**Back to Jerusalem**

The collapse of the Camp David II negotiations and the onset of the second Intifada in September 2000, followed by Israeli and American declarations that the elected Palestinian leadership was an irrelevant non-eligible partner, has effected Palestinian/Israeli co-operation, especially in relation to Jerusalem issues that had been the focus of the Camp David summit. The fact that the Camp David negotiations failed, due to the high emphasis on religious and national symbols rather than dealing with territorial and functional issues, had two somewhat contradictory impacts on the work of the Bommersvik group: on the one hand, its knowledge base became an important repository of information relevant to understanding the issue, and on the other hand, the work became irrelevant to the peace process itself, which almost stopped.

The uncertainty and the escalation of the conflict created a new reality; from one national side, the whole discussion on an open city shifted to separation. The Israeli public came to favor separation. Concerns over security and a perceived demographic threat combined to serve as justification for this trend.

Israeli voices for an open city were mostly silenced. The restriction of Palestinian mobility increased and entry to Jerusalem became impossible, thus thwarting any positive Palestinian-Israeli contacts. Because of the Israeli closure policies, access to Jerusalem became almost impossible for members of the Palestinian teams living in Ramallah, Bethlehem and other West Bank areas.

The positive atmosphere of preparing for ‘the day after’ the signing of a peace agreement totally vanished. The raising power of the right wing in Israel and the cycles of successive retaliation, targeted killings and suicide attacks fueled a downward spiral toward greater polarization. The mutual destruction and violence made it more difficult to proceed and to convince our Swedish partner to continue to support our co-operation in the absence of a peace process. Nevertheless, the two organizations; the IPCC and the JIIS, continued to co-operate. A lot of effort was put together to convince European partners to support the continuity of the joint work on Jerusalem, and to avoid the termination of this co-operation. The two sides invested resources and good will. Regrettably, these efforts did not succeed.

**The TU Delft Jerusalem Urban Peace Building project**

With the knowledge and experience of the Bommersvik meetings, and the willingness to go on, both organizations approached Delft University of Technology (TU Delft) for partnering with them in a peace-building project at the end of year 2000. The involvement of the TU Delft, through CICAT (TU Delft management center for international co-operation) and the Faculty of Architecture, and the participation of Amin, one of the authors of this Chapter, a member of IPCC think tank and the Middle East Senior project manager at TU Delft at the same time, created the opportunity for discussions about ways to develop mechanisms to assist the urban peace transformation in Jerusalem.

The basic assumption reached by the three partners was that peace is not possible unless a mechanism of urban peace building can be developed as an action-oriented plan through trilateral professional
intervention. The three partners developed a proposal in which the mechanism of urban peace building focused on four main clusters:
- Urban and Architectural Images;
- Housing;
- Conservation of Architecture and Urban Heritage;

These clusters expressed the city's needs and interests of all its residents, and were supposed to provide politicians and stakeholders from both sides with new urban development scenarios that are based on equality, mutual acceptance and participation of the public.

As a part of the project, a two-day kickoff workshop in Delft was organized in March 2001. Palestinians, Israelis and international experts on ethno-national divided cities worked together on the 'Case of Jerusalem', within the framework of a project that addressed various urban planning issues in the Divided City. In this workshop, the participants spent the two days analyzing the Jerusalem case as a divided city and compared the urban dynamics of Jerusalem with other divided cities, especially Belfast (Northern Ireland), Nicosia (Cyprus), Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Johannesberg (Germany).

The three partners failed to convince the Dutch foreign ministry to support this initiative. The deadlock of the peace process and the sensitivity of the issue of Jerusalem seemed to be the reason behind this decision. After the failure of several attempts to raise funding to support this initiative, the project was placed on hold.

**Learning from Berlin**

The period between September 2000 and October 2001 witnessed clashes and escalation of the conflict in which Palestinian and Israeli civilians were killed in a vicious circle of violence and counter-violence. This situation did not stop the two partners from continuing their co-operation and attempting to involve a third 'knowledge' partner in their efforts. In other words, the group shifted from searching for a venue, like the case of Bommersvik experience, to attempting to engage international partners in sharing experience and knowledge, especially exploring the experience of other divided and formerly divided cities from which Jerusalem can draw negative and positive lessons for any possible peace transformation.

The idea of learning from Berlin was raised for the first time in Jerusalem with the former director of the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung in the summer of 2000. At the beginning, there were many doubts about what Israelis and Palestinians could learn from the German capital. However, after the first familiarization visit to Berlin, at the end of summer 2001, the Jerusalem participants came to believe there is much that can be garnered from the experience of this European city. The processes of political, administrative and physical integration have advanced faster in Berlin than have the processes of social, cultural and economic integration. Thus the first Berlin workshop put its central emphasis on explaining this phenomenon, specifically the disconnection between the general frame of unification and the everyday lives of the people.
As a result of this first visit, the Jerusalem Berlin Forum (JBF) was founded in October 2001; it brought together 10 experts, planners and local decision-makers from a formerly divided city – Berlin – and a team of 16 experts and planners from Jerusalem (8 Palestinians and 8 Israelis) most of which took part in the Bommersvik process. The Berlin experts explored the mechanisms of integration in Berlin, and furthermore, the obstacles to the functioning and unification of the city. Thus, they aimed to assist the Jerusalem group’s goal of transforming Jerusalem from being a city of conflict to becoming a city of peace.

The JBF has held four joint workshops since 2001, two workshops in Berlin, and two in Jerusalem. Moreover, in 2003 the JBF published its first book, *Divided Cities in Transition I* (Friedman & Nasrallah, 2003) in which the various participants of the JBF discussed their often diverse assessments of how processes of integration and separation have affected both cities. The book contained 26 articles, in two main parts. The first part contained the Jerusalem Palestinian and Israeli perspectives; 8 articles were by the Palestinian members of the team, and 8 by the Israeli members. In these articles, both teams mixed two interests. A desire to learn from the experience of other divided and formerly divided cities, lessons that would assist both the Palestinians and the Israelis to identify solutions and develop multi-dimensional models of transformation applicable to Jerusalem. Their second desire was to promote a realistic dialogue on the issues they believed to have the greatest impact on the success or failure of the peace-building process in Jerusalem. They discussed different aspects of Jerusalem’s reality, and future scenarios between being an open city and one of physical division. This included the fields of economics, geography, urban and spatial dynamics, socio-economic and social development, education, population and boundaries, transition, separation and integration as opposed to co-operation, and the reciprocal relationship of the city with its surroundings.

The second part of the book consisted of 9 articles by the Berlin-team members. In this section, the Berlin team explained the situation in 1990 and the mode of operation of the City Forum ‘Stadtforum’, founded in 1991. They illustrated their personal and collective experiences and activities in the formerly divided Berlin and their contributions to the management of transition to a unified Berlin. They also illustrated the ‘Social City’ program, which was founded to combat socio-geographical division in Berlin.

In July 2005, the second volume of this series, *Divided Cities in Transition II* (Auga, Hasson, Nasrallah & Stetter, 2005) was published. In this book, the German, Israeli and Palestinian participants of the JBF analyzed in further detail the complex processes of transition which affect their respective cities. The aim of the book was to investigate developments in Jerusalem and Berlin, systematically, in order to provide a potential framework for Jerusalem’s transformation from a city of conflict to one of peace. It consisted of 12 articles in two main parts. The first part contained 10 articles by the Jerusalem team; 5 of which were presented by the Palestinian team, and 5 by the Israeli team. In these articles, they concluded that the political solution is not sufficient to reach peace transformation; both sides should look at Jerusalem’s potential as a world center, which can be the leverage for enhancing the city’s centrality for both sides, and that this can only be done through respecting the claims of both parties. They theorized that the only viable approach to the Jerusalem problem is political separation alongside socio-economic and physical integration, and that it can be a positive model of peaceful equal real partnership co-operation, which could transform it from a frontier city into a metropolitan center of the region (Illustration 13.4).
Illustration 13.4: The Palestinian and Israeli metropolitan Jerusalem (Source: Nasrallah, Khamaisi & Youhan, 2003)
The second part of this volume consisted of two articles written collectively by the Berlin team. They discussed the management of transition in Berlin; Berlin between co-operation and division; reconstructing the past via fragmentary analyses of errors and missed opportunities in German unification. The dialogue between and within the Jerusalem and Berlin teams encouraged the Berliners to develop their discourse based on the future issues affecting the two cities. The result has been not only the proposal of models for peaceful transformation in Jerusalem, but has prompted the teams to question for the first time: what went wrong with the unification, and what mistakes can we learn from the past experience? This exercise of reassessing the unification and the integration process has generated a fresh perspective for Berlin.

In the third workshop of the JBF in Berlin, August 2003, we launched the ‘Scenario Building’ project, incorporating Palestinian and Israeli participants. The dramatic change on the ground by the construction of the Israeli Separation Wall in the Jerusalem area changed the whole atmosphere between the two partners. The Bommersvik process had been focusing on ‘the day after’ reaching the peace agreement, where the JBF process has been focusing on positive transformation from the current conflict to the peace situation. The deterioration of the situation, where prospects for a renewed peace process seem more distant than ever, has forced both partners to rethink their co-operation. They decided to deal with the negative transformation of the conflict, as well as working to identify factors that will foster the peace transformation and avoid the continuous mutual destruction and escalation of the conflict.

Scenario Building

Jerusalem Scenario Building has become a part of the JBF project. It is an intensive program that started in May 2004 in order to develop scenarios for the future of Jerusalem and strategies of intervention. A group of 12 Palestinian and Israeli planners, economists and social scientists dealt with the complex dimensions of the conflict around Jerusalem, including its ethno-national, political, social, economic and urban consequences. The program has been facilitated by Mr. Dirk Jung, a German expert in developing future scenarios and strategies of intervention from the Denkmodell in Berlin.

The participants identified the factors that are supposed to affect the city of Jerusalem and its future, developed matrix relations between the different factors and their driving forces and developed the structure scenario for Jerusalem. The initial scenarios for Jerusalem were developed by the end of December, 2004. It required intensive work to further develop these scenarios and to workout the details and the modifications. The year 2005 was dedicated to this work.

Against this background, this project intended to examine through scenario building different possible futures for Jerusalem. In this way, we enabled the public to review a variety of possible futures and to ask critical questions concerning the future of Jerusalem. Following the 2005 development, we developed a detailed vision for the city of Jerusalem. The difference between the scenarios and the vision are quite clear (Nasrallah, Rassem, Amin, Hidmi, Abu Ghazallah, Wa'ary, Hasson, Fishel, Maoz, Goren, Prince-Gibson & Garb, 2005). Illustration 13.5 shows the scenarios that were developed by the two groups in the Scenario Building 2005 workshop. The groups identified four possible scenarios for the future of Jerusalem, illustrating each by variations of four main factors that affect the future of Jerusalem and its people. These factors are: Strength of Governments, Occupation, Role of Civil Society and International Intervention. The four scenarios varied from a worst-case scenario, to a best-case scenario.
### Illustration 13.5: The four scenarios for the future of Jerusalem, developed by the Palestinian and Israeli groups in the Scenario Building Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Factor</th>
<th>Strength of government</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Role of civil society</th>
<th>International intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Besieged City</td>
<td>The Palestinian Authority is weak and the Israeli government is strong but lacks a future perspective for a final status agreement. Both governments focus almost exclusively on internal issues.</td>
<td>Israeli occupation continues. Palestinians in the city continue to live between the Israeli and Palestinian systems while belonging to neither.</td>
<td>Civil society is collapsing due to the flight of the elite and middle classes out of both the East and West Jerusalem.</td>
<td>The international community continues to support the Palestinian Authority, avoiding significant support for Jerusalem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The City of Bridges</td>
<td>The two strong governments are able to reach final status agreement and control the peace spoilers.</td>
<td>The final status agreement brings an end to the Israeli occupation and defines two distinct capitals in Jerusalem for the two states.</td>
<td>NGOs engage in cross-border co-operation in the fields of economic development, service provision, planning, conservation and preservation of the Old City.</td>
<td>The international community facilitates the implementation of the agreement and assists in developing Jerusalem as a world center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Fortress City</td>
<td>The two governments are strong enough to control peace spoilers but are not yet able to reach a final status agreement. They manage to sign a partial agreement within the framework of the road map.</td>
<td>According to this partial agreement, Palestinians have functional autonomy in Jerusalem in the form of a borough with limited security and planning responsibilities.</td>
<td>Moderates and peace entrepreneurs proliferate and are active, but play a marginal role.</td>
<td>The international community attempts to contain the situation by acting as a facilitator and supporter of peace entrepreneur activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Scorched Earth</td>
<td>The two weak governments are unable to reach any political agreement.</td>
<td>Occupation continues and intensifies. Jerusalem is walled-off and ‘soft’ ethnic cleansing occurs.</td>
<td>Civil society is weak. Moderates and peace entrepreneurs are regarded as traitors, and extremists become the leading force.</td>
<td>The international community retreats.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>