points out:

... not all such local knowledge systems (LKS) are equally powerful, some can explain a great deal more than others because, for example, they have access to or control more of nature or social relations... We could think of these as positional rather than substantive epistemological and scientific resources to mark how it is a position in power relations with respect to other cultures that generate such resources.

Harding argues that the distinction between local knowledge systems is first and foremost about power relations; the white superiority and political power which has created the colonialism and imperialism in recent centuries, allows one type of knowledge to be considered as 'professional', 'universal' and the other type as merely 'local'. Moreover, several critics point out that the epistemological dominance of northern thought has not been established, in fact, through the internal 'properties' of European scientific and epistemological methods, but has been developed through the power of European expansion to test scientific hypotheses across extremely diverse local conditions (1996, p. 440). Such critical statements question the legitimate superiority of the 'white knowledge' of modernity in planning, and puts the legitimacy of the local knowledge of the 'other', the labour migrants in this case, in the forefront of the debate.

Despite the importance of the links between planning epistemology and the production of space, this debate thus far has not been clearly discussed. Rather, the debate has focused mainly on the capitalist system as a social structure that can be a key to understanding the organization of space in the service of capitalism, the aim of which is to balance between private and collective capital, thus incorporating a potential for social oppression (Castells, 1978). Yet, this point of view does not pay enough attention to the necessity of understanding daily practices of the users as part of the planning knowledge required for formulating plans which will meet people's needs and aspirations.

Theoretically, in this context a different reading can be suggested of the writings of Henri Lefebvre (1991), who aspired to integrate theories and abstract thought with

practices and tangible daily urban experiences. Here, Lefebvre's work marks an important shift; 'space is a social product' and thus cannot be seen solely as a reflection of either knowledge or experience. Rather, it is the juxtaposition of three interrelated dimensions: the perceived space, the conceived space and the lived space.

Perceived space, following Lefebvre, relates to physical space and the way in which it is organized. Perceived space contains the very functional uses of space, including infrastructures and the built environment that shape our spatial experiences. Conceived space relates to the way in which professionals such as planners and architects represent space. This conceptualized space is the result of epistemological processes and developments that cannot be seen as autonomous from the socio-political context in which they are produced. Finally, Lefebvre mentions the lived space that embodies images, symbols and associative ideas of the 'users' that give meaning to space. Returning to the question of whose knowledge is relevant to the act of planning, it will be suggested that the Lefebvrian approach integrates various layers of knowledge into the planning practice, looking in particular at the power relations between the different actors while politicizing their nature and the process of their formation.

### **One Space—Different Knowledge**

The analysis begins by exploring the different expressions of knowledge that were exposed in the planning process of the CBS area, and introducing three narratives of the main actors that function in the area; the planners, the Jewish residents and the labour migrants. First, there is a citation of a planner who works for the Tel Aviv municipality:

We recommended a planning alternative which [we thought] could lead to a practical alternative that will connect the Central Business District (CBD), the margins that are linked to the CBD and the residential areas, which are similar to conventional residential areas in other parts of Tel Aviv. We succeeded in connecting the residential areas and the CBD, which is usually problematic. (City Planner, 31 December 2001)

The planner, in this case a municipality planner, perceives the CBS area from a modernist perspective, using her professional knowledge and language to analyse and emphasize components which interest planners, such as the distance and proximity of the area to other economic activities in the city. She locates this area as 'the margins' of the city and mentions the 'connection' that 'they', the planners, drew between this area and other areas in the city. This is clearly a technically oriented mapping of the area, highlighting its practical functions and spatial relations.

The above point of view coincides with the 'conceived space', using Lefebvre's terminology, which is not the same as the perspectives of the residents of the area. Their perceptions reflect a distinct aspect of knowledge of daily practices and experiences, more emotional and intimate. First is the labour migrants' narrative that highlights the difficult living conditions in the area:

There are old buildings in the area and one forgets the dirt and the sanitation problems. We don't ask for much. We pay what we have to pay [municipal tax] so that the municipality can clean the area. There are rats in people's homes. In the winter there are water overflows. This is my point—contamination and drainage, buses, noise. It is unpleasant to live in Neve Shaanan [the neighbourhood's name]. There are drunk people on weekends.

I am willing to pay what I have to pay, but I don't get anything in return.  
(Labour migrant from Africa, 7 February 2002)

The African labour migrant speaks of his daily problems, experiences and grievances that mostly have to do with the way these zones are managed by the municipality. In fact, this narrative can be viewed as a reflection of the municipality's mismanagement of the area. The labour migrant speaks in everyday language rather than in a professional language, describing the 'lived space', which contains images and impressions. Meanwhile, the Jewish residents' point of view expresses another aspect of his lived space, which is based on his daily experiences in the area, that of the resentment towards the 'other':

Foreign workers, maybe not 100 percent of them, are drunk, drug addicts, robbers and using the brothels. . . In my point of view the value of the area has decreased because of this population. (Jewish resident, 1 February 2002)

One space and three perspectives that reflect the sometimes contradictory types of knowledge of the same setting. The next section of the article will elaborate on these different perspectives of one tangible space, that of the CBS area, but rather than look for the somewhat obvious expressions of professional versus local knowledge by the planners and the residents, the relationships between these different types of knowledge are analysed; are they always contrasting? Are there any points of consensus between them? Initially, is it correct to introduce a dichotomy such as local versus professional knowledge? The focus will be on how these different perceptions are constructed by the main actors functioning in the area: the city planners, the planning team planners, the Jewish residents and the labour migrants. Through this their significance will be discussed in debating whose city it is, then? And how the different ways of knowing what it means to live in cities of today can be linked to planning practice. In analysing the different narratives of each of the actors, the focus will be on the two main issues mentioned in the introduction: how each 'actor' perceives the power of planning to shape and re-shape the area, and the perception of the 'other'.

### *The Planners*<sup>12</sup>

The planners in this case are represented by the municipality planners and the team planners that included us. Overall, the perception of the area of each individual in those two groups stems from her\his conceived space, i.e. the way in which professionals conceptualize and then represent space. As mentioned earlier, this is a result of epistemological production processes and developments that are inherent in the socio-political context in which they are produced. From this starting point it can be seen first that planners in general are not one homogeneous body. Rather, each one of them reflects her\his own perceptions and ethical attitudes as David Harvey clarifies:

The planner, like everyone else, is an embodied person. That person, again like everyone else, occupies an exclusive space for a certain time and is endowed with certain powers and skills that can be used to change the world. He or she is also a bundle of emotions, desires, concerns and fears all of which play out through social activities and actions. The planner, as an embodied person, cannot deny consequences of that embodiment in material, mental and social life. (Harvey, 1999, p. 272)

As will be seen below, there are nuances and opinions among the planners' perceptions regarding the two issues that were raised: the ability of planning to shape the area, and the



perception of the other, although it must be emphasized that there are more similarities than differences with regard to these two issues.

*The Ability of Planning to Shape the Area*

As explored in the theoretical discussion, planning as a modern discipline is based on the assumption that its rationality enables 'solving' problems and transforming space. Indeed, as planners whose professionalism is constructed around the power of their discipline, most planners—both the ones working for the municipality and the team—talked about the plans that were made for this area as if they are part of the present reality. In their narratives they use verbs and pronouns that describe actions, while in fact these ideas are just part of the planner's visions and intentions regarding this area. For example, one of the Tel Aviv District Planners said:

This population [the labour migrants] *will be channelled* to the less prosperous area because the prices there are low. The labour migrants *create* a 'prologue to gentrification', they *clean* the area of its negative image . . . then the municipality will provide the services: schools, health clinics, open spaces. When personal safety [in the area] will be improved, the area will flourish. (B. 20 January 2003)

When one of the planners was asked what the role of the municipality is in the development of the area, she said that

The municipality wishes *to change* the area. The area operates on a very low standard and creates many obstacles to the environment, so *we want to change it*. (A. 31 December 2002)

One of the team planners made a much stronger statement about the role of planning in the development of the area. First he described the role of one of the previous plans that were issued for the area. Then he said that "by making the plan we *freeze* any planning initiation in the area, so we can see what the effect of the Central Bus Station is". Later on he added:

As long as there is no decision (about what to do with the area) you can't plan and therefore *the area is on hold*. (C. 22 January 2003)

The strong belief in the power of planning is clearly expressed in this statement. The planner believes that there is no way to affect the area other than via planning, and as long as there is no planning the area cannot be changed or developed. Some other perspectives of the 'power of planning' are expressed in the following description. Here, the municipal planner illustrates a situation where the actual process of residents' participation in the planning procedure empowered them to the extent that they used the plan to criticize and attack the municipality for not realizing the plan:

It seems that the more planning affected the environment, the more it empowered the residents who were involved in the planning process. In another planning process that the municipality initiated with the involvement of the local residents, the plan became a tool in the hands of the residents to attack the municipality. The general deputy of the municipality said that he is against this [participatory] process where the plan becomes a tool to attack the municipality. This approach emphasizes the wide gap between the planning process and the implementation process in Israel, and in Tel Aviv in particular. (A. 31 December 2002)

Here the plan in its role as a document becomes almost 'evidence' for what should be in the area, both by the residents and the municipality. But perhaps the most explicit expression of the *conceived* mapping of the area is presented in the analysis of the different alternatives to the future of the area. This stage of conceptualizing alternatives for the development of the area is a well-known step in the rational comprehensive planning approach, and became an important part of the strategic planning process of the CBS. The team planner advocated this method of alternatives and stated:

The great advantage of this method is that it forces us to identify alternatives, which is a process of pure planning, and so our work is much more organized and systematic. It is much more transparent. (C. 7 April 2002)

The procedural rational planning knowledge becomes a powerful tool in rationalizing the different paths to the development of the area, and the planner uses terminology that reflects his desires to make this type of knowledge as scientific as possible. Such a process visualizes the area in five different directions of development, and then the chosen alternative becomes the preferred one, usually in the eyes of the planners and the authorities, not so much in the eyes of the residents.

However, as mentioned at the beginning of the article, the voices of the planners are usually diverse, although most of them perceive their action as coming from a professional knowledge perspective. Moreover, not all of them are so confident in the power of planning to change activities in the area. For example, one of the municipality planners said in a meeting that dealt with the options of the dispersion of labour migrants outside the CBS, that "the question is to what extent we are *controlling* this process [of dispersion]. They made an intended gentrification in Paris, but here ... I doubt it" (E. 7 April 2002). As noted at the beginning of this section, planners have different views and attitudes as to what power planning holds in shaping the area, and perhaps more than that they have different views about the ability of the municipality to implement plans. Yet, it must be emphasized that it seems that most planners that were involved in this process projected a great deal of belief and faith in the power and influence of the plans to re-shape the area, that is, a great belief in the power of the professional knowledge to produce a 'good plan'. Some of them even believe that as long as there is no authorized plan the area cannot be developed. This is a typical belief of planners in the power of plans, i.e. that the professional document can shape cityscapes. This view contradicts that of the residents regarding the extent to which the plan can improve the standard of living in the area.

#### *The Planners' Perceptions of the 'Other'*

The actual discussion about the planners' perceptions of the 'other', hint that the 'other' has been an 'issue' in this project. Obviously, the planners' perceptions of the 'other' cannot be seen separately from their socialization as part of the Israeli society. Moreover, their perspective in this context reflects also the official apparatus that they represent. Here their knowledge of the 'other' stems from their everyday practices as individuals, residents in other parts of the city, citizens of the state and having their own sets of identities, perceptions and perhaps superstitions regarding people other than themselves. The ethics of planning and the standpoint of the planner and his/her approach to the 'other' is a result of his/her multiple layers of knowledge, attitudes and social affiliations. This was reflected very clearly at the start of our work.

In the first stages of the work, as part of the planning team which prepared the strategic plan for the CBS, we noticed the different wording which was reserved for 'the other'; the most common labelling was 'foreign workers' or 'foreigners', which is also used in official

government documents. This terminology reflects Israeli government policy of emphasizing the temporality of 'the phenomenon'. Later, when our knowledge in this field deepened, we learned that the term 'foreign workers' actually reflects a specific policy towards the labour migrants (Schnell & Alexander, 2002).

Then we began to distinguish between the notion of 'labour migrants', which is the professional jargon of this phenomenon, and the terminology used in practice. We started using the term 'labour migrants' in the team meetings as well as in the discussions with the municipality planners, clarifying the differences between the various definitions. Slowly, some of the planners and municipality officers began to adopt the term 'labour migrants', but others still thought that they are 'foreign workers', as if this term underlines their temporary status.

These different wordings reflect in many ways the ambiguity, confusion and even embarrassment towards the labour migrants in Tel Aviv. This is despite the fact that Tel Aviv, with the highest number of labour migrants in Israel, has adopted positive approaches to the labour migrants, in welfare and health services in particular (Alfasi & Fenster, 2005), providing them with basic rights in spite of the official government policy to ignore and finally evict them. The municipality's approach indeed acknowledges the basic rights of the labour migrants, but provides partial solutions.<sup>13</sup> One such solution is the establishment of Mesilah (a special municipal unit, which works with labour migrants in Tel Aviv): "It is the duty of the Municipality to provide these services" says D. a municipality planner (13 March 2003).

In order to understand the perception of the planners about labour migrants, they were asked when they had first heard or knew about labour migration. Only one of them talked about 'the phenomena' in person and said: "I first met labour migrants near where I live". But then she continued and talked about 'the issue' and 'the subject':

The *issue* was raised in the metropolitan policy document that was prepared for the District Master Plan. I was aware of the *subject* as the district planner ... the *subject* interests me ... (B. 20 January 2003)

In this example it can be seen how sometimes different layers of knowledge are expressed; the personified\subjective one together with the professional\objective, all in the same person. This perhaps shows that the dichotomies of local versus professional are not always the only way to understand the dynamics in the planning process and the results in the plan.

Other municipal planners noted that they became aware of the presence of labour migrants in the area a while ago, during their work in the CBS district. One of them stated: "I didn't meet them in person; I just noticed the changes in land use in the area" (A. 31 December 2002). By that she related to the emergence of 'services' for labour migrants such as ethnic restaurants, cafes and laundry services which had opened up where they live. But she continued and said that the *subject* was never discussed as a central *issue*, but always as an explanation to other trends in the area, such as *illegal* uses of the area, housing problems etc. It seems that the connotation is usually negative when associating 'the other' with the *problems* in the area:

... this phenomenon of labour migrants has been raised usually as *an obstacle* to the Jewish residents, although we know that this is not always true. (A. 31 December 2002)

Until the municipality understands that there is *a problem* and the way to deal with it is in strategic planning. (C. 22 January 2003)

Some of the municipal planners were then asked whether they thought that there is a need for a different planning approach for the labour migrants. One of the planners said:

It is a difficult question. I've never thought of it. I was in two meetings with the labour migrants, we made many efforts to involve them in the planning process, and my conclusion is that they don't understand our reality and the need for long-term planning, they have nothing to say. They don't know what a law is and perhaps even don't know that it exists and should be obeyed. Their lack of understanding of long-term planning is very obvious. They do understand that such planning poses a threat (to their lives in the area), as it makes the area more expensive. My second impression is that we lack an understanding of their everyday life. They certainly understand their needs. They have ideas, complaints, but it touches only their everyday life. That's their important input as far as they are concerned. (A. 31 December 2002)

These words reflect the frustration of the planner in face of the gaps between the different layers of knowledge. The residents, and more so the labour migrants, have no idea what long-term planning, the law or the considerations that planning should look at are. At the same time she admits planners do not understand the everyday life of the labour migrants or the needs which are the outcome of their lives. It seems that she has mixed feelings about the abilities of the professional knowledge to understand people's needs, and the abilities of the people to understand what the planning constraints are. Furthermore, this planner is aware of the possible lack of ability of each actor to bridge the knowledge gaps between the conceived and the lived spaces.

Another municipality planner responded differently to this situation. She thought that there must be a special planning vision, which fits the labour migrants:

In terms of physical planning or housing density, the policy should be such, that labour migrants could live in the area. It is important that if we plan (small apartments) for labour migrants, we could always re-plan these housing structures so that the area will not become a slum. (D. 13 March 2003)

Here we can also identify the effort that the planner makes to bridge these knowledge gaps between the local and the professional, and to come up with specific suggestions, not those that she heard from the residents but those that she thinks are professionally relevant.

To conclude, the planners attribute a great deal of influence to the professional planning processes and documents in the development of the area, although they also express their doubts as to their abilities to deeply understand the meanings of everyday life of the residents living in the CBS area. Their attitudes towards the 'other' reflect an amalgam of perceptions that range from seeing them as a 'problem', to accepting their existence in the area and acknowledging the role of the municipality in providing services for them. Nonetheless, quite apart from the planners' perceived space, the lived space, i.e. the way in which the 'users', to use Lefebvre's words, narrate their daily experience, adds more complexity to the picture, as will be seen in the following section.

*The Residents of the CBS Area*<sup>14</sup>

Just as planners are not homogenous entities, neither are 'the residents'. The people living in the CBS area in particular, represent a large variety of social, cultural, racial and economic identities, typical of globalized cities today.

For us, professionals who were asked to initiate a participatory process in the area, this social diversity was a challenge. But what was soon discovered was that this whole notion of residents' participation was quite problematic from the beginning. This is because despite the municipality's current rhetoric that encourages the involvement of the different communities in the making of the CBS strategic plan, in practice it has neglected the area for many years through low budgets and services provided to its residents. One of the expressions of this is the fact that for many years neither a social worker nor any other community organizer has been assigned to the area, despite the many social problems of its residents. As already mentioned, the only organization that exists and acts in the area is 'Mesilah', the Aid Centre for Foreign Workers established by the Tel Aviv Municipality.<sup>15</sup> The municipality's officers admit that the area is neglected in terms of welfare services. In the light of this, it is obvious why the residents react with suspicion towards any new efforts to prepare yet another plan for the area. Their experience taught them that plans are not usually implemented, and the fact that there is a new plan on the way is quite meaningless.

Having no basic municipal, community and welfare services in the area meant great difficulty in making the first contacts with the residents. Hence, we used the help of Mesilah to start the process of residents' participation in the project. But their help focused mainly on linking us to some labour migrants' community leaders. As for the Jewish residents living in the area, we initiated a 'snowball' technique. We contacted some representatives of local neighbourhood organizations and asked them to inform their neighbours of the meetings we initiated, telling them that the various stages of the planning process were open to their participation. In practice, our first step was to organize focus groups with two main aims: (a) to identify the planning needs of the different 'actors'; and (b) to create a communal basis that will enable the continuation of the inhabitants' involvement in the planning process. The following section presents the narratives that were raised in those meetings in relation to the way the residents see the planning process, as well as to their images and perceptions of the 'other'.

*The Power of Planning in Shaping the Area*

Two major issues were raised in the focus groups; the first was the residents' lack of belief in the power of planning to change the situation in the area, and also their accusations that the municipality had neglected the area. Past experience was very negative both among residents and labour migrants. For the Israelis who live there, both owners and renters, as well as for the working migrants, the area is associated with 'poverty', 'crime', 'dirt', and 'darkness'. One of the inhabitants personified the site and described it as an 'old sick man'. Some associations were more positive though, mainly mentioned by some of the flat owners that grew up in the neighbourhood and saw it nostalgically, stating that "I know the place, it has potential" (Israeli resident, 27 November 2001) and "I love the place, this is my grandmother's flat, it has a history" (an old Israeli resident, 27 November 2001).

The majority of the Israelis in the focus groups said that they had lived in the area for a long period of time. They described their flats as small and well maintained, as opposed

to the dirt and negligence 'outside', as one woman stated: "My flat looks nice on the inside. It is clean and tidy. Outside—there—it is noisy and sooty" (27 November 2001). Indeed, the participants repeated that theme and mentioned that the empty undeveloped lots scattered in the area that became a nuisance:

There are many abandoned lots which are either empty or with half demolished structures. *The municipality does not make the owner do anything about it.* It could be used for construction. . . (An Israeli inhabitant, 27 November 2001)

In addition, the marketplace, mentioned by the participants as an important function in the area, is linked to the lack of responsibility on the part of the municipality:

The market is open even at night and I like it. But when it is closed there are piles of garbage and *the municipality does not bother to collect it.* . . it is filthy and it prevents walking there. . . (An Israeli inhabitant, 3 December 2001)

The Israeli residents blamed all this on the municipality and as citizens they felt discriminated against, pointing at the inequality in urban services and infrastructure between the rich areas of northern Tel Aviv and the poor area where they live: "I do not really know why in north Tel Aviv there is a garbage can every 30 metres", said in this context an old man who had lived in the CBS district for many years. Another old lady, who was frustrated and very sceptical about the results of the meeting, mentioned similar points:

When one of us calls the municipality—*they* ignore it. Around my house there are car repairs and garages working around the clock. . . Once a month I write a letter of complaint. . . I invited the mayor to visit; it is about time he wakes up. *But he really does not care about the southern part of the city.* (27 November 2001)

The Israeli inhabitants expressed their mistrust in the ability of the process to lead to a better plan that will improve their life in clear words:

There were so many plans in the past. There were promises, but nothing really happened. Even when a comprehensive plan for our district was presented in the past, nothing changed. It has only deteriorated. (An Israeli inhabitant, 3 December 2001)

The working migrants who participated in the focus groups raised similar points. Issues of dirt, abandonment and the authorities' shying away from responsibility for this area were highlighted as a young Filipino stated:

Tel Aviv is a small area. The economic and commercial activities leave the area very dirty, with drunkards around. *The problems are sanitation, garbage and pollution.* We pay the municipality and it should keep this area clean and nice. The municipality must do something about it . . . I represent all foreigners; we've all been plagued by rats and cockroaches. (28 November 2001)

These negative feelings are also linked to the image of the area as 'wild' and 'disordered', two metaphors that were repeated in the meeting. The spatial 'wilderness' of the district was linked by the Israelis to the criminal activities which are taking place subsequent to the withdrawal of the authorities from the area, as one inhabitants expressed it: "I would expect the police to increase their patrols here in order to find all these drug addicts". Indeed, drugs and criminal activities are linked by the dwellers to the policy of the

authorities that prefer to ignore such activities. This argument, it is important to mention, is raised by both renters and owners:

I saw everything [crimes in the area]. I phoned the police everyday... If the police are present here, it will be better. When they come from time to time we have some tranquil days. (An Israeli inhabitant, 5 February 2002)

The Israeli young renters are concerned with the drug dealers and drug addicts that are active in the area. Here again they complain of the absence of police control, which forces them to act independently in order to protect themselves, as noted by one of them, a young photographer:

On the one hand there is an inspiring atmosphere there. But the problem is the junkies. I live alone, and when I see a junkie near my door I kick him out. So in my building you will not find them. (An Israeli inhabitant, 27 November 2001)

The very critical attitude of the inhabitants towards the authorities and the municipality was explicitly expressed in relation to the planning initiative in the CBS area. The Israeli participants were sceptical as to the power of planning to change the area. This is because of past experience that showed continuous estrangement from the neighbourhood and its people: "there were many plans in the past. Nothing really happened, and it has deteriorated" (3 December 2001).

It is interesting to note that this point of view was also raised by the labour migrants who were doubtful concerning the ability of the municipality to implement any plan, as a Filipino worker said: "It is very good that you try to develop, but do you have a budget for the project?" (28 November 2001). These words perhaps show that some of the residents do have a broad knowledge of professional procedures, and are able to distinguish between the actual plan-making process and its implementation.

Another issue was raised in relation to the danger of upgrading the area and the expected rise of housing prices, as an African woman noted: "What will be the cost of living in the area after you'll do those projects ... *Is the municipality about to build houses for rent?*" (28 November 2001). This is a familiar reaction of low-income residents in neighbourhoods that are undergoing processes of regeneration, whether they are labour migrants or residents. Charlie Forman (1989) describes the process of the capitalist expansion in the East End (Spitalfields area) in London. He mentions: "East is best, it's both the nearest and the cheapest" (Forman, 1989, p. 142). This is a very negative intention, in his eyes, for the residents of the area in East London because: "there is little the City has to offer the people in Spitalfields—the more money there is invested in the area, the poorer its residents become" (1989, p. 141). Forman sees the recent developments in the East End as a battle between the city's expansion, the developers' motivations and the local voices of the poor. Most of Spitalfields' residents are poor. This ward is ranked as the most deprived ward in Tower Hamlets, the most deprived borough in London.

In many ways the CBS area is similar to Spitalfields, not so much in terms of global investments in the area, which are obviously higher in London than in Tel Aviv, but more in terms of the fears of the local communities that a massive investment in the area will push them out, since they will not be able to afford the increasing rents and standard of living.

As this section demonstrates, the 'users', both Israeli inhabitants and labour migrants, share many concerns. Their everyday lives are affected by the deterioration of the area due to the negligence of the municipality and the low level of infrastructure and

services. This is also the basis for their doubts concerning the power of planning to shape and reshape the area. Yet, while for the Israeli inhabitants a plan such as this, if implemented, might improve their standard of living and increase the value of their property, for the labour migrants it means a rise in housing rent. But beyond the common criticism and interests stands the 'other' as a significant theme, this is the presence of the working migrants in an Israeli neighbourhood, as will be explored in the next section.

#### *Israeli Residents' Perceptions of the Other*

'Cleaning up' the area is not just a planners' jargon. Rather, it is very central to some of the Israeli inhabitants' approach, which linked the increasing number of labour workers with the deterioration of the CBS area. An old lady expressed this by saying that "the foreign workers are the majority and we became the minority, and I am afraid; is there any plan to clean up this area?" (5 February 2002). Another Israeli inhabitant complained: "There are Negroes,<sup>16</sup> Turks and Russians" and explained that "they live 6–7 people in 2.5 room rented flats, they are noisy, their children are dirty and so are their staircases... The flat owner sees only money" (5 February 2002).

This claim is characteristic mostly of the Israelis who own flats and live in the area, but some of the owners who live in other districts of Tel Aviv also express dissatisfaction about the fact that their tenants are 'foreigners', and blame them for low rental prices in the area. It is important to mention in this context that rent prices in the CBS area are closer to the average rent value in the city (76 per cent) than the price for sale (39 per cent) (Economic Report for the CBS Station Strategic Plan, 2002). Thus, one of the results is the increasing density in flats; groups of workers tend to share flats in order to minimize their rent expenses, a well-known fact among flat owners, who subdivide their flats into very small rooms, which attract workers to rent them.

Moreover, the demonization of the 'other' is very central in the narratives of some Israeli owners, who see the 'top-down' and informal development of community centres for the labour migrants (mainly churches in basements and in neglected industrial buildings), as a threat:

There are *Negroes everywhere*. Little kids, I see them in the *dark nights*. They pass like *devils*. What do they think it is here—New York? (An Israeli inhabitant, 27 November 2001)

Later, when he understood that representatives of the labour migrants participated in the planning process, he took his argument a step further, emphasizing their dangerous nature as a 'non-Jewish' community:

We do not need them. *They are missionaries*. They are looking for more spaces for their churches. We do not need them as workers. *They have no right to participate*. (An Israeli inhabitant, 23 June 2003)

However, New York, as a metaphor, is also used by Israeli renters in the area, who are mostly young and somewhat bohemian, and represent a different group of Israelis living in the area. They perceive the area more positively and see the potential of it, as we learned from a young student who explained:

I live near the Central Bus Station, and I do not have any problem with the foreign workers . . . On Saturday you see colours, it's fun to see. I feel as if I live in a city like New York. (5 February 2002)



For this group, renting 'New York style lofts' for less than in northern Tel Aviv is another reason for living in the area: "We are young fellows who want to live here . . . There are few other bohemians: a manager who moved with his kids and renovated an amazing house" (27 November 2001). Indeed, what the old Israeli inhabitants perceived as intimidating, is mentioned as exotic and as a cosmopolitan advantage for the young renters: "I like to hear the Turks from upstairs chatting in Hebrew with the Filipinos downstairs" (27 November 2001).

This cosmopolitan image also stems from the shifting characteristics of the commercial activities. In the CBS area many grocery shops selling African as well as Asian food and other products opened up. In addition, cheap international call booths and other services opened up for the new communities who reside there. This process was mentioned by one of the Israeli flat owners, who pointed, negatively, to the economic profit of the merchants: "it gives them money", he said (5 February 2001).

Another important issue is the sex industry, which is very visible in the area. From our fieldwork findings we can report that there are some 45 active brothels in the neighbourhood. Embarrassed participants raised this issue, linking it to the dirt in the area as well as to the presence of the working migrants: "... the brothels are spread out in a large area. They [the working migrants] walk in groups, they are drunk" (5 February 2002). However, following our question what should be done with the sex industry, some of the inhabitants, mainly the youngest, accepted it on condition that it would be under tighter scrutiny. But they also linked the existence of the brothels to the working migrants 'needs', stating that "it is not realistic to think that they will disappear . . . all the foreigners [the labour migrants] need it" (5 February 2002).

Linking the image of the 'other' to the sex industry embodies a wide set of meanings, and contradicts the 'reality', i.e., the fact that sex industry in the CBS area serves many Israelis. In fact, from interviews with prostitutes and middlemen we learned that they serve not just Tel Aviv, but that this is one of Israel's main prostitution centres. However, this lends a 'carnival image' to the area:

Regardless, there are happenings and celebrations here during the weekends involving the foreign workers. Let's turn it to the red-windows quarter . . . and demand high municipality taxes from these businesses. (A young Israeli inhabitant, 27 November 2001)

The last meeting we had with the CBS area inhabitants was organized in order to present the inhabitants with the different alternatives for planning the district. This has been the first time that we invited both Israelis and labour migrants to the same meeting. Thirty Israelis and only five Filipino working migrants came. The meeting opened with the architect's presentation of the project and a simultaneous translation to English; some of the Israelis complained that the translation was noisy and asked to stop it, expressing their fury at the fact that 'non-citizens' have the right to decide how 'their' neighbourhood will look in the future. This last meeting was a clear manifestation of the hostility that the Israelis have towards the 'other'.

To sum up, both Israelis and labour migrants expressed their mistrust in the power of planning to change the area. Their mistrust is based on past negative experiences in this matter. At the same time, their attitude to the 'other' is more complex; for the young 'gentrifiers', who are often renters, they give the area a cosmopolitan image. Yet, for many of the old inhabitants they are the source of all problems. They expropriate 'their' city.

### Discussion: Whose City is it, then?

This concluding section returns to Leonie Sandercock's vision, of the multiple communities within a city perceiving and connecting with each other's cultures as part of their shared space. Clearly, this article has pointed out that the situation in the CBS area is a far cry from this cosmopolitan desire. This raises the question whether and how we can, as planners, promote such vision of the city. In other words, how can we incorporate the different, and sometimes contrasting, types of knowledge in the planning process?

This is a complicated issue, as the different expressions of knowledge are not homogeneous. We have demonstrated in this article the different nuances of both local and professional knowledge that exist within each of the actors. A clear example of contrasting knowledge is the fact that the perceptions of some of the Israeli residents often contrast with the perceptions of the labour migrants. While a majority of the former wish to live in a 'cleansed' area, many of the latter wish to live in multicultural environments.

Further questions are raised about how we, as planners, become involved in the formulation of a strategic plan, when we are exposed to perceptions and attitudes that contradict our own ethics and attitudes? This dilemma has been elaborated upon elsewhere (Fenster, 1999) with regard to the knowledge used in the planning of Bedouin minority towns in Israel. In the context of this article, this dilemma became acute when we had to choose between five planning alternatives, or future visions, which the senior architect in the planning team had proposed.<sup>17</sup> We had to choose the alternative that we, the professional team, thought was 'right' for the future development of the area,<sup>18</sup> knowing and hearing the objections of the Israeli residents to such a move.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps here lies the difference. We, as planners, thought that taking into consideration the multiple layers of knowledge before evaluating the various alternatives is crucial, whereas the Israeli residents considered their own needs and desires as a primary indicator for the future vision of this area. We used our professional and perhaps ideological knowledge, while the residents used their own subjective and personal perceptions.

Whose city is it, then? In order to discuss this question, let us refer again to the theoretical discussion. In terms of resources and equal distribution of urban services, both labour migrants and Israeli inhabitants suffer discrimination at the hands of the authorities in the CBS area. The new strategic plan and the municipality policy mark a shift for these two communities—the Israelis who are formal citizens, and the working migrants who are 'a temporary phenomenon'. However, at the centre of this shift we pointed to the tension between them. This tension stems from fear and alienation, which dominate the image of the other as expressed by some of the Israeli inhabitants, who perceive the city as theirs. This is a sad illustration of how multiple layers of knowledge are seen as a social threat that endangers the area.

However, as we have seen, the fear of one group is the ground from which stems an urban experience, an *oeuvre* in Lefebvrian terms, for the other. The young 'gentrifiers' accept the labour migrants and see them as a source of alternative urban life in Tel Aviv. They are part of the urban social and cultural fabric which in turn demands re-definition of urban citizenship in the age of globalization. It can be seen how the clear-cut dichotomy of professional versus local blurs somewhat upon hearing the actors' experiences in the area.

But here lies the very problem of urban planning and management, the apparatuses of implementing macro-policies in general, and in Israel in particular. The social and demographic dimensions of the global economy change urban landscapes and at the same time contradict, and even 'endanger' national ideologies. But urban space, which is dynamic and socially produced, is also shaped by the daily experiences of those

who are excluded, 'illegal' and 'transparent' in the city. Thus, urban planning and management in the age of globalization, we would conclude, requires the development of a new agenda and different conceptual tools that will bridge over the different perceptions and knowledge of urban places and spaces. This is an important topic for further research, but here some planning implications of the above analysis can be mentioned:

- First is the growing importance of planners' attention to multilayered identities of the residents of globalized cities. Planners, it is suggested, must map the diversity of residents at the start of any planning activity (see also Olufemi & Reeves, 2004).
- It is highly important to expose and learn everyday practices of each of the communities involved in the planning process. As shown in the article such practices can teach planners about the multiple uses, meanings and perception of space. This understanding is often a key issue in re-designing urban spaces especially when they occupy people of different cultural and ethnic communities as is the case in globalized cities.
- Finally, planners need to acknowledge the diversity of 'actors' involved in both the planning and implementation processes in order to work on the plan with full co-ordination of the various actors involved. The analysis in the article showed that even 'the municipality planners' are not a hegemonic unit. Rather, each of them perceives the planning process and the various communities living in CBS in different ways and perceptions stemming from their own identities.

Indeed, these are just a few points of view on how the topics raised in this article can be incorporated in a planning practice which aims to suggest a smooth and more sensitive way to design globalized urban spaces which takes into consideration the multiple layers of knowledge articulated by the different 'actors' which use and shape globalizing urban settings.\*

## Notes

1. In the context of this article, the 'other' refers mainly to the labour migrants, these are the non-Jewish 'foreign workers', that live in the area illegally, in the most part. Most labour migrants come from: Eastern Europe, Latin America, Africa (especially Nigeria, Ghana and Ivory Coast) and East Asia (especially China, Thailand and Philippines).
2. From a methodological perspective the interpretation and analysis of the texts and documents in this article are based on vast literature that deals with discourse analysis in general and in relation to the built environment and planning in particular. See Fairclough, 1992, 1995; Finnegan, 1998; Hastings, A., 1999; Markus & Cameron, 2002; Scollon, 1998.
3. For details about the globalizing aspects of Tel Aviv see: Alfasi & Fenster (2005).
4. The two cities were officially united after the founding of the state of Israel in 1948 and they have the official name Tel Aviv – Jaffa.
5. It should be emphasized that the migration of non-Jewish workers to Israel is a result of a government decision from 1993. Following the Israeli\Palestinian conflict, particularly the first Intifada, Palestinian cheap labour, which had dominated Israeli labour market (especially in the construction industry and in agriculture) was largely prohibited from entering the state. (see Cohen, 1999).
6. The Law of Return declares the right of every Jew (defined as a person with at least one Jewish grandparent) to settle in Israel and receive full citizenship rights. However, the religious establishment defines a Jew as either born to a Jewish mother, or converted according to the orthodox rule. Based on this law, Jewish newcomers have the right to financial and housing support (see: [www.knesset.gov.il](http://www.knesset.gov.il)).
7. At time of writing (July 2004) the government of Israel initiates a strong and aggressive policy of deporting illegal labour migrants. It is expressed in intensive propaganda against employing unregistered migrants. Furthermore, a special Migration Police has been established in order to deport non-registered workers. In July 2003, about 20 000 workers were deported ([www.kavlaoved.org.il](http://www.kavlaoved.org.il)), and according to an advertisement of the Migration Police, 100 000 unregistered workers were deported (Israeli radio).

8. For a detailed analysis of the social, spatial and political implications of the Russian migration to Israel see Lustick, 1999; Shumsky, 2001; Yacobi & Tzfadia, 2004.
9. According to the Israel National Bank data, in the year 2000 there were 211 000 'non-Jewish' workers in Israel: 98 000 Palestinians and 113 000 'foreign workers'. In 2001 'Kav LaOved' (an NGO that deals with workers' rights) stated that there were 138 500 authorized labour migrants and 151 000 unauthorized (www.kavlaoved.org.il).
10. The survey included a random sampling (one flat has been sampled randomly in every one in three buildings in the area) and consisted of flats. The survey took place in March 2002 during weekdays.
11. The ratio between Israelis and labour migrants living in the area is 35:65, which means that in each part of the area there is a mixture of Israelis and labour migrants, not an absolute majority of labour migrants as the authorities estimated.
12. The planners' narratives are based on minutes of the teams' meetings and individual in-depth interviews.
13. It must be emphasized that since the current mayor was elected, the municipality did adopt different policies towards the labour migrants in several areas, which in many ways contradict the official government policies or policies in other cities such as Jerusalem (especially in the field of education and welfare) (Alfasi & Fenster, 2005).
14. The narratives presented in this section are part of the discussions held in five focus groups and two discussion groups that we initiated as part of the methodology of the planning process. The difference between the discussion groups and the focus groups is mainly in the method and dynamics of communication. While focus groups were conducted by external professionals not involved directly in the planning process, discussion groups were conducted by the team members themselves and a more open and free dialogue between the inhabitants and the planners and the municipality representatives has developed. We also initiated in-depth interviews as well as informal meetings and discussions with the CBS inhabitants, planners and policy makers.
15. *Mesilah* is an example of a municipal independent policy toward meeting the needs of the labour migrants, which contradicts the national policy. This organization deals with personal problems and assists labour migrants to uphold their human and labour rights.
16. *Negroes* is used here as a translation of the Hebrew word *Kushim*, which is used as a derogative word for black people in Israel.
17. It is important to note that all the alternatives were based on different future visions of the situation (maybe state of affairs) and existence of labour migrant communities in the area. In two visions labour migrants had moved out of the area (CBD Connected and Neighborhood Rejuvenated), two suggested a future vision of the area with the labour migrants as part of its residents (Meeting Zone and Special Quarter) and the fifth suggested a continuation of the present situation (Open Sector). The alternative chosen was the Meeting Zone, which emphasizes the future of the area as a meeting place of the different ethnic groups living there.
18. As mentioned before, this process of formulating alternatives and selecting one is in itself an expression of the professional planning process.
19. The Israeli residents chose the alternatives that showed the removal of labour migrants from the area, and the labour migrants chose the alternatives which call upon their staying in the area.

## References

- Alfasi, N. & Fenster, T. (2005) The national city and the global city: Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, *Israeli Sociology*, 6(2), pp. 265–294 (Hebrew).
- Castells, M. (1978) *City, Class and Power* (London, Macmillan).
- Castells, M. (1997) *The Power of Identity* (Oxford, Blackwell).
- Cohen, A. (1999) Thai workers in Israeli agriculture, in: L. Achdut & R. Nathanson (Eds) *The New Workers*, pp. 155–204 (Tel Aviv, Hakibutz Hameuchad) (Hebrew).
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge, Polity Press).
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media Discourse* (London, Edward Arnold).
- Fenster, T. (1999) Space for gender: cultural roles of the forbidden and the permitted, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17, pp. 227–246.
- Fenster, T. (2001) Planning, culture, knowledge and control: minority women in Israel, in: O. Yiftachel, J. Little, D. Hedgcock & I. Alexander (Eds) *The Power of Planning* (Dordrecht, Kluwer).
- Fenster, T. (2002) Planning as control—cultural and gendered manipulation and mis-use of knowledge, *Hagar, International Social Science Review*, 1, pp. 67–84.
- Fenster, T. (2004) *The Global City and the Holy City: Narratives on Knowledge, Planning, and Diversity* (London, Pearson).

- Finnegan, R. (1998) *Tales of the City—A Study of Narrative and Urban Life* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).
- Forester, J. (1989) *Planning in the Face of Power* (Berkeley, University of California Press).
- Forester, J. (1999) *The Deliberative Practitioner: Encouraging Participatory Processes* (Boston, MIT Press).
- Forman, C. (1989) *Spitalfields: A Battle for Land* (London, Hilary Shipman).
- Harding, S. (1996) Gendered ways of knowing and the 'epistemological crisis' of the West, in: N. Goldberg, J. Tarule, B. Clinchy & H. Belenky (Eds) *Knowledge, Difference, and Power*, pp. 431–454 (New York, Basic Books).
- Harvey, D. (1999) Frontiers of insurgent planning, *Plurimondi*, 1(2), p. 272.
- Hastings, A. (1999) Discourse and urban change: introduction to the special issue, *Urban Studies*, 36(1), pp. 7–12.
- Healey, P. (1997) *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies* (London, Macmillan).
- Innes, J. (1995) Planning theory's emerging paradigm: communicative action and interactive practice, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14(3), pp. 183–190.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space* (Oxford, UK & Cambridge, MA, Blackwell).
- Lustick, I. (1999) Israel as a non-Arab state: the political implications of mass immigration of non-Jews, *Middle East Journal*, 53(3), pp. 416–433.
- Ma Reha, Z. (1998) White knowledge and Western superiority. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Institute of British Geographers, January.
- Markus, T. & Cameron, D. (2002) *The Words between the Spaces—Buildings and Language* (London and New York, Routledge).
- Moulaert, F., Rodriguez, A. & Swyngedouw, E. (2003) *The Globalized City—Economic Restructuring and Social Polarization in European Cities* (Oxford, Oxford University Press).
- Olufemi, O. & Reeves, D. (2004) Lifeworld strategies of women who find themselves homeless in South Africa, *Planning Theory and Practice*, 5(1), pp. 69–92.
- Sandercock, L. (1998) *Towards Cosmopolis* (London, John Wiley).
- Sandercock, L. (2003) *Mongrel Cities* (London, Continuum).
- Sassen, S. (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo* (Princeton, Princeton University Press).
- Sassen, S. (1994) *Cities in a World Economy* (Thousand Oaks, Pine Forge Press).
- Sassen, S. (1998) *Globalization and its Discontent* (New York, New York Press).
- Schenell, I. & Alexander, M. (2002) *Urban Policy towards Labor Migrants in Tel Aviv- Jaffa* (Jerusalem, The Floresheimer Institute for Policy Studies) (Hebrew).
- Schön, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner* (New York, Basic Books).
- Scollon, R. (1998) *Mediated Discourse* (New York, Addison Wesley Longman Inc).
- Shumsky, D. (2001) Ethnicity and citizenship in the perception of Russian-Israelis, *Theory and Criticism*, 19, pp. 17–40 (Hebrew).
- Taylor, P.J. (2000) World cities and territorial states under conditions of contemporary globalization, *Political Geography*, 19(1), pp. 5–32.
- Tzfadia, E., Yacobi, H. & Yiftachel, O. (2002) The shifting sands of urban politics, planning and identities: a review essay, *Geopolitics*, 7(3), pp. 183–194.
- Yacobi, H. (2003) Everyday life in Lod: on power, identity and spatial protest, *Jamaa*, 10, pp. 69–109.
- Yacobi, H. & Tzfadia, E. (2004) On the construction of territorial identity: nationalism and space among migrants in Lod, *Theory and Criticism*, 24, pp. 45–71 (Hebrew).
- Yiftachel, O. (1994) The dark side of modernism: planning as control of an ethnic minority, in: S. Watson & K. Gibson (Eds) *Postmodern Cities and Spaces* (Oxford, Basil Blackwell).
- Yiftachel, O. & Yacobi, H. (2003) Urban ethnocracy: ethnicization and the production of space in an Israeli mixed city, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 21(6), pp. 673–693.