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Introduction

"la visió del mediterrani constitueix per a mi una necessitat"

"The view of the Mediterranean is a necessity for me"

Antoni Gaudi

At the southern edge of Barceloneta, in a point that probably holds the highest proximity of a residential building to Barcelona's Mediterranean water; a small steel board is posted on a little sandy rock with the words of Antonio Gaudi regarding the vision of the Mediterranean Sea.

The same way the Mediterranean image for Gaudi contains a "necessity", the Mediterranean Sea is a well know historical and geographical entity that suggests a spatial unity, and in many ways holds a world of its own. We frequently hear comprehensive references about the Mediterranean climate, Mediterranean coasts, Mediterranean ambience, and so on...

This paper began as a "hunch", as a will to find a possible association between the nearly farthest urban shores of the Mediterranean Sea.

More than 3,000 Km of water separate between the Israeli short coastlines to Barcelona, a distance that contains the whole complexity of the Mediterranean world, and that lights the imagination regarding the possibility of common geographical and historical issues that might contribute to our understanding of the contemporary Mediterranean metropolis.

The initial intuition was guided by the famous notion of "Mare Nostrum", a term that generally used to describe the Mediterranean as a geographical entity that function as a unify element, as a place where geography demonstrate its most powerful influence on history, on human life and activity. The Mediterranean geographical properties, its shores and water, its trade trails and battlefields and it's political, commercial and cultural relations were broadly investigated and fascinated historians and geographers, as well as cultural and social experts and investigators all over the world. It was so often referred to as the "cradle" of civilization, as the generator of myth and legend of great empires and unique cultures, that eventually it can be treated almost as an entity that
has a life of its own, and that engender all the singularity of human existence around its shores\(^1\).

The point of departure was then to examine the link between geography and urban development along the Mediterranean coast. Quickly an evaluation of several coastal urban situations in relation to the Mediterranean water was made and compared to each other. Although important physical similarities were found, as more additional content was added to the basic initial equation that holds on one side the Mediterranean and on the other side the urban area of its shores, the preliminary concept began to creak. Behind this beautiful image of unity that the Mediterranean can deliver, fundamental variations, differences and diversities are hiding. Although coastal Mediterranean cities share at least one geographical common quality, in this paper a more complex situation was revealed that might tell a unique story regarding the position of the city today between global function and local identity. Mediterranean coastal cities can actually demonstrate a part of that interesting history of the processes that bring almost every big city today to share that unique position, and in order to begin to tell this story, we first need to "dive" dipper into that great body of water, and to better understand its precise features that directly affected its cities.

Eventually, this paper will deliver the story of two coastal urban developments in Israel that demonstrate a much deeper and intricate notion of a Mediterranean urban condition. An existence of the Mediterranean that go beyond the direct consequences and implications of its oblivious geographical features regards its waters and its coastal environment, a much profound concept regarding the Mediterranean waters that may suggest a cultural and maybe even an intangible mechanism of 20th century planning conventions and the ways they were transmitted and implemented in a completely different context.

---

\(^1\) - Perhaps the most interesting work regarding that view of the Mediterranean Sea, is the work of Fernand Braudel one of the 20th century greatest historians that actually based on the Mediterranean a whole theory regarding the study of history. His approach was to direct history research mostly towards the study of geography, environment and human activity, rather than big events, wars and leaders. Braudel F. (2001), Memory and the Mediterranean, Alfred A. Knopf, Random House Inc. New York.
Fig. 1-2 - Six coastal metropolitan areas on the Mediterranean coast and it relations to water
Two banks of the Mediterranean

In his classic paragraph regarding the geography of the Mediterranean, the historian Fernand Braudel makes a fundamental cut in the apparent unity of the great blue surface. Like many geographical divisions Braudel distinguishes between the north and the south banks of the sea. He describes the powerful geographical actors that mastering each side of the Mediterranean coasts; the mountains and the desert (respectively) and the way they implicate a diversity of geographical forms that holds different human existence along its shores, and therefore plays a unique role in the history of the whole Mediterranean area. In this paper, another distribution between north and south will be suggested and followed - as most relevant to the story that will be revealed. The partition between empires and colonies especially during the first half of the 20th century draws the same line along the middle of the water surface, as northern empires held colonial territories in the south. Therefore, the Mediterranean basin and its coastal urban settlements can be seen as a "laboratory" for colonial and postcolonial relations since it forms perhaps the truly one area on the globe where a unique proximity between imperial nations and its colonial territories had existed. That fact highlights the role of the Mediterranean waters as the carriers of roaming cultural and social concepts and ideas, as a bridge between cultures and as a vessel for constant bi-directional influences and exchange of knowledge.

The Israeli "colonial-native" mixture

The small territory of Israel is located approximately in the middle of that imaginary line between the rulings north to the "native" colonized south. It might be a joint geographical and historical coincidence that until this very day the whole story of the establishment and formation of the Israeli country contains a strange mix between the two poles of the colonial classic equation. For since it was initially drafted as a national idea till our preset times, the basic notion of Zionism and of its most celebrated product - the national Israeli state - contains inherently a well blended combination between pioneering activity, and a struggle to create a self redefinition of a native nation. Immigrants that saw them self as natives, pioneers that had built a mythical connection to the new land they have come to settle. The country of Israel even today, its rural and urban layout, its habitants and their everyday life structure contains that same preliminary paradox that was planted way back at the very first stages of the state physical establishment.

That unique duality was probably precisely the condition that enabled the strong reaction between European social utopias along with preliminary concepts of urban planning, and the Zionist aspiration of physical realization in Palestine. Throughout that reaction an avant-garde European ideology was broadly transmitted and planted in the establishing process of the pre-state Zionist social and practical endeavor. It was the preliminary moment of transforming the Zionist rhetorical and ideological conclusions.

---

into physical distributions of urban and rural settlements. Coastal cities played a unique role in that process since conventionally they served as the landing place for colonial ideas and activities, as well as the first impression of the new land for visitors and immigrants, while at the same time contained the local inhabitants that maintained their vernacular forms of living.

Fig. 3 – 20th century North South colonial relations

---

Sonder I. (2014), *May be solved by the construction of “garden cities”: German-Jewish literary proposals on garden cities in Erets Israel*, Manchester & New York, Manchester University Press.
A Personal note... Town and Country marriage...

The year is 1993 it is a quiet summer Friday evening, the members and families of "Kibbutz Gadot" (a small agricultural cooperative settlement in the north of Israel) are gathering at the large dining hall for the traditional "Shabat" dinner. It is a weekly festive moment when all members of the community are joining together for a ritual symbolic small celebration that stresses the communal essence of their peculiar form of living. An hour or so later they will all go down to the "Big Grass" (a large green public space next to the dining hall and tangent to a wide granolith surface in the center of the small settlement) and will continue their communal evening with a companionship simple coffee and cake. Although my family was, as usual attending the communal dinner, I wasn’t present at that particular evening. I was about 250m far from the central dining hall executing my milking night shift at the Kibbutz's dairy; a regular monthly task that every teenager of the community was asked to fulfill. It is a fairly simple task; involves mostly routing out the cows from their stalls escorting them to the milking shade and back to their stall again. A certain amount of attention has to be paid for the opening and closing of the stalls gates. At this particular evening my mind was distracted and I left one gate open! It took some 20 minutes before I noticed few of my quiet glutton companions of the evening eating grass outside their stall. It was rather too late! dozens of cows had found their way to the big public grass where all the Kibbutz members were spending their peaceful evening. It took the help of many members that had jumped on their working trucks or ran whistling and shouting all over the area to bring back the cows to their stall and the calm evening to its order. Besides the shame that was involved, this incidence remained one of my strongest memories from my childhood and youth in the Kibbutz. This surrealistic vision of animals and people mixing together in a Friday evening always resembles to me the unique form of place where I grew up. A realm of liquid, flexible, uninterrupted, continuous open space, where buildings of all kind gently laid down with no further arrangements. No plots, no fences and basically an almost complete absence of any kind of border or barrier, to the degree that cows and people could be mixed together after few minutes, at the center of the settlement if one gate is left open...

22 years later... I am an adult and a father of two kids in their first years of life. We are starting our third year of living in the old city center of Barcelona – a dens congested urban center of a most populated European metropolitan area. Quite the extreme opposite from the 200 inhabitant's Kibbutz, where I was born and raised. We lived by the Via-Laietana, a major thoroughfare that crosses Barcelona's central urban area vertically, and contains an endless amount of transportation that runs through it every day. It is certainly an unpleasant and stressful place to wander around with kids and was frequently avoided by me for that reason. Any labyrinth twisted curved route to reach from one point to another in our neighborhood was almost always favored on top of even a short walk along Via-Laietana corridor. One Sunday morning of September, as we went out the street, the Via-Laietana Avenue was surprisingly empty from cars! A short inquiry revealed the fact that this particular Sunday was the "Dia sense cotxes" in Barcelona (a day with no cars) and the Via-Laietana Avenue was chosen among other streets in the city to be evacuated from any kind of vehicle and to host a verity of public events. Next to the Baixers school that stands directly on one the avenue wings, a huge pan of "Paella" was beginning to be prepared by a group of the school parents, and a long table with chairs and a white tablecloth had been set at the center of the avenue that was now the most calm and quiet places in the
neighborhood. It was in that moment when the Kibbutz had all of a sudden became entirely presence in my experience! The place that for two years had function as the most obvious barrier in almost every aspect of our daily routine (physically as well as mentally) was converted to the "Big grass" next to the dining hall of my childhood Kibbutz. We spent a whole day at Via-Laietana, eating together with our neighbors, painting with the kids on a huge strip of paper that was spread along the avenue and dancing to live music that was playing also by "Baixeras" school parents. Did the Kibbutz have penetrated the center of Barcelona? Could the communal experience of one of the most extreme cases of social experiments that ever took place in the world rebirth itself in the center of one of Europe's largest metropolises?

Having approximately spending my 40 years of life halved between the two extreme poles of - country and city, Between a cooperative agricultural rural settlement of a small Israeli Kibbutz in the Galilee, to the three largest urban centers of the country (Haifa, Jerusalem & Tel Aviv) and the inspiring metropolitan area of Barcelona, the whole idea of Town and country marriage is rotted deeply in my very core of being. In an uncontrolled manner I always look after the Kibbutz in the city, after the closeness to nature and the deep sense of community that were an inseparable part of the Kibbutz life, in the place that probably resemble the opposite.

Town and country marriage is one of the core concepts of the extensive social and urban experiment that was drafted by Ebenezer Howard and the garden city movement more than 100 years ago. It had created one of the most powerful movements in urban planning that probably affected our urban environment in an unprecedented manner, far greater then we might acknowledge even today. It was quite immediately embraced by the Zionist movement and transmitted to Palestine to be tested and implemented on a new context. What had become of this melted ideological social and urban mixture is strongly evident to this very day in Israel's large metropolitan centers, and took many surprising turns and modifications to become a unique mutation of the original garden city concept.
Fig. 4 – My personal town and Country marriage experience.
**Objectives**

This paper will try to trace down the processes of transition, implementation and modification of this original core European urban ideology and its consolidation in the land of Palestine since the beginning of the 20th century, and until our days. Its objectives deal with the basic curiosity regarding the roaming nature of urban concepts and the gap between strong formulated ideologies to the uncontrolled and unforeseen character of reality.

**Hypothesis**

It is therefore assumed, that through the examination of Haifa and Tel Aviv - the two largest Mediterranean coastal metropolitan areas in Israel and their preliminary expansion phases, an interesting mechanism of transition and implementation of core modern urban planning theories in to a new context will be reveled. These first crucial urban steps were treated by Zionist organizations as an opportunity to establish a new modern urban form that will convert the movement strong social and national aspirations into a physical urban model. The planning of these urban expansions was traded by several European figures and dealt directly with the necessity to adjust and transmit their planning visions that were originated in Europe to the new context they encountered.

**Methodology**

A focused comparative research of the preliminary urban expansion of Tel Aviv and Haifa will be conducted in order to apprehend the different forms of implementations of core ideas and theories in modern urban planning, as they were drafted in Palestine at the beginning of the 20th century.
Roaming Utopias

The Classic and the activist utopia

In their book "Collage City" Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter had managed to define in a unique and concise clarity two types of Utopias that had generated pragmatic models of thoughts regarding the fields of architecture and urban planning along the history. These two types of utopia: The classical utopia and the Activist Utopia, and the process of ideological shift between them, can shed light on one of the fundamental aspects of the "Zionism - planning" relation.

The classical Utopia, according to Rowe and Koetter is a well known traditional tool that serves mainly to criticize society from a wide and detached point of view. Or, if to use Rowe and Koetter exact words:

"The classical utopia, the critical utopia inspired by universal rational morality and ideas of justice..."  

"An icon of the good society, the terrestrial shadow of an idea, the classical utopia was necessarily, addressed to a conspicuously small audience; and its architectural corollary, the ideal city - no less an emblem of universal and final good - is to imagine as an instrument of education addressed to an equally limited clientele."  

What is important here is the detached character of the idea of utopia in its classical original form, which surly contradicts the modern version of this idea that was to be engaged during the 19th century and more powerfully during the first decades of the 20th century. The activist utopia is no longer an instrument of observation only, a model that demonstrates a better society; it is an active motor to change and to revolutionize society itself:

"It is a case of a metaphor of the good society thought of, quite literally, as becoming the thing itself, of myth become prescription and of prescription endorsed by threat of Either : Or. A choice of utopia or else..."  

It don't required much effort to make the connection between such a definition of utopia to the social roots of modern movement in architecture and urban planning, and equally to the very essence of the Zionist idea itself - to establish a whole new society, (completely deferent from the traditional Jewish existents), in a whole new land. Throughout the long journey of conceptual definition, and long before reaching the stage of a physical establishment, the Zionist idea and more importantly, it's inevitable and desirable final product - the Jewish state were intended to be written in advance. If we examine the

---

4 Rowe c. and Koetter F. (1978), *Collage City*, Cambridge Massachusetts, the MIT Press.
In the chapter:"Utopia : Decline and Fall" Rowe and Koetter demonstrate the transformation between these two kinds of utopia that occurred during the 19th century.
5 Rowe c. and Koetter F. (1978), *Collage City*, p.13
6 Rowe c. and Koetter F. (1978), *Collage City*, p. 14
7 Rowe c. and Koetter F. (1978), *Collage City*, p. 31
8 In his article at Bezalel Papers on Architecture, Prof. Efrat Z. shows this unique formation of early Zionist ideology and quotes Theodor Herzl, perhaps the most significant and known Zionist Thinker how is consider as the establisher of the Zionist movement and the "Prophet" of the Jewish state. Herzl had wrote already in 1896 his book "The Jewish State" where he describes in great detailed the whole structure of the future country, including preferable territorial patterns and rural, as well as urban forms of settlements.
components of both, social and urban European concepts that were developed since the second half of the 19th century along with their contemporary Zionist ideologies, the notion of active utopia will certainly rise as the most dominant force of both movements, and various similarities between the two will also stand up clearly.

**Travelling with an urban prescription**

Two key notions of urban visions rose up in Europe, almost in a parallel course since the end of the 19th century and more intensely at the beginning of the 20th century. They were developed mostly as a critical reflex to the 19th century industrial city and formulated leading social and urban theories that had provided planners and social leaders with a set of rhetorical and pragmatic tools to be experimented and implemented all over the world.

The Garden city movement - an impressive ample and comprehensive social experiment, originated ideologically almost exclusively by a single person - Sir Ebenezer Howard (1850-1928), was perhaps the main branch that had generated coherent and effectively practical method of new urban vision.

The new evolving pioneering discipline of town planning that was developed in England and other European countries as an extensive academic and rather scientific field, was a second paralleled branch of new social and urban ideology that derived from the ambition to repair the horrors of its contemporary industrial European cities. One of the fundamental axes of that new in-formation study is known as a product of an intense joint research and theoretical work of several key figures in England during the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century.

In the case of the Zionist national territorial establishment project, both of the branches that were described above had a crucial impact on the preliminary planning activity of Jewish rural and urban settlements in Palestine.

The garden city idea was a main concept in Zionist ideology from a relatively early stage. It exists in the written works of several key Zionist figures and takes a major part in the vision of Theodor Herzl who is indisputably known in Israel and throughout the world as the Jewish state prophet. An additional proponent enthusiastic spirit to garden city concepts was provided by the new Jewish immigrants that had arrived from Europe and were sturdily charged with strong well defined European prescription of a correct new way to produce and plan urban environments. That "urban prescription" contained collectively the lessons that were learned in European cities and the ambition to reinvent the traditional Jewish social existence in Diaspora. It had been transmitted to Palestine by several Jewish social leaders, architect and scholars that emigrated from Europe.

The pioneering ideas of early urban planning had joined the Zionist planning activity in Palestine in a further direct manner. Two of the founding fathers of that new study of cities were to arrive to the pre-state Israeli coast and had provided an example of their own educated proposal to the way a city should be planed. They were perhaps the strongest

---

*Sonder I. (2014), *May be solved by the construction of “garden cities”: German-Jewish literary proposals on garden cities in Erets Israel*, Manchester & New York, Manchester University Press.*
actors in their homeland of England in the field, and they brought with them few of the most fundamental concepts of town planning at the time.

The first to arrive to the Palestinian mandatory land was Sir Patrick Geddes; he was originally invited by the Zionist organization to propose a plan to the new Jewish university in Jerusalem, and later on to the development of Jerusalem outside the old city walls. He ended up receiving various commissions for the Zionist organization, as well as for the British mandate government between the years 1919-1925, but his most significant and known work was undoubtedly the master plan and report he provided for the development of the new and first Hebrew city – Tel-Aviv along the Mediterranean coast.

The second Englishman to land on mandatory Palestine was Sir Patrick Abercrombie, who in 1930 commissioned by the "Bayside Land Corporation" and the "Jewish National Fund", in co-operation with Clifford Holiday (a British architect and town planner that was based in Palestine between 1922-1935) to propose a plan for the Haifa Bay area and the urban expansion of the city.

The whole notion of modern town planning had arrived to the eastern Mediterranean coast with the visits of these two pioneering scholars - planners. They brought with them a spirit of reform and a well drafted doctrine of what urban planning should deal with. These moments in the history of planning are considered to be the foundation of the whole discipline, and can be retrospectively visited and rethink as almost pure preliminary exercises of drafted embodiments for modern urban planning concepts.


Garden city prototype and its "Mediterranean mutation"

"Passing out the Crystal Palace on our way to the outer ring of the town, we cross Fifth Avenue – lined, as are all the roads of the town, with trees - fronting which, and looking on the Crystal Place, we find a ring of very excellently built houses, each standing in its own ample grounds; and as we continue our walk we observe that the houses are for the most part built either in concentric rings, facing the various avenues (as the circular roads are termed), or fronting the boulevards and roads which all converge at the centre of the town."  

Ebenezer Howard - Garden Cities of To-Morrow (1902)

"Thousands of white villas gleamed out of luxuriant green gardens. All the way from Acco to Mount Carmel stretched what seemed to be one great park. The mountain itself, also, was crowned with beautiful structures... A magnificent city had been built beside the sapphire blue Mediterranean. The magnificent stone dames showed the harbor for what it was: the safest and the most convenient port in the eastern Mediterranean."

Theodor Herzl - Old new land (1902)

Two descriptive small paragraphs from the same year in the beginning of the 20th century illustrates a pair of utopian urban layouts, and basically abstract one of the most extensive and prominent stories of modern urban planning and the roaming qualities of utopian urban schemes. The first quote represent Ebenezer Howard's image of the physical embodiment of his utopian social experiment. It is presented to the reader of Howard's canonical book - Garden Cities of to-morrow immediately at the beginning of the first chapter declaring at once that this utopia has a clear concrete measurable and calculated appearance. Following that description the reader is provided with exact detailed figures regarding population, density and area of the future city.

The second paragraph is from Theodore Herzl's utopian novel - Altneuland (Old new land in German). A delirious journey of a young despondent European Jewish intellectual that decides to join a solitude travel to the pacific. He visits Palestine in two separate occasions with 20 years isolation in a pacific island in between. During the second visit he encounter with the realization of a new Jewish society in Palestine. He finds the Mediterranean version of Ebenezer Howard garden city adjacent to the Mediterranean Sea in the Haifa bay at the foot of Mount Carmel.

Reading these tow citations one after the other reveals at once an inevitable and ingrained mechanism that accompanies planning, and perhaps any social ideology in a global prospect. We distinguish immediately the prototype and its variation, or the origin and its mutation. Like every situation of this kind we can also realize the similarities and the deviations between the two poles of that process, and to comprehend the nature of this transformation.

---

13 Sonder I. (2014) May be solved by the construction of "garden cities": German-Jewish literary proposals on garden cities in Erets Israel, Manchester & New York, Manchester University Press.
Prototype

If we are looking for a prototype in the sense of a product preliminary model, an alpha version of the garden city invention, then Letchworth Garden City would be probably our detection - The first Garden city that was built in 1903 about 55 km away from London, following Howard’s book as its conceptual and diagrammatic blueprint. But if we wish to defined the Garden city prototype as an idea, as an urban utopian concept that had drifted the world at the begging of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and that wished (and to a great extent probably succeeded) to reveres and shuffle the relations between rural and urban living patterns, then we are looking for a more complex essence which the physical place Letchworth certainly function as an integrated part of, but does not reveal the whole aspects of this extensive concept.

In the introduction to the 1946 edition of Howard's book "Garden cities of To-Morrow, its editor F. J. Osborn comments that:

"The history of the book and it effects is full of paradoaxes. It endowed all modern languages with a new term (Garden City, Cite’-Jardin, Gartenstadt, Ciudad-Jardin, Tuinstad), and thought this term was given a most precise meaning by Howard, everywhere it has been used persistently in a sense entirely different from, indeed opposed to, the author’s definition.

Again the book holds a unique place in town planning literature, is cited in all planning bibliographies, stands on the shelves of the more important libraries, and is alluded to in most books on planning; yet most of the popular writers on planning do not seem to have read it – or if they have read it, to remember what it says."

Indeed it seems that the garden city movement, or more importantly the garden city concept, the invention, the social experiment that it conveyed to the world, is treated today more as an introduction episode to modern planning. I remember clearly being introduced to it as a first year architecture student in the classes on Modern architecture history, it was dealt with at the first session along with other significant

occurrences (such as arts and crafts movement, the crystal palace, Eifel tower and so on), as a bed that had provided what was to come after; the very cores and founders of modern architecture: Le Corbusier, Bauhaus, CIAM, and so on. This treatment is of course in contrast to the undisputable extensive impact of the garden city invention on so many aspects of our lives even today. It is hard to think of any other planning concept that had managed to touch in the same manner the very core of social existence and the configuration of urban environments all over the world. In a course of more or less 100 years, garden city became an idea so rapidly embraced and promoted to a level of an accepted default layout of modern planning, and then condemned later, as the very source of the agreed disastrous phenomena of urban sprawl!

What construct this powerful notion of garden city? What are its original components that as was told before were so misunderstood and twisted by planners all over the world? Understanding these conceptual origins could surely tell us something regarding the many versions that was developed to it worldwide and more specifically to our matter, in the land of Palestine at the beginning of the 20th century.

We can basically divide the conceptual package of the garden city idea into two main vectors that together made this vision so powerful and influential. It seems that one of its most potent features was the combination between a simple well drafted social theory and a series of practical operations that were meant to activate the utopian vision and to implement it in reality. The theoretical side of the garden city equation is rooted in the utopian tradition and echo the classical concept of the ideal city, but at the same time it is full of criticism toward the urban condition of its time and its social implications. We are therefore confronted with a rhetorical ideology that combines directly the urban and the social! That plays with models of utopian urban layouts along with social theories that are inspired by early socialism, perhaps even anarchism.

The practical side of Howard’s project is reveled more in the way he sought to promote his utopia, and to direct it towards realization. It also uses bourgeois and capitalistic instruments such as privet land purchase and capital rising in order to do so. The practical nature of Howard’s garden city enterprise exists in all of it layers and details, from the textual publication of the idea to a constant determination toward its physical realization following the foundation of a worldwide Garden City Associations.

Both of these fundamental aspects that basically defines the garden city movement as an activist utopia are present simultaneously at all stages and components of Howards notion and constantly operating and contributing to the clarity and communicatively manifestation of its massage. This mixture is mostly dominant in what was probably the first component of the garden city idea that was released to the public – the well known book “Garden cities of To-morrow”, originally published in 1898 under the title "To-morrow: a peaceful path to real reform".15

---

A book some diagrams and a movement

It is maybe one of the thinnest books ever been published in the fields of urban planning or social studies, but it contains an essence of a fully thought and calculated social reform. Throughout this text in the size of a pocket book or a travel guide, Howard delivers a didactical, practical and operational concept for a social reform that set to stop the densification of the industrial city and the creation of poor urban living environments; the tenets housing or slums as they were called in England at the time. The idea is delivered in a direct simple and straightforward manner, barely using any kind of references or others academic and scientific forms of textual verbalizations. It’s simple and direct language revel at once the concept and its applications and functions, the social ideology and the means to accomplish it in reality right away! The sensation that is delivered to the reader is that Howard’s book is basically more a text guide to a social reform than any other kind of philosophical or historical research. As the reading is progressed it is becoming more obvious that the aim of the book is to prepare a social experiment, and maybe even to persuade the reader to join it and to participate. 5 diagrams accompany the short text and provide a graphical explanation in any level and scale where this social experiment should take place, from the solution to the extensive demographical and social conflict between country and city (the famous three magnets), to the general suggestion of a preferable urban layout that the physical new entity to be established should follow. All of the diagrams are presented along with a specific notice: "A diagram only. Plan must depend upon site selected", Howard is simply telling us – Do not try this at home... and he is probably well aware to the many variations that might appear once the prototype will be released.

A social experiment

More than anything, Howard treated his idea as an invention and therefore, as was already mentioned, the book is the laboratory chart that describes the social experiment for the testing of that invention in reality. Perhaps the two most ambitious and fundamental factors that served as the practical and ideological core of the social experiment were:

1- The idea of massive voluntary migration.
2- The concept of town and country marriage.

Out of these two ideological foundations all the rest of the experiment stages and elements were derived, and probably the real powerful and interesting part of that social experiment lies actually more in its detailed and practical components rather than in its big aspirations. The call for an ambitious demographic and social transformation such as a voluntary migration from the existed cities to the new sites of the future garden cities leaned on the recognition that the only solution or remedy to the poor current situation of European cities will not be found within the existed city itself. It calls for a fresh new start on a new land outside the city, and one of its final intentions is no other then to solve the industrial city congestion, density and sanitation problems by slowly dilute it demographically till it will finally stabilized. The specific site selection was

---

deliberately chosen in order to accomplish the extensive migration movement, and to make it more efficient and feasible. Instead of an endless concentric extension of one big metropolitan urban center, a net of new garden cities will be drafted considering the distances between one to another and between each one and the central city according to travel durations in public rail oriented transportation. The creation of this cities cluster, as Howard called them, was the exact mechanism that was supposed to generate the motivation for the voluntary migration outside the old city and in the same time the regulator feature that will provide the garden city itself from becoming too dense and losing its desirable character\(^{17}\). Each city was to be distanced 10Km from the central city and some 16Km from one another. This metropolitan deconstruction immediately dictated its spatial dimensions according to its period means of transportation, and arranged at once a whole territorial organization.

The idea of town and country marriage already deals with the new town itself and its nature than with the problems of the old city. It was designed to create a contrast image of the industrial city on a new site, in which all the illnesses of the old cities are to be converted and repaired: congestion and poor living condition will be replaced with well calculated density rates and sufficient space to aloud modern town planning and fresh urban layouts, bad sanitation will be substituted with closeness to nature, extensive privet and public green spaces and lots of air and light to each dwelling unit, social alienation and selfishness will be transformed to a form of cooperative economical mechanism and strong sense of community, traffic congestion that leads to economical time waste and disconnection between working zones to living areas, will be avoided by the sustainable, self-sufficient economical organization of the new city that will provide a verity of living, working and leisure facilities within the municipality area. The size of the new garden city was determined precisely in order to maintain a specific physical layout that will guarantee the development and the preservation of all the urban qualities that were listed above. A population of 30,000 inhabitants on an area of 6,000 acres (about 2,000 m\(^2\)), were the figures that Howard had defined in his book, and a significant area of rural green belt should surround the city and will separate one garden city from the other.

After outlining the schematic layout, and the basic components of the social experiment that the garden city idea was to conduct, it was time for the realization phase to march forward. This didn’t occur in a conventional liner process but rather as almost a simultaneous action. The garden city prototype in Letchworth had been established only few years after the publication of Howard's book, and a big portion of that text was dedicated precisely to provide a detailed prescription regarding the manners and means for the foundation of the first garden city enterprise.

---

A new town and a planner

The first point of detachment from Howard's original invention, and the moment when the garden city idea began to be interpreted by other actors occurred, naturally, when written ideas and theories began their transformation process to reality. From the schematic pure ideologies and diagrams that were expressed in Howards book, the conceptual packaged of the garden city notion had landed on the drawing board of Sir Raymond Unwin and Richard Barry Parker. They had planned the first two garden cities projects in Lerchworth and Welwyn and were practically the sculptures of the garden city physical prototype.

Out of the two planners Sir Raymond Unwin had come be most recognized and probably had more influence both on the implantation of the ideological rhetoric of Howard's idea and certainly on the formalization and appearance of the experiment first physical results. He was an enthusiast apprentice of the arts and crafts movement and worked side by side with one of its founding fathers William Morris. He therefore actualized the probably obvious association between garden city layout and the romantic image of arts and crafts movement houses.

Out of his many professional activities, two key documents should be noted here as most relevant to the transformation of garden city concept from idea to reality, and to the development of preliminary variations and interpretations to the original concept. In 1909 he published a book titled: "Town planning in practice - An introduction to the art of designing cities and suburbs". Almost 500 pages and 300 illustrations that contained as Unwin indicates: "some maps photographs and other material which I had collected during some years study and practice of what I have ventured to call the art of town planning". This extensive album of illustrations accompanied with simple technocratic textual inquires is rather an introduction (according to Unwin), to the ample subject of town planning. He covers all sorts of topics, always in a practical manner, from ideological observations regarding the role of urban planning in the age of massive urban extension, or the relation between beauty, civic art and civic life, to an examination of historical urban layouts and the "individuality of towns". As the book progress it gets more and more technical and specific and starts to deal with practical issues of town planning. He elaborates the way to conduct a city survey, how to treat urban centers, the various manners of integration of main roads, residential roads, plots arrangements, building placement, Bay laws planning, and many other issues. Eventually, the thick volume that Unwin had produced can be seen as an extensive global catalog for garden city establishment, a broad selection of numerous possible layouts and configuration for the realization of the garden city idea, a planning tool box for the modern urban planner.

Few years later, in 1912 another publication by Unwin is released, a small booklet called: "Nothing gained by overcrowding - How the garden city type of development may benefit both owner and occupier". Here Uniwin provides the garden city idea with

19 Unwin R. (1912), Nothing gained by overcrowding - How the garden city type of development may benefit both owner and occupier, P.S King & Son, Orchard House Westminster.
a professional economical and technical quality stamp, an engineering ideological warranty. As the title of this document implies, its content deals with the economical and practical advantages of the garden city idea as it was already embodied in varies designed physical layouts that began to repeat itself by the time Unwin wrote this essay. After calculating the amount of roads that had to be constructed in order to permit a more compressed layout of houses, Unwin demonstrate a mathematical flowchart that describes the well known system of row houses, not only as un healthy and with poor social values, but also as unprofitable economically. Already at the beginning of the paper he suggests that garden city planning principles and layout should be adopted also in places where a genuine new garden city cannot be established.\footnote{Unwin R. (1912), \textit{Nothing gained by overcrowding - How the garden city type of development may benefit both owner and occupier}, P.S King & Son, Orchard House Westminster, p.2.} He claims that if a city wishes to extend beyond the fixed 30,000 inhabitants that were dictated by Howard's original idea, it can do so by an integration of a new urban layout - the garden city suburb. Unwin basically liberate here the garden city concept from its ideological context and turns it to an independent urban layout that can be applied to other situations, a copy paste operation long before the digital era! He also ties the advantages of this layout to the inevitable need of roads construction, and by that not only changes dramatically the reliance of Howard's concept on rail oriented transportation but also make the so recognizable and criticized association between the garden city layout and the use of the privat car.

Even previous to the publication of the two documents that were mentioned above, in 1906, Unwin along with his associate Barry Parker were assigned by Samuel & Henrietta Barnett for the preparation of the Hampstead Garden Suburb master plan; A stretch of urban layout t that imitate the garden city physical configuration and appearance but didn’t actually followed its ideological and social principals, especially the idea of a self sufficient system that contains all life aspects within its realm.

By the time the garden city concept had received it's designed and planned physical components there was already a sever distortion and alienation from the original idea. The first planned product of the garden city idea had arrived also with thick hints regarding what can become of it in the future and what might be the immediate possible mutations that will twist its original DNA. Although Raymond Unwin is considered as one of the most enthusiastic supporters of Howard’s ideas, he was also one of its first modifiers! His most acute interpretations to the garden city concept were certainly in the application of designed layouts that he had provided to the general schemes of Howards concept, but also and maybe even more importantly the liberation of this layout from its original callous ideological frame and the extension of the range of possible applications where the "garden city layout" (not the idea) can be adopted.
Mediterranean Mutation

Still before "Garden city" was known to the world as the utopian social reform that Ebenezer Howard had drafted, the phrase was already in use merely as a description for some sort of relation between a city and any kind of green open space (either parks and gardens inside the urban sequence or rich natural environment outside the city)\(^{21}\). Preliminary association between Zionism and the garden city term occurred probably on that general basis. Perhaps the most famous use of the garden city term in that sense was by no other then Theodor Herzl himself in his preliminary writing about the Jewish problem and its applicable solution in Palestine. Already in 1896 he began to "play" with the possibilities of urban layouts and their relation to nature and green open spaces (in one of his diaries he actually flounder whether to "build cities in forest clearings...or plant trees between the houses")\(^{22}\). But soon enough the link between the two ideological and social notions became more and more practical and tight, and the Zionist use of garden city principals turned out to be further literal and identical to Howard’s ideas. This association aimed mostly towards the image of a new urban essence, with better values of sanitary and life quality that were engraved in the garden city terminology and provided also a pure statement of a new start and a clear detachment from the old urban world. It was the need for a plain sharp declaration that the fulfillment of the Zionist ideology should follow an ordinate planed process according to a fresh, up to date social, economical and urban concepts.

During the first two decades of the 20\(^{th}\) century significant efforts to draft, formulate and to plan the practical phase of the Zionist idea were promoted in varies channels. At that time, Howard’s social experiment was already a well known concept, and the garden city idea received great attention worldwide. Zionist endeavors towards the verbalization and formulation of Jewish urban layouts in Palestine were drown up and published mostly in Germany and were influence greatly by the German Garden City Society, who’s several of its funders and members were Jewish figures that also participated in Zionists organizations.\(^{23}\) Throughout several published documents that were edited in Germany at that time, numerous attempts to elaborate the garden city Palestinian version can be traced. It had received all sorts of dimension and configurations, from a small inland settlement of 2,000 inhabitants that is constantly growing by receiving new immigrants in an unprecedented rate of 100 citizens per month, to a huge 200,000 hectares costal urban stretch in which, according to its author - Wilhelm Stiassny: "there is no house without a garden, no street without stands of trees"\(^{24}\). These Palestinian garden cities programs were accompanied as well with illustrated schemes and diagrams, some of which practically were a duplicated


\(^{22}\) Sonder I. (2014) May be solved by the construction of “garden cities”: German-Jewish literary proposals on garden cities in Erets Israel, Manchester & New York, Manchester University Press, p.125.

\(^{23}\) Fascinating description about these early Zionist and their association to the garden city concept can be found in: Sonder I. (2014) May be solved by the construction of “garden cities”: German-Jewish literary proposals on garden cities in Erets Israel, Manchester & New York, Manchester University Press, pp.123-143.

\(^{24}\) Sonder I. (2014) May be solved by the construction of “garden cities”: German-Jewish literary proposals on garden cities in Erets Israel, Manchester & New York, Manchester University Press, p.131.
version of the diagrams that Howard had published in his book, and others were more an attempt to demonstrate how a Mediterranean garden city layout would look like.

Going back to the two citations at the beginning of this chapter it is relatively evident that Zionist venture towards practical fulfillment and physical establishment in Palestine was totally engaged and motivated by the most fundamental components of the very pure concept that Ebenezer Howard had generated. Particularly appealing to both Zionist thinkers’ leaders and planners were the two ideological cores that were mentioned earlier and served as Howard’s social experiment key mainstays. The idea of a voluntary migration was almost a twin concept for both ideological and social movements and a fundamental necessity in both theoretical and practical manifests. Additionally, the idea of town and country marriage appealed to Zionist promoters mostly for its qualities as an application for a total reformation of society. Like Howard’s garden cities that had served eventually as a practical tool for an extensive social reform, Zionism was to transform completely Jewish social patterns in Diaspora and to reconstruct a new social organization in the new land.

Further than these two ideological and practical main concepts, Howard's garden city also provided to the Zionist movement a coherent critical and already tested original outline of a new urban utopia. It had initiated a new physical layout that had offered a rather proven answer to the inherent critical aspect towards the industrial city, and to the most ill and defective phenomena in both urban and rural existence in Europe at the time. This compact clear idea that was already translated to a drawn layouts and built models had received a status of an almost default urban scheme that had began to spared in Europe and to other parts of the world and was transmitting a massage of modern social reform and a written and planed prescription for the integration of that reform in reality.

Thus, an idea of a new urban existence that was born and developed in Europe was colonized to be planted at the other side of the Mediterranean cost, on a so-called new ground. It was an historical coincidence (or opportunity?) That this concept along with its urban planning supportive ideas had been handed over to the hands of a society that was formulating a rhetorical physical bond to the land they had come to settle. The garden city like other urban concepts and physical configurations of European utopias had travelled the world through the grate vessels of colonialism. In the case of Palestine and the future Jewish state, the European idea of new urban life, had crossed the Mediterranean with the help of the Zionist movement back wind, but an inherent paradox needs to be mentioned! The basic circumstances that had generated the garden city in Europe were far from being exist in the Palestinian colony!

A utopia that was constructed as a contrast to the European industrial city, was to be implemented in the eastern Mediterranean shore before the industrial era had even arrived. The horrible European industrial city was nowhere to be found! It seems as the solution had preceded the problem...

Furthermore, even the classical, traditional rural condition that was the second fundamental component in Howard’s core concept of town and country marriage had existed in Palestine almost exclusively in the form of the Arab village. Jewish agricultural
settlements were at their preliminary raw phase of development that was composed mostly of varies small experimental beginnings.

And, finely, the obvious differences in the basic axiomatic geographical and climatic conditions were also in a severe distinction or even contradiction to those that served as the immediate context for garden city realization in Europe. Instead of a territorial configuration of cities cluster that was to be developed from an existed urban center toward a deconstructed form of metropolitan arrangement, a deliberation between sporadic inland shimmers of small urban sprouts, or a huge strip of continuous urban costal layout along the Mediterranean shore had to be considered. The radial metropolitan model that was implied from Howard's social cities cluster, simply cannot take place in a linear costal territory. Regarding the climatic colossal differentiations, needless to say that the vast amount of open public and privet spaces that was an integral part of the garden city layout in Europe, and was its declared celebrated advantage and most attractive image, had to be treated in the Mediterranean climate more as a maintenance problem. The charming appearance of lush and fertile green gardens could not have been transplanted to the new environment along with its generator urban layout, simply because there was not enough water to insure their survival in the hot sunny Mediterranean climate.

These basic fundamental paradoxes will have had extensive consequences on the planted seeds of the garden city idea in Israel, and especially on the two major coastal urban developments that were to become the biggest metropolitan areas on Israel's Mediterranean coast. It immediately raises questions regarding modes of mediation and the process of transformation from an original concept to its application in a totally new context.

How do you bridge the gap between the dens populated and congested industrial European city, to the small Mediterranean urban settlement that was developing slowly during the ottoman rolling, and was the best reference the land of Palestine was able to offer? How do you reinvent a thousand years of rural and agricultural tradition and a vernacular country layout in a society that needs to be thought from scratch the whole notion of agricultural and rural practice? And how do you reshape the European garden into a Mediterranean open space? These fundamental questions are exactly the issues that the falling pages of this paper are trying to deal with.

It seems like, as had happened in many other places around the world; that the transformation of the garden city prototype to a new context had to be charged with series procedures of adaptations and modifications. Initially, as was already mentioned the prototype itself had received several forms of adjustments and revisions that had provided it with a formulated practical and calculated layout of urban blueprint that could have been duplicated and planted in a more quicker and effective manner. But also, the expected clash of the original concept ingredients with its new context reality in Palestine was to produce its own process of alteration and modification. Indeed the most common way in which garden city elements were used in the beginning of the 20th century by the Zionist organization in Palestine, was by the integration of several garden suburbs layouts into few of the major urban centers that had existed at the time. This action demonstrated even a further recede from Howard's original concept by
detaching the garden city urban layout from its European central metropolitan center, and integrating it to a much small and totally different urban basis.

The consequences of this implementation in the two coastal urban settlements that were chosen as case studies in this paper might seem extremely unpredictable and surprising, and can demonstrate a fascinating sequence regarding the transformation of the garden city concept from the preliminary origin to one of its most extreme variants, from the conceptual prototype to its Mediterranean mutation.

Comparing the incomparable

Today, for an Israeli mind, the comparison proposed in this paper probably won't make any sense, or could not even be considered. The reason for this might simply lie in the tremendous clear gap existed between the function of these two major costal urban entities, and more so in the way they both grasped in the Israeli collective public perception. Each one of the cases function differently as a metropolitan area, and for that maybe, also plays a different role in the national urban hierarchy regarding cultural and social image. Tel Aviv is the undisputable metropolitan center of the whole country, has functioned almost since the most preliminary steps of the pre state establishment decades as a strong social and cultural focal point, a position that only seems to get stronger and firmer. Today it is a famous notion in Israel that the city of Tel-Aviv, the hart of Israel's biggest coastal metropolitan area is occasionally addressed in public culture and national political discussion as a state of itself - the Tel Aviv state.25 This has to do with its strong social identity and pride that had maybe developed from its evident central geographical location, but also for many other demographical and social processes. This evident centrality and social dominance had coined Tel-Aviv as a place that on one hand had vacuumed a significant cumulative historical sequence of major social, political and cultural events (such as important public manifestations for instance), but on the other hand is consider as an haughtiness alienated universe where a mix of elite society and middle class people live their lives, detached and remote from the rest of the country tough and complicated reality.

All of this represents almost the contrast of Haifa metropolitan area that is geographically located in the northern section of the Mediterranean coast and was never approached in any similar way as a national center. It had receive other titles and appellations on local form of speech; the most prominent one is the "read city" referring to its strong demographical representation of working class population and its strong dominance of the Israeli labor party in the city for many years.26 Another more

25 Allweil Y. (?), Anarchist City? Geddes’s 1925 Anarchist Housing-Based Plan for Tel Aviv and the 2011 Housing Protests, Technion IIT, published in Academia.edu: https://technion.academia.edu/YaelAllweil
recent label for Haifa titles it as a "mix city" refers to its nature as a city with a significant demographical blend of Jewish and Arab people.

Perhaps, even more daring and unconventional is the compression between the two preliminary expansion phases of these metropolitan coastal centers. Here the differences demonstrate even a greater gap, as the first master plan for Tel Aviv - known as Geddes plan, although started as a garden village suburb expansion project to the Mediterranean settlement of Jaffa, had become eventually the most central and populated urban fabric of Israel – some say the only true city in the country. Conversely, the Haifa expansion project, planned by Sir Patrick Abercrombie is strongly fixed in the collective public opinion as Israel's ultimate sleeping suburb. A metropolitan rear, where working class families are gathered to establish daily routines dictated from the position of their urban component in the whole metropolitan system.

One way to further understand the contradictory status of these two urban fragments is to explain the meanings of both of the case studies names. Tel Aviv is named after the famous novel of Theodor Herzl, a tremendously important Jewish Zionist leader and thinker, consider collectively as the Jewish state prophet. His utopian novel – *Altneuland*; Old new land in German (that was cited as well in the previous chapter), was translated to Hebrew and then granted to the first Hebrew city. It is a name that expresses a spirit of urban regeneration that was so elemental to Tel Aviv founders. An ambition to create an innovative urban form in relation to its existing context. This title, although given to the city before the expansion project analyzed here, and was also a substitute of the original name "Ahuzat Bait" (meaning "Home-Estate" in Hebrew - the name of the first settlement established in 1909 that later on developed to become the Tel Aviv township), had soon took over and swallow under its dominance all the many small urban developments that had progressed outside Jaffa since the mid 19th century, and undoubtedly signify today as well as through Israel's short history an undisputed social cultural and economical center. It is also a name that represents Tel Aviv glorified myth as a city that was born from the sands, a fresh modern urban germ that grew up to become a model for the country Jewish urbanity....

The Haifa preliminary expansion project that was firstly drafted and promoted by Patrick Abercrombie 1936’s master plan to the Haifa bay area had created a general urban area that was later divided to several sub-urban fragments. Each segment was eventually a small township; each township was named in Hebrew "Kiryat Avoda" meaning "working borough" all of these townships together are collectively called "Krayot". It is like a common urban nickname that eventually generalizes an important key urban fragment of the Haifa metropolitan system as a place that houses the working class population.

Another way to better apprehend the significant differences between the two case studies social and cultural positions in the Israeli collective cognition, can be gained by a
short introducing with two Israelis rock bands from the 80s that became popular and successful during the same years. One band was a group of young friends that served together in the IDF (Israeli defense forces) radio station – located in Tel Aviv. The group base and initial activity was therefore in this city, and they called themselves "Tislam" an Arab word that means excellent or way to go. Their most known hit was called "Loud Radio" and the chores went simply: "My baby loves loud radio, loud radio, radio show". All of their songs were basically dealing with young people issues in the big city, romantic relationships, or "Smokin’ in the boy’s room"; another hit of the group that describes how they used to hide in school in order to smoke cigarettes together.

The second band was a group of youngsters from the "Krayot", they called themselves "Benzin" – Hebrew word for "Gasoline". The name of their first album was "Night shift" as also the title of one of the albums most known hits. This song chores went like this: My father starts his night shift, mother surly had long gone to sleep, they don’t know but tonight I’m driving, driving away, far away from here".

It doesn’t take much to realize the totally different worlds that are expressed by these two popular music examples. Without resorting to any kind of musical judgment, it is obvious that in Tel Aviv youngsters were living in an urban culture of light escapism, that had provided them the most casual materials to work with in order to write songs. In the "Krayot" an entirely different set of issues served as a direct subject to the band’s lyrics, an urban environment and life routine that engender a grey reality of distress and that evidently urges an unstoppable need for a truly act of escape.

It is precisely that clear public cognitive gap between the two cases that makes them such a fascinating subject for comparison. A short period of only 11 years separates between Sir Patrick Geddes’s 1925s plan for Tel Aviv, and Sir Patrick Abercrombie plan for Haifa bay, yet today’s evident outcomes of these two preliminary urban steps are so drastically different. Setting aside all other obvious conditions that surely affected and contributed to the present urban situation; such as unequal distribution between veteran population and new immigrants that reinforced economical and social gaps, this paper will seize the opportunity to analyze both cases preliminary planning schemes and to try and extract clues of drawn urban concepts that represented actually an unconscious, but crucial shift in urban planning ideologies.
Metropolitan bipolar syndrome on the Mediterranean shore

Two cities on the Israeli Mediterranean coast that were progressing in a relatively parallel course - demonstrate today eventually a reverse ratio towards the metropolitan condition.

Tel-Aviv – the undisputed Israeli urban center that by now is treated unease as the phenomena that might occupy the majority of the small country territory, and turn Israel into a "city-state"\(^27\), was initially launched as a garden-city suburb. The densest urban area in the country was never meant to deal with any type of congestion or density.

Haifa was envisioned by the first planner of the new Jewish state Arch. Arieh Sharon\(^28\) as the state "international city", that will serve as its national gate to the Mediterranean Sea (in contrary to Tel Aviv that was described by Sharon as the "Israeli city")\(^29\), is today...

\(^27\) See Prof. Prof. Efrat Z. lecture in the Shenkar "The Israeli city conference" where he further demonstrate this possible inversion relations between state and city, that is probably much notable in a country as small as Israel: http://efrat-kowalsky.co.il/files/city-state.pdf (text in Hebrew).

\(^28\) Arieh Sharon was a Jewish Israeli architect that immigrated from Europe in 1920 in order to join to a new Kibbutz (an agricultural cooperative and communal settlement that was a fundamental operative part in Zionist ideology). He later on went to study architecture at the Bauhaus Dessau, came back to Palestine and founded a successful architecture practice. At the beginning of the 50s he was invited by the first Israeli prime minister David Ben-Gurion in order to establish the new states Government Planning Department, and to draft the first national outline plan. He is mentioned generally as the first state architect or the state planner, as his plan had a crucial role in shaping and defining the economic, social and physical structure of Israel in its first years.

actually a fragmented urban mixture that is struggling to pick up its pieces and to become a coherent metropolitan area.

In a country that holds one of the shortest shore lines of the Mediterranean, no more than 100 Km between Tel Aviv and Haifa we can observe and describe these two poles of metropolitan configurations.

Tel Aviv that started as a pure well drafted idea that was laid down on what was thought at the time as a "Tabula Rasa" tray of dunes and swamps, is constantly sprawling, squeezed and congested aiming to swallow the whole country. Haifa was initiated from the beginning as an explosion of strategies along with global and international interests and is obliged to confront with present consequences of its initial colonial planning decisions, and to define what kind of urban environment it wants to be.

Fig. 7 – Haifa and Tel Aviv on the Israeli Mediterranean coast
But back in the end of the 19th century the areas that today contain these two metropolitan configurations could be seen, apart from significant differences of geographical conditions, as a continuance coastal sequence that shapes the eastern shore of the Mediterranean Sea. A map from 1880 that delivers the state of the built environment which occupies the Mediterranean coast reveals an extensive apparent vacancy that surrounds the compact small old port cities. The opportunities for urban development seem totally open and possible to be extended in many directions, but a closer look disclose already the probable limitations. While Jaffa (Tel Aviv old city) is surrounded by agricultural plantations and old Haifa is limited by the proximity of the Carmel Mountain, both areas seems to be more likely to extend towards the north, along the dunes and sands of the Mediterranean coast.

Fig. 8-9 - Tel Aviv and Haifa Metropolitan area as it was in 1880 and current situation (in red line are the areas of first urban expansion phases)
On top of this apparent basic calm, low key geographical and urban distributions the new layers of innovative modern urban concepts, theories and models were to be planted. Each coastal area will be imagined as a certain version and translation of the European urban paradigm by three deferent agents that will transmit the theoretical world they had built or absorbed in Europe to the situation they had encountered in the mandatory territory of Palestine.
Fig. 9 - Tel Aviv and Haifa current metropolitan area - residential tissues.
Fig. 9 - Tel Aviv and Haifa current metropolitan area - open spaces distribution
Three European agents

From ideas, diagrams, urban planning concepts and social ideologies, the form of the two main urban settlements along the short Israeli coast of the Mediterranean, had to be realized through concrete plans and by actual planners. Instruments and figures which would serve as vessels of transition from the origins of the urban utopias and the place where they were initiated (Europe) to the new land where they to be absorbed.

Sir Patrick Geddes, Sir Patrick Abercrombie and Arc. Richard Kauffmann, are three planners that came across the position to suggest a possible urban development for the Israeli Mediterranean coastline, at the preliminary callow phase of its two major urban coastal centers. They all came from Europe and were engaged with the Zionist establishment in varies forms of association and duration. So when the time had come to initiate the development of what was to become the most stronger and important coastal urban centers on the Mediterranean shore, for the new mandatory imperial British regime, as well as for the Zionist establishment, it was the same historical opportunity to conduct an urban experiment on what seemed to be a sandy sterile "laboratory condition" tray of sand and dunes.

Among all participants in the formation of Israel's two major urban coastal centers, these three key figures stands out to be extremely interesting to examine especially regarding the timing of their involvement, that occurred at the first crucial actions of urban extension outside the original historic centers of the city. Understanding the position and the point of view of each one of them, can tell us allot about the roaming qualities of urban theories and concepts, as well as the way they are being adopted and transmitted differently and by different agents (planners or clients) all over the world. This is extremely relevant even today, as the profession of architecture and planning become much more moveable along with today's advanced means of communication. It raises questions regarding the everlasting "battle" between global visions of the architectural and urban planning disciplines to the local characters of cities, between the enthusiasm of architects all over the world to test, transfer and manipulate ideas around the globe, to the intimate and profound familiarity and cognizance of the project site and other local properties, that can be gained almost exclusively by local planners.

As both British planners Geddes and Abercrombie barely needs introduction, the Jewish German architect Richard Kauffmann is hardly known outside of Israel. All of the three were deeply influenced by the theories of the garden city movement and had planned projects according to this concept before admitting their proposals for the Israeli urban centers on the Mediterranean coast. But while Geddes and Abercrombie can be considered as theorists and ideological promoters of the garden city concept, and as well reputed (mostly together) as the pioneering founders of one of the first chapters of precursory theories in urban and regional planning, Richard Kauffmann is regarded much less as a theorist and more as a practitioner. Although he had strong opinions and criticism regarding planning in Palestine at his time, and he did published them mainly through newspapers and planning magazines\(^30\), he can be seen more as an implementer

\(^30\) - A broad and interesting collection of many of Richard Kauffmann writings works and publications can be found in a web site titled: Richard Kauffmann – Architect and Town Planner - a daughter’s perspective on his life and work.
of ideas that he believed in rather than a generator or a writer of theories and new concepts. Nevertheless at the period of time when these three planners had acted in Israel (roughly between 1920-1940), the idea of garden city was already rooted deeply in European planning paradigm, and all of the three planners that we are dealing with were to produce their own version of this idea according to their analysis of the site and their acquaintance with their client.

So – our task might be to investigate how seeds that contained a utopian European idea of a new city, had made the journey towards the eastern Mediterranean shore on "three different ships" and were intended to be planted and probably materialized on a new bed of sand. In order to do so we shall first make a theoretical division between the three versions of the same idea. And the most important figures to divide theoretically are with no doubt Geddes and Abercrombie, since history tends to classify them together to the same preliminary moment when the vocation of town and regional planning was initially drafted and promoted, as a coherent set of tools and planning operations that should be applied on the urban and regional scale\(^{31}\).

\[\text{PG} \quad \text{PA} \quad \text{RK}\]

1854 - 1932 \quad 1879 - 1957 \quad 1887 - 1958

Fig. 10 – The three European agents

http://richardkauffmann.com/wordpress/tag/town-planning

\(^{31}\) - About the tendency to unite under one title the theoretical work of Geddes and Abercrombie Michael Batty and Stephen Marshall are showing in their article: *The evolution of cities: Geddes, Abercrombie and the new physicalism*, how late criticism on the conventions of town planning was directed towards the work of them both at the same way. For example they describe how Jane Jacob - perhaps one of the strongest 20\(^{th}\) century opponents of modern urban planning, the garden cities movement and their built outcomes, saw Geddes and Abercrombie both responsible to the promotion and implementation of these planning conventions, while their ideas and theories actually differs a great deal. Batty M. Marshall S., 2009, *The evolution of cities: Geddes, Abercrombie and the new physicalism*, Town Planning Review, Volume 80, Issue 6, Liverpool University Press online.
"The survey first emerged into public view at the great Town Planning Exhibition of 1910 at Burlington House, and it is safe to say that the modern practice of planning in this country would have been a more elementary thing if it had not been for the Edinburgh room and all that implied. It was a torture chamber to those simple souls that had been ravished by the glorious perspectives or heartened by the healthy villages shown in other and ampler galleries. Within this den sat Geddes, a most unsettling person, Talking, Talking, Talking... about anything and everything"... "But if they chanced within the range of Geddes talk, henceforth nothing could medicine them to that weet sleep which yesterday they owed. There was something more in town planning then met the eye."

This way, Patrick Geddes's "Edinburgh room" in the "Town Planning Exhibition of 1910 at Burlington House was described by no other then one of his best-known followers, and incidentally our second figure of observation, Sir Patrick Abercrombie. It perhaps narrows down precisely the inherent differences of their personalities as well as their intellectual and spiritual background. It is possibly also one of the brightest evident to the moment of "Baton handover" between Geddes as a spiritual teacher and a founder of new wide field of research, to Abercrombie as a more practical and didactical promoter of the pragmatically applications that Geddes's life study and work had provided. Moreover, We might as well being introduces here to some kind of Abercrombie's summary regarding Geddes's massage, as if he had taken the duty to write a conclusion episode to Geddes's life work, to pack-up Geddes's extensive research and to provide something that can be easily understood and practically implemented.

"The survey before plan mantra" as described in Micahel Batty and Stephen Marshall article from 2009, is an appealing practical piece from Geddes's thinking that was adopted and promoted strongly by Abercrombie, the Liverpool School of civic design, and it's well known Town Planning Review journal. But of course Geddes's work contains and delivers much more than the survey before plan, (that seems quite a literal and basic concept by today's urban planning conventions), and Abercrombie vocation was not categorically a linear succession of his "Master" extensive field of study.

A deeper inquiry to each of these two figures written illustrated and built evidences, that we can examine today, reveille rather two entirely deferent (and sometime even contrasted) worlds.

Their basic scholar and academic background, to begin with, was significantly different! Geddes (which actually never acquired an academic degree) began his intellectual voyage at the botanical department of Edinburgh University, where he stayed one week before turning to his further known and by far extensive filed of research in natural sciences - biology and evolution. He was deeply interested and engaged in the theories of evolution that were freshly used and discussed in the world of science at the

---


time, and studied at Thomas H. Huxley's laboratory one of Sir Charles Darwin's best known successors.

Opinions differ regarding the outcome of an unfortunate incident during an expedition in Mexico in 1879, Geddes was forced to stay weeks in a dark room in order to avoid possible blindness. Whether he lost the ability to exert a microscope, or actually had experienced a spiritual aura, it was about that time when he left the laboratory and started to develop a much conceptual and extensive mode of thinking that began to approach the study of social and human existence. At the end of an almost two decades of long, daring, multi faces and - to a great extant self educated - intellectual voyage, he eventually establish such a wide field of knowledge that retrospective biographies had needed a whole sentence to tilted his occupations: Biologist, sociologist, botanist, geographer, urban planner, educator... to cite a few of them.

This apparent restless character of Geddes strive for learning was indeed a reverse course to that of the typical orthodox scientist of his time, and perhaps to the entire scholar system that was based more on structuralism as a method of gaining profound knowledge in a specific field rather than constantly extend research and study. Nevertheless, as the list of topics he was engaged with seems endless and variegated, it actually contained two fundamental main faces: the biology study of life - based on the concepts of genetics and evolution, and the social study of cities, urban environment, geography and maybe even economy.

Soon enough he began to produce further applications and illustrations to the scientific and social research he was developing, along with suggestive and innovative educational tools that were supposed to provide new means to generate knowledge and to spread it and implement it in reality. From the beginning he used special vocabulary to describe his ideas. Apart from the powerful and daring title of his book "cities in evolution" that immediately implies a commitment to describe and demonstrate the combination of tow extensive but rather new disciplines at his time, he also coined some new definitions to social and urban phenomenon he wished to explain, by inventing words, or metaphors to the phenomena. He practically dared Darwin's classic theory of evolution by proposing his own educated version to this biological mechanism, a wider and less technical approach that will better fit to social sciences and will strongly reduce the fundamental element of competition in Darwin's theory. In that sense he frequently used the term "Evolutionary ethics" implying that cities should be driven to conduct a great social transition that will occur through a cooperating evolutionary movement within society, rather from survival and


Another example is the word "Conurbation" that like other phrases from his "cities in evolution" is used to describe the present situation and uncontrolled expansion of the industrial city. Along with that linguistic originality, Geddes suggested as well, some further more practical and corporeal instruments in order to convey his massage. Diagrams, such as the famous "valley section", or the relations between town and nature scheme were elemental part of his intellectual activity. Outline drawings of supposed built complexes that will serve to enlighten and instruct all parts and classes of society. Layouts and charts that describe his suggestions for a "thinking machine", an "Index Museum" or a "national Institute of Geography", and even a built "Outlook Tower" in Edinburgh, and a roaming "Cities Exhibitions" that traveled with him all over the world. Without attempting to cover the whole scope of Geddes's rhetorical and illustrational arsenal, we can sense his fidgety ambition to collect and digest knowledge from wherever he can, and deliver an erudite and analyzes conclusion towards whoever is there to receive the massage.

Sir Patrick Abercrombie, on the other hand was educated exclusively as an architect. He almost inclusively engaged himself to the task of extending the profession of architecture in a way that a broader scope of subjects could be treated by, and subjected to the work of the architect-planner, a new professional title that Abercrombie had a great part in defining its purpose and intentions. That meant eventually establishing and promoting the discipline of town and regional planning in his homeland England, but accordantly in a more global sphere of influence. Unlike Geddes he spent most of his first academic years in Liverpool as a founder member and a professor at the university's School of Civic Design. He was the chief editor of the Town Planning Review, and wrote many of the issues articles as well.

His biography demonstrates a much linear course then the widespread multi edges activities of Geddes. Through his activity at the Town Planning Review, he managed to deliver a much clearer coherent and simple massage regarding what urban and regional planning should be dealing with. He was not really the elaborator of new ideas and concepts, as when he began his more influential activity on the field of urban planning, there were already a basic research and theoretical study produced by the pioneering generation of theorist researchers and planners (certainly Geddes will be one of the dominant figures in that list). But he was certainly the right person with his suitable ability to simplify and systemize the general massage of the new discipline in order to transform it toward practical and coherent concept.

In a quite initial stage of his career Abercrombie began to receive planning commissions some of them through competition winning proposals like his Dublin of the future project from 1913, or Doncaster (1920), East Kent coalfield and many more.

---


projects that whether completed or not, approved or remained on the drawing desk, they demonstrate an evident part in his career that allows him to constantly test the conventions and technocratic tools that he was busy formulating throw his theoretical and written articles in the town planning review.

Much of the conventions that Abercrombie and his colleges at the School of Civic Design in Liverpool and the Town Planning Institute (in which he was also a founding member) had formulated evolved from Geddes's broad thinking and ideological foundations. The critical notion towards the industrial city and its malicious and irrational development, the unsuitable human existence that was spreading and duplicating throw the inexorable extension of urban environment, received - in light of Geddes's work, a degree of almost a mathematical axiom, that hardly needs to be further verified. Furthermore, the idea of what planning should be all about, of the way cities should be approached and treated trough planning utensils, was at least rhetorically well planted in Geddes's massage, as we can acknowledge from Abercrombie's own definition for planning, which he express in his book "Town and country planning" from 1933":

"Town and country planning seeks to proffer a guiding hand to the trend of natural evolution as a result of careful study of the place itself, and its external relationships. The result is to be more than a piece of skillful engineering, or satisfactory hygiene or successful economics: it should be a social organism, and a work of art." 42

The intention to read the city as a "social organism" could be as well found in many of Geddes's students notebooks, but despite this short beautiful and catchy definition that Abercrombie provide, his deeds as a lead planner in England, already by the mid 1920s, as well as his educational and academic approach led to an deferent direction that departed from Geddes's original intentions.

Without getting any further into the specific biographies of Geddes and Abercrombie as key figures in the formularization of modern urban planning terminology, we can already get the apprehension regarding their fundamental differences of their ideological and theoretical world.

A no-professor that wanted to master everything compared to an 18 years old graduate architect that ruled the academy towards the formation and the amplification of the British urban planner duty. A holistic multi faces positive thinker, next to a didactical technocrat. A deeper examination of few key elements in each one of these two British planners' biographies along with some evident product from their planning legacies can teach us more about the different approaches they will bring to their planning commissions on the Mediterranean coast.

The Manifesto and the Manual

Perhaps the easiest way to perceive the divergence between the interior worlds of Geddes and Abercrombie, to grasp the disparity of their point of departure, their background and the massage each one of them was striving to convey, is to describe the content of the books that each one of them had published at a relatively early stage of their vocation.

"Historically treated, architecture has seemed too long but a description of buildings, like fossil shells and corals, past and dead. Yet as an evolutionary science it begins anew with the living and growing city reefs, as we have seen them in their growth overflowing whole plains, ascending innumerable valleys. In this synoptic vision we have yet had too little touch with the actual living polyps, yet their presence their essential activity, their vital needs, have been generalized indeed, but not forgotten."  

Patrick Geddes – Cities in Evolution 1915

In 1915, four years before his first arrival to mandatory Palestine Geddes had published one of his best known books - "Cities in Evolution". The title immediately implies the extensive canvas that Geddes was working on, and at the same time the very essence of his theoretical "life project" - Geddes is known as probably the first to combine the two worlds under one title. The book demonstrates a struggle to close a theoretical electric circle between the pure new brilliant invention of biology – the evolution of the species, and the possible solution to the social environmental and economical condition of the industrial city. In order to do so, Geddes actually post himself side by side to the author of the evolutionary idea - Sir Charles Darwin, and suggest a different interpretation to the subject - a further development to the definition of evolution that will be better qualified to be used in the fields of social study and urban planning. Geddes writes about both ample and immense subjects from many different aspects and suggests various possibilities of connections and relations between them; such as the idea revealed in the citation above to understand architecture and urban planning through a "synoptic vision" (also a term famously related to Geddes) as the very active matter that determine the evolutionary process of cities expansion, a physical written code that dictates the organism form of growth. And according to Geddes in order to intervene and affect this growth an action should be taken directly at the level where this "code" is generated. He therefore goes back and forth....

Although the book doesn’t fully clarify the way evolution is embodied in cities or the way urban planning and the social study of the modern city can use the evolution mechanism, there is an unquestionable echo of holistic, extensive, enthusiastic approach to the social challenge that the city is presenting, and the uncompromised commitment of its author to engage himself with the search for a new ways to develop and create the contemporary urban environment.

Apart from the manifested written concepts that Geddes and Abercrombie had produced a significant distinction of conceptual and theoretical thought can be traced through their graphic illustrations and diagrams that were made to transmit their message. From a simple observation of two diagrams that were drafted by these two planners we can learn more about the differences in their approaches to urban planning.

One of Geddes’s most known diagrams is the Valley Section, a regional section influenced mostly by geography research of the French sociologist Le Play. Here Geddes elaborated an analysis of a traditional regional function as a relation between geography and human activity or in Geddes’s words between place and work. It is a simple inspiring diagram accompanied by short essay in which Geddes explains the different types of occupations in relation to their geographical locations; from the miner and hunter in the mountains to the shepherd, farmers and fisherman in the plains and seashores. Geddes’s claim that any planning of urban or regional complex has to trace these traditional relations in order to better understand the most fundamental social and geographical structures of the planned context. If we compare the Valley Section diagram to one of Abercrombie’s known diagrams: “The Towns Silhouettes”, a rather distinctive difference between two approaches can be traced down. Abercrombie’s Silhouettes deals with the relations between density, and the location of uses in few

---

46 A further reference to the valley section and its anarchistic nature can be read in page 64 of this paper on a chapter titled: An Anarchistic urban structure
key urban layouts of its time. It directly portrayed the planed city, the physical outcome of the planning action, straightforward and almost without any subtext.\textsuperscript{47}

The most prominent difference between these two graphical instructive tools can be seen as the contrast between the theoretical and maybe even philosophical analysis method of Geddes regarding the planed environment, to the more pragmatically didactic approach of Abercrombie. One seeks to study carefully the territorial context and to use its basic geographical structure in order to inspire and extend its planning possibilities; the other is proposing a categorical set of suggested layouts that deals directly with the physical built new urban environment. One is searching to plan from the bottom; using basic contextual elements from the planed environment, the other seek to provide planners an assortment of possible layouts that will arrange the future city according to mathematical relations of built masses and geometrical distributions of uses.

\textsuperscript{47} This diagram along with additional explanations can be found in Abercrombie’s book: Town and Country Planning: Abercrombie P. (1933), \textit{Town and country planning}, Early urban planning 1870-1940, edited by Richard Le Gates and Fredric Stout, New York, Routledge/Thoemmes Press, Pg. 115.
A double agent

If Geddes and Abercrombie are to be viewed as external agents, that had brought with them an utopian conceptual correction to the European congested and polluted industrial city and a new pioneering vision regarding the role of urban planning, Arc. Richard Kauffmann, can be described for that matter as a double agent, as the only one of the three that bore within his inner world and life experience the deeper sense of combination between the basic factors of the equation, between new ideas of modern town planning, and a personal accession and later on even complete affiliation to Zionist ideology and activity.

He was a jewfish German educated architect, graduated in 1912 at Munich under the teaching of Theodor Fischer; also known as the teacher of a whole generation of glorified modern masters including: Bruno Taut, Ernst May, Erich Mendelssohn, and also two significant forefathers of modern architecture and planning; Walter Gropius and Le Corbusier (who actually attended several classes only and as we know never really graduated). However, the atmosphere in which Kauffman was educated and later on made his first professional steps was well rooted in German modern planning conventions in which Ebenezer Howard garden city served as a major ideological and practical agenda. Kauffmann absorbs the garden city idea along with its developed planning components and applications in an already "second hand" manner after being transformed from England to Germany. Being, as reported at several documentaries, a brilliant and talented young graduated architect Kauffmann spent his formative years as a planner practicing and testing modern planning theories and producing several urban layouts of neighborhoods and worker houses complexes in Europe. He also won few competition awards among which a proposal for a new garden city layout near Kharkov Ukraine.

At a point of what seems to be a significant carrier peak for a young architect, after being chosen out of 50 candidates to join a major architectural firm in Norway and after already establishes his position there by wining several more awards for planning proposal, he makes a sharp cut in his professional course and decides to comply a request from Dr. Arthur Ruppin (Director of the settlement department of the Zionist Executive) to open a practice in Palestine that will engaged with the fundamental mission of providing a suitable design for the constantly forming organization of new Jewish settlements in Palestine.

It was that move at that particular biographical point of his life that makes Kauffmann life journey and planning legacy so relevant to our matter. Not only that he was able at the age of 37 to literally transmit within his own being the European modern planning ideology to a new contextual platform in Palestine, more importantly he was parallel and simultaneously engaged in both social and ideological movements – modern planning notions and Jewish practical Zionism activity.

---

During the following 38 years of his life and career in his new becoming homeland, Kauffmann will be totally engaged in a life project, that perhaps can be suitably portrayed by using Walter Binyamin’s description for the task of the translator; as he inspiringly claims that translation isn’t merely repeating the original in a new language but rather recreating its essence, reconstructing the pure message of the its genuine poetics in a new lingual formula.\(^49\)

The modern planning conventions that Kauffmann had managed to be part of its preliminary formation phases in Europe; both as a student and as well as a professional, had to be deconstructed to its elementary components and later on built up again in a new context and to new requirements.

All the gaps, paradoxes and distortions between the European contexts that had engendered both the garden city social experiment with its manifested urban layout and the early town planning study accompanied by its sets of conventions and Insights, had to be filled in by Kauffmann, as he confronts his new site and his new client. At a relatively short amount of time he manage to produce a significant amount of varies designs that will touch a wide spectrum of programs and an assorted types of scales. He begins with the urgent need to quickly provide spatial configurations to the verity of new social rural agricultural developments which had became the most celebrated and enthusiastic goal of the Zionist organization in Palestine. But soon enough, he starts to deal also with larger scale commissions, among which are many design proposals for garden suburbs that will be adjusted to existing urban centers, and even a scheme for a whole new city and a regional layout.

Out of the severe differences between the European and the Mediterranean context the most prominent aspect was probably the almost reverse situation of the urban and rural conditions between the two places. But while the Palestinian city hardly received any ideological and practical attention from Zionist organizations at its preliminary steps towards territorial and physical settling, the rural form of settlement became its main objective, and to a great extent Zionism declared a combined operation both towards the territorial occupation of the rural sector, as well as regarding to the social configurations that will settle it in the future. The reason for that one way course of action was rooted in Zionism ideological code that aimed at the creation of a new social existence of the Jewish collective in its new land, but was surly also motivated by more practical issues such as availability and feasibly of land acquire.\(^50\)

Kauffman genuine invitation to arrive to Palestine was an integral part of that Zionist primary task – to establish a Jewish rural existence in its new territorial destination. His mission is to practically formulate a new rural model, an assignment that was probably unprecedented at the time (and maybe even in our days as well). Town planning, although being a new discipline, did become quite a known convention at the beginning


\(^{50}\) The idea of Jewish social reform and its reliance on agricultural activity as economical and social forces can be understood very well by reading a citation of Dr. Ruppin in an article that Richard Kauffmann had wrote in 1926 to the Town Planning Review: Kauffmann. R., (1926), *Planning of Jewish settlements in Palestine*, *Town Planning Review*, Volume 12, Issue 2, Liverpool University Press online.
of the 20th century, but village planning had no references what so ever, not in Europe for the most part. European villages were probably the most pure examples of vernacular, spontaneous or circumstantial developments, its Palestinian counterpart were the agricultural Arab villages. Kauffmann decides to combine them both along with what he called the scattered American model and to construct a new rural spatial language that will assimilate European town planning conventions and concepts into the new situation he had encountered in Palestine – a combination of Zionist social and ideological requirements and the Mediterranean contextual environmental condition.51

This first assignment that he had undertaken began almost in his first days in Palestine, and became the most celebrated element of his carrier and the most significant part of his legacy. At the end of this journey he concludes over 135 projects of rural village designs. These projects retrospectively can be seen as Utopian exercises, as a process of constant elaboration of a new spatial layout. But actually his first "prelude" was to become the most famous and worldwide recognized example for Zionist reinvention of a rural spatial form.

Richard Kauffmann's utopian exercises

"While the farmer in America or South Africa is happiest when from his doorway he cannot see his neighbor's chimney the Jewish farmer wants to live close to his colleague. His need for personal contact and conversation with others, and especially his high cultural needs – for lectures, discussions, music theatres, reading, chess – oblige the builder to place in the center of each settlement, large or small, a cultural hall. This special Jewish need, together with other principles, makes for the special architecture for a Jewish settlement." 52

Richard Kauffmann

In August 1920 Richard Kauffmann descend the sheep that had carried him from his birth continent - Europe to what will become his homeland – the Palestinian British mandatory territory in the near east. Few months later he and his young women architect associate of the small planning practice he had rapidly established in Jerusalem, are riding across the Jezreel Valley (Plain of Esdraelon) on their way to meet two funder members of the first "Moshav" in the world (a new type of agricultural cooperative community). They gathered on a foot of a hill, a small elliptic topographical bump that stands out slightly in contrast to the dominant flat landscape of the plain.

51 Reading two retrospective articles that were written after Kauffmann's demise along with a report of Kauffman himself to the Town Planning Review can demonstrate that he was perfectly aware to the uniqueness of this mission exactly for the same reason that was mentioned, and had also conducted a small preliminary research regarding varies types of rural settlements models in the world:


52 A citation of Kauffmann in the article of: Rabinovich A. (1983), The grand designs of Richard Kauffmann, Jerusalem Post Friday Magazine, April 1 1983, Jerusalem
Out of this meeting Kauffmann's first Palestinian village spatial layout was born. It took the shape of the elliptic hill to set as a spatial ordering element and all of the settlement components were posted according to that perfect elliptic form. The new settlement was called "Nahlal", and it had also become the most recognized work of Kauffman in the field of rural planning. It demonstrates probably one of the most pure associations between social ideology and spatial layout, but in order to understand that relation and the way it function, a small explanation regarding the formation of three basic social ideological models for rural settlement needs to be introduced. These rural models were born exactly at the same moment when Kauffmann began his Zionist Palestinian village planning journey and became the basics instrument of the Zionist rural land colonization in Palestine.

The ideological formula was quite simple: Jewish enthusiastic immigrants that had arrived to Palestine in order to become agricultural pioneers and rebirth themselves to turn into new Jewish farmers, didn’t stand a chance to accomplish that vision competing with the well trained and skilful Arab peasants on a one on one bases. In order to survive the struggle and to fulfill their mission they had to gather in working groups. These working groups were finely fixed under three types of social organizations. Each one of these types was basically characterized by different form and degree of communal social ideology:

1- The "Kvutsa" (Hebrew word for - Group) with its bigger and most known counterpart the Kibbutz, was the first type to be developed and also the most communal and radical in its social ideology. All of the property belongs to the cooperative organization of the settlement, all life aspects is done in a communal manner including working, eating and children raising and educating. There is no private property what so ever (including the land itself) and all the economical profits are divided equally between the members of the group.

2- The "Moshav"- was born out of a decision of few members in the first Kibbutz to establish a different type of settlement with a less rigid social ideology. Here each family has its own agricultural plot and is responsible to develop it independently, but all other aspects are organized collectively, that is; buying equipment and selling products, education and cultural activities and economic organization. However an important restriction is worth mentioning: no hired work is permitted, the land had to be developed only by the members of the settlement themselves. This type of settlement was supposed to provide its members a more personal fulfillment, working their own allotted land, while still maintaining the spiritual economical and social advantages of the communal organization of all other aspects.

3- The "Meshek Shitufi" (Hebrew term for – cooperative farmstead) is basically a consolidation between the Kibbutz and the Moshav.

These three ideological social outlines had determined the programmatic and social constants for Kauffman's mission. The variables were all others aspects of his planning; dealing mostly with site characteristics and the nature of the group of settlers itself.

---

53 For a wider explanation regarding that subject see comment number 45.
Nahall, was the first "Moshav". The elliptic scheme that Kauffmann had created was almost a mathematical result to it's given ingredients. At the bottom of the small hill, adjacent to an elliptical road that outlined the settlement scope, Kauffmann placed all the dwelling units of the farmer's families with their privet houses plots. Outwards to this dwelling circle the agricultural lots were arranged also in an elliptical manner and with an extremely accuracy of exact same agricultural area to each family. Inside the elliptic area from the houses line and towards the center all the public economical and social services programs were placed along with some privet dwelling plots for a non agricultural residences (craftsmen, artists doctors and so on). The scheme resonates in a direct manner the genuine essence of this new rural model. It stress the importance of the proximity between each farmer to its fields but at the same time creates an obvious strong communal center that dominant the landscape (being located at the highest point of the settlement) as well as the village physical and social structure.

But another comment, most relevant to our matter needs to be stated. It seems as that the quite familiar Ebenezer Howard's garden city diagram was poured down on that small hill in the Jezreel Valley to become a 3D miniature of the garden city schematic chart. What was published by Howard with the restriction not to be used in reality is projected in almost a fully direct manner to become Kauffmann's first rural planed component in Palestine. Being the first project of Kauffmann in the new Palestinian context he basically imported the most pure and updated symbol of new European social and territorial theory and casted it physically in a new site. This rigid direct design did had also some evident faults (that as known, were brought up by Kauffmann himself); the most prominent was probably the question regarding the ability of such a structure to cope with the future extension of the settlement, but it was probably needed more as a statement! As a preliminary step that sets off a wide exploration towards the formation of a new rural spatial language.

In 1926 Kauffmann publish an article at the Town Planning Review with the title: "Planning Jewish settlements in Palestine". 6 years after his first village layout he already has a broad assortment of works that he can present as a chronicle planning voyage and share some of his interesting conclusions and apprehensions. He describes in the article a wide collection of 9 rural designs (4 Kibbutz's and 5 Moshav's) that he had managed to carry out during these intensive six years of work. It is perfectly evident that he had extremely elaborated his rural spatial language. Each designed settlement is

---

described first by a short accurate account of its special variables characteristics: one has a main road in the centre; the other is on a sharp slope of a mountain, one is for 20 families (and 1,000 chickens for instance) others for 200 families (and 5,000 chickens); one follows the principle of mixed farming community and requires a 1000 m² of agricultural land for each family, another located close to Tel Aviv urban center and is about to practice intensive cultivations method of banana and orange plantations that requires an average agricultural plot of 100-200 m². The illustrations that accompanied Kauffmann’s report demonstrates a much sophisticated adaptation method of each plan to its contexts and program with a specific effort to assimilate the settlement in its surrounded landscape.

His method of rural planning becomes clearer as he constantly adding more and more variants to its preliminary elliptic scheme of Nahallah. The first evident dichotomy that appears is the clear spatial differentiation between the two ideological models of settlements: The "Kvutsa" and Kibbutz schemes demonstrated a detailed homogeneous layout of what seems to be a condense core of an autonomous spatial organism. There is no division to plots and the agricultural fields are not part of the plan. The emphasis here is obviously the social and communal qualities between the members of the settlers that the spatial layout will generate, and the connection to the agricultural land is minor in its importance. Regarding of the "Mosha" settlements, it seems like that a higher exertion was applied by Kauffman to elaborate the variations of the basic layout. Here a constant balance between the association of each farmer to its agricultural land and the endeavor towards the creation of concentric entity with a coherent social economical and cultural public center had dominate the manifestations of the suggested schemes.

He concludes the chapter regarding agricultural settlements with a paragraph that demonstrates the strong imbued senses of the experimental mission he is engaged in:

"We are far from claiming that the plans sketched above represent the last word. In the same way as the conception and the working plan of the Moshaw and the Kwuzah are intended to produce maximum utilitarian results, do the above designs try to adapt themselves as best as may be to given conditions. Just as we shall go on trying to improve our farming methods, so will the endeavor have to be made over and over again to attain to the best possible results in laying out the settlements, and in making the plans elastic enough to admit of innovations". 55

This extensive report revel the beginning of a long process that eventually should produce a rural spatial formation for the pre state Zionist territorial establishment in Palestine. It is focused mostly in the sector of "Jesrel" valley and the development of a net of agricultural relation between the region rural settlements. But besides this most enthusiastic description of Kauffmann regarding what was sought by him and obviously by his commissioners as the most important and glorified effort of the Zionist movement towards the fulfillment of its social and practical desire, other parts of the article regarding further planning commissions in different sectors and on totally different scale, revel the problematic aspect of Kauffmann’s perspective toward planning issues in Palestine.

A reveres regional model

Together with the description of the rural sector planning projects, Kauffmann also describes several of his planning proposals on an urban and regional scale. He divides the nature of the Jewish urban development activity in Palestine into two different typologies, and makes an extraordinary statement that while read today it is shockingly disclose a miserable huge gap between professional and ideological vision to what was probably already an undeniable reality when Kauffmann published his issue:

"Two distinct lines of procedure can be traced in the development of urban settlement. The expansion of existing towns is the one usually followed. The second method, the construction of a town from the beginning, is rarely attempted anywhere, so few town builders receive the opportunity it affords. As referred to above, one town has in recent times been freshly built in Palestine, namely Tel Aviv, near Jaffa. In the course of 15 years it has grown up from a small garden suburb into a township numbering to-day more than 40,000 inhabitants. Unfortunately, this town was not built according to a coherent plan and, therefore, shows all the serious defects resulting from such anarchic procedure."

Before beginning to describe his experience with planning of urban projects in Palestine, Kauffmann dismisses the role of Tel Aviv as relevant to the subject, apparently for being developed not "according to a coherent plan", although he himself acknowledge it being genuinely the first Hebrew city in the old-new Jewish homeland. He also decides to skip any description of his own planning proposal to the development of the first Hebrew city that was part of his attachment with the Palestine Land Development Co. already in 1921 (shortly after he arrives to Palestine). According to a late retrospective biographical account of Lotte Chon (Kauffmann's women architect first associate) His plan had reached an incisive conflict with the "Petit Bourgeois" founders and promoters of Tel Aviv that according to Chon, saw the speculative real-estate profit as most important issue and didn't accepted Kauffmann's

allotments of public areas or his recommendations for plots size and building limitations.  

Fig. 15 – Kauffmann’s proposals for Tel Aviv – 1921 with a clear influence of percolation method of detached hoses developed by Raymond Unwin at the beginning of the 20th century.

Instead of Tel Aviv, Kauffmann elaborate his experience with Garden suburb planning mostly in Jerusalem and Haifa, and more importantly his suggestion for a suitable urban substitute to the wrong and inappropriate reality of the first Hebrew city; A freshly new Jewish town in the Jesreel Valley to be planed and constructed where no urban beginning was even thought of or hinted before. So imbued and committed to his apprehension of the Zionist idea that his ideological and spatial vision ignores and dismisses the most evident urban center that reality is clearly stating, and suggesting instead to start from scratch a proper urban configuration that he sort for Zionism in Palestine. He provides a rational didactical explanation to this idea of a city from scratch:

"There are two aspects, which will be the determining factors for the rise of a town at this particular spot. Firstly, south-to-north trade routes will intersect here the most important trade routes running west to east. Secondly, it is the central point of an extensive and fertile agricultural Hinterland, the plain of Megiddo and of the Emek Jesreel. When they are laid down, the west to east traffic arteries will be of special importance. After the harbor at Haifa is built, they will form the simplest and easiest means of communication from this part of the Mediterranean coast through Palestine to the countries of the East. To-day the railway from Haifa to Damascus already passes Afuleh. Once these fundamental conditions governing the future economic development have been made fast the growth of the town will be able to follow as a matter of course."

Looking the plan that Kauffmann had drafted for what he called the "Emek Town" (Emek means valley in Hebrew), today known as "Afuleh" after the Arab name of a small agricultural tenant's colony that was located at the same spot, immediately revels the gap between Kauffmann’s ideal Palestinian garden city version to what he had encountered in Tel Aviv. The "Emek town" is almost an exact duplication of the genuine European Garden city. It perfectly resembles Letchworth garden city layout, program and land use division, as well as the radial shape of Ebenezer Howard's schematic diagram. Moreover, in the center of the urban layout a linear thick stretch that at a glance seems like all the prominent urban rivers of the most well known European urban centers such as Paris London or Rome, cuts through the Jewish "Emek Town". It is not a river! It is a strip that forms a part of the international rail network that was laid by the Ottomans at the beginning of the 20th century and was supposed to connect the "Emek Town" to Haifa harbor, Damascus in Syria and even El Medina in Saudi Arabia. This duplication of European relations between the continents major urban centers and its central water ways, a scale down of a European city layout that was projected by Kauffmann on an almost empty plain in the Jesreel valley was spouse to fulfill the association between rail public transportation infrastructure to the garden city layout, a combination that Howard had originally suggested.

59 Although in Howard’s diagram the rail system is suggested to join the urban layout at its marginal exterior areas and not to cut through it in the middle.
At the end of the article, in a short paragraph, Kauffmann exposes briefly one of his most ambitious and singular plans on a regional scale, which he had initiated at 1925 shortly before he had published this essay. It was his "Diagrammatical Sketch for Regional Scheme from Mt. Carmel to Acre", also known as the Haifa Bay, or the "Zebulun Valley". A plan which was rejected by the British mandatory government, or as claimed in several documentaries on the subject, had never really been considered.  

Here Kauffmann joins the dream that was portrayed earlier by Theodor Herzl and that had imagined Haifa bay as a Mediterranean harbor garden city. He reinforced this delirious vision with a coherent overall regional and urban scheme that should provide the small coastal urban settlement the opportunity to become the international gate of the Jewish establishment in Palestine and an important harbor and commercial center.

---

for the entire Middle East. This interesting regional scheme will be further examine later on in this paper, but an important massage should be mention for now, in order to conclude and apprehend more completely the professional and ideological world that Kauffmann had constructed at his first years in Palestine.

Gathering together all the four major fields of planning that Kauffmann describes in his Town Planning Review article: rural settlements, a garden city new town layout, a coastal harbor regional scheme and garden suburbs layouts, and understanding the relations that he had suggested between all of these components – a quite stunning principle is Revealed. Kauffmann takes Ebenezer Howard's spatial and urban relations between existing urban centers, new garden cities and rural environment, and reverses it in order to rebuild it in a northern geographical sector of Palestine. In result, according to Kauffmann's vision, the Zionist regional model will begin with reinventing and establishing a new network of rural settlements, continues with the establishing of a new garden city to function as a commercial and service center for the rural system, and ultimately will lead to the construction of a major harbor urban center on a 250 km² stretch of the Mediterranean shore. This entire regional complex will be laid on a geographical area where there is hardly any existing development that might suggest this future progress. The big industrial metropolis that originally initiated the search of Ebenezer Howard and other European planners that and had generated eventually the garden city concept is actually the final stage of Kauffmann's regional development process in Palestine. The garden suburbs typology is left by Kauffmann to be used as urban extension projects for existed urban centers.

As was stated at the beginning of this chapter, Richard Kauffmann can be seen as a double agent that had parted his life and professional carrier between European preliminary initiation and practice to a fully engaged mission in the service of the Zionist organization in Palestine. It was probably for that nature of his activity that he was able to perform an overall appreciation regarding the relations between European planning notions, Zionist ideology and the physical conditions of the country. But unfortunately this was also possibly the cause for his uncompromising rejection to see the rapid natural course of reality as it had occurred much faster than the realization process of Zionism was able to follow. He therefore made en extremely important contribution by inventing a rural spatial language that was perfectly sewed to the definitions of the rural agricultural pioneer's aspirations and ideology. He had literally provided the country component in the Town and country marriage equation concept. He even went further and composed by the verity of his projects a whole regional mechanism that contained his apprehension of Howards garden city territorial relations, as he sorted will be best fit to the conditions of Zionist organization in Palestine. As was already mentioned, all the components of this regional arrangement were designed almost entirely from scratch and the order itself had been reversers and twisted to become feasible and appropriate for the new situation in its new context. However, His strong commitment to the Zionist establishment phase, as well as his rigid and didactical enthusiasm to the assimilation of a new Jewish spatial order in Palestine, had made it impossible for him to collaborate and contribute to the development of Tel Aviv crucial phase of expansion.
Fig. 17 – Kauffmann's proposal for the expansion of Haifa as a Bay City 1926
Context

The three agents that were broadly described had produced in a relatively short time span (approximately between 1921-1936) three versions of new urban layouts that contained European planning notions mixed together with each planner planning philosophy and professional experience, as well as their interpretation and understanding of the Palestinian physical context and Zionist national ideology and programmatic requirements.

In contrast to what Zionist myth, legend and known rhetorical historiography had tried to convey, there was never a real "Tabula Rasa" situation at any of the cases that are examined here. Though the fact that Zionist expansion projects outside of the existing old "Mediterranean urban centers" were indeed new forms of urban existence in the Mediterranean environment it is impossible to apprehend the true nature of these new developments without describing the world in which they were implemented in. Thus, speaking of context regarding the preliminary formation phase of Tel Aviv and Haifa should deal also with the sets of national and international interests and ideologies besides the direct and obvious geographical and environmental conditions. The aspiration of Zionist organizations towards these two coastal urban settlements, the local social and economical mechanism of its inhabitants and promoters, the colonial relations between Zionists activists leaders and the ruling authorities, and of course the relation between Jewish and Arabs citizens and their living environments, are all parts of a fully complex world in which the new theories and planning concepts were supposed to fit in.

The comparison between Tel Aviv and Haifa preliminary urban expansion steps is made here not merely because of the resemblance between the two cases but rather precisely for the variation that each case represent to a what is generally treated as a similar or equal sets of planning concepts that had been originated from one theoretical source. It demonstrates precisely the delicate phase in planning of transformation from idea to reality, on the more so when this phase contains as well the transformation of ideas to a deferent section on the globe. In that matter even the most immediate physical context of the two coastal urban sprouts along the Israeli Mediterranean shoreline demonstrate a significant variation to the starting conditions of the two future projects.

Although relatively close to each other (approximately 100 Km distance) the two case studies display perhaps the farthest geographical extremes of coastal configurations in the Israeli Mediterranean shoreline. A quick look at a simple topographical map reveals immediately the excessive variance between the two coastal areas, in which almost all aspects of basic Mediterranean geographical coastal condition differs: Tel Aviv's shoreline is linear and basically straight and continuous while Haifa's water front is curved and creates a significant bay close to the old Mediterranean city. The land that spreads from the waterline eastwards into the country also differs extremely while Tel Aviv area was characterized mostly by flat agricultural fields with sporadic topographical alterations of small hills and dunes. In contrast Haifa's inland is dominated by the strong presence of Mount Carmel (546 m above sea level, and 232 Km²) that almost touches the Mediterranean waters very close to the old city (App 132m in the nearest point between mountain and water).
One thing dose resembles between the two cases geographical conditions. It is the condition that has to do with the water that flows from each area inland basins, to the Mediterranean Sea. Both cities are located close to a thin but significant stream that constantly running water to the Mediterranean. This significant water presence that is relatively rear in the Mediterranean climate and specifically in Israel, together with the two basic geographical conditions that were mentioned will have a great influence on the nature of the spatial proposals that were suggested to these coastal urban future and their manner they will be implemented and promoted.

The linear expansion and the strategic leap

The first step, the first urban decisions regarding the development and the expansion of the two coastal settlements outside their original core, marked perhaps one of the most acute moments that had affected the course of development of each one of them. So crucial and critical were these preliminary urban actions that they might be seen today as the very moments when urban situation began to contradicted itself, and depart further and further from the very vision held by its planners and promoters. In order to understand the nature of this key period in the urban development history of the two case studies it is important to understand the way these coastal urban centers were viewed by the key actors that played the most essential role in its new urban episode.

The most important condition that had already had created the first main differentiation between the two case studies had to do with the British interests in Haifa bay area and with their intention to developed it as a main port. Already in 1922 the British engineer Frederick Palmer was chosen to examine several alternatives for the Haifa's port that were submitted by different planning companies from all over the world. He eventually chose his own company proposal that were also the faster and cheaper one to develop and also had a tremendous impact on the future expansion of the city.\(^{61}\) Palmer scheme for Haifa's port included a creation of long mole parallel to Haifa's historical center that practically had blocked almost all aces and views to the sea from the old city.

Almost immediately after Palmer had chosen his own scheme for the development of the port, the Zionist organization had presented to the British Mandatory authorities Kauffmann's proposal of an overall new urban layout for Haifa's bay area including a different position of the port. In Kauffmann scheme it is extremely prominent that his designing principals and objectives were all oriented towards the creation of optimal relations between the port and the city.

However, the British government didn’t even consider Kauffmann proposals and began to develop Palmers plan that was completed in 1933. Since the establishment of the port a large industrial area was promoted next to it, and had created a thick buffer zone between the city's center to the future expansion project in the northern bay area. This significant strategic leap that was forced on the future expansion project of the city is defiantly its most important prominent contextual factor. It had created a fixed given

---

situation that had forced a spatial detachment between the old city center and the new expansion project.

In contrary to that detached situation in Haifa bay, the territorial condition of Tel Aviv's that had precede its first expansion project dictated rather a linear gradual urban growth. It was a condition that was derived from the limited possibilities of land purchase that provided the Zionist organizations and Tel Aviv's main leaders and promoters to acquire land only where Arab owners didn’t saw any options of agricultural development. These land were located mostly north of Tel Aviv's original settlement.

![Fig. 18 – Proposals for Haifa's port – at the bottom the is Palmer's final proposals that was eventually built](image)
Fig. 19 – View of Haifa bay before and after the construction of Haifa’s port
Fig. 20 – Linear expansion of Tel Aviv as a result of land purchase policy - 1921
The seeds are planted

The engagement of the two British founding fathers of town planning movement with the development of urban settlements in Palestine had occurred naturally as a direct result of the British Mandatory rule in the Middle East that began in 1918 after the end of the First World War. As was stated at the beginning of this paper, the Zionist organization in Palestine and the British Mandatory regime were engaged in a rather unique relation that was character by the strong ambiguity nature of the Zionist and Jewish perception that had constantly challenged their position in the conventional colonial political and social hierarchy. This situation had great affect on the nature of planning activity and lead to a verity of different types of associations between colonial planners and Zionist organizations and leadership in Palestine.

Tel Aviv's urban acceleration and Geddes's last opportunity

"All the world can see that Zionism stands for regional reconstruction, for better combination of town and country accordingly; so hence the opportunity of Tel Aviv."  

When Patrick Geddes had first arrived to Palestine in 1919 he was already a 65 years old experienced senior planner and scholar, with an impressive ample and deep body of practical planning and theoretical scholar research activity. However, his deep and extensive notions of social and urban concept for new ways to treat and plan cities, villages and regional formations had mostly been rejected and very little of his projects and proposals ever reached any kind of realization.

His first attachment to the Zionist organizations in Palestine didn’t include any consideration regarding Tel Aviv. He contacted several Jewish ladders already in 1918 from his stay in Kolkata India expressing his desire to work actually in Jerusalem, hoping to be able to examine and operate some of his methods of "fixing and cleaning old urban centers" as he puts it in one of his letters.

Geddes was probably referring to his techniques of **diagnostic Survey** and **conservative surgery** that were developed by him since his first years as scholar in Edinburgh and further elaborated during his time in India, where he had evolved an original unique approach towards British colonial government intervention in the existing urban fabric India and other colonial old towns. He therefore receives several planning commissions from Zionist organization in Palestine, most importantly in Jerusalem including revaluation of the plan for new urban expansion outside the city walls, and a submission of planning proposal to the Jewish university complex in Mount Scopus, Along with other projects he was requested to be involved in including varies places in the country such as Haifa, and Tiberius.

Only in 1925 after almost all of his planning commissions had failed to be realized, during his second visit to Palestine for attending the opening ceremony of the Jewish university in Mount Scopus (eventually planed not according to his scheme), he was approached by Tel Aviv's first and most influential mayor Meir Dizengoff to propose a plan for the future development of the city. The story tells that Geddes had accepted

---

63 Marom. N. (2009), *A city with concept: Planning Tel-Aviv*, Babel LTD, Tel-Aviv.
the offer Wright away! He extends his stay in Palestine and begins enthusiastically to work on his plan.⁶⁴

This random encounter between these two most charismatic, spirited and Imbued figures had generated the preliminary and most significant overall master plan for the first Hebrew city. Geddes's plan and report had to deal with a most complex situation regarding the mixed and chaotic existing urban fabric, the rampant speculation market and the sharp rapid increase in population. During the 4 years that had passed since Geddes first visited the city it had changed completely its nature, from a small urban germ of 182 houses and 2,084 residences, to a 2,612 houses complex that contained 34,200 residences.

Supposedly, and as Geddes himself had formerly expressed there was nothing in Tel Aviv and its area to fit his practical and ideological ambitions in light of his unique approaches in planning and his revolutionary and radical methods. There was no old traditional urban fabric that needed any kind of intervention or reformation; there was no use to apply his sensitive and unique conservative surgery technique that he had demonstrated in his India's planning proposals and reports. On a contrary, Tel Aviv had presented a chaotic context of an urban mixture that contained many different new starts sometimes separated from each other only by few minutes' walk distance.⁶⁵ Neither there was any regional logic to be found that might required a diagnostic civic survey in order to trace down the original "valley section" mechanism of the area. If any, such system did exist it was more prominent in the regional fabric of the Arab sector that had maintained their established relations between Jaffa as a Mediterranean port city to its agricultural surroundings and commercial relations.

One aspect regarding Geddes's commission in Tel Aviv did probably match in a way a most preliminary and fundamental ideological part of his conceptions. It had to do with the nature of his client's character - the Tel Aviv association and its most influential promoters represented by the city mayor Meir Dizengoff.

Tel Aviv from its very first days was founded with a strong imbued ideological aspiration of its founders to be the first Hebrew city and to promote by that the most fundamental objective of Zionist ideology - the physical redemption and colonization of the land. Although it was a much more bourgeois version of this Zionist notion, certainly comparing to the rural agricultural pioneering settlers that in addition also aspired to create a new Jewish social figure that works and stele the land as a peasant and not simply as a city residence. Tel Aviv founders claimed they can provide decent homes to the many new Jewish immigrants that will arrive to Palestine that didn’t share the motivation or the capability of becoming agricultural settlers.⁶⁶

⁶⁶ For a further fascinating description of the ideological aspect in the first steps of the funding actions of "Ahuszat Bait" (the original urban settlement that later on changed her name to Tel Aviv) see - Allweil Y., (2011), Building a Home-Land, Zionism as a Regime of Housing 1860-2005, a dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
In any case, Geddes probably could strongly relate to the sturdy ideological motivation of Tel Aviv's mayor and other of its prominent figures to initiate a new urban entity out of a voluntary and particular social organization that had a clear enthusiastic character of being a bottom-up action. Even so it was certainly a bourgeois capitalist initiative, he probably saw in this type of association the very evidence of his vision of the city as a collective instrument for a great social transition, as an organism that should be developed from the smallest social units toward the construction of the urban complex, then the regional and the national. As was expressed in many of his writings and activities, he strongly believed that cities should be built up by its own dwellers and that the key cornerstone of any urban settlement is the home of the people, and the basic family unit.67

This basic association he had share with the ideological statement of Tel Aviv's founders was probably more than enough for Geddes in order to commit himself to the preparation of the plan. He managed in a relatively short amount of time to approach his task according to most of his major planning notions and to express in it the unique ideology he had devolved in the long course of his professional and scholar life. The result, as was already mentioned, was his most complete and ambitious plan that ever been realized, as well as the fundamental preliminary crucial chapter in the development of Tel Aviv from a growing urban germ garden suburb of old Jaffa, to a strong urban center and later on to the biggest metropolitan area in the county of Israel.

**A quick civic survey a report and an urban scheme**

As an inevitable part of his planning vision, and although his commission was seen by his clients (mainly by the Mayor Meir Dizengoff) as the opportunity to provide Tel Aviv an instrument for its expansion and its Self-definition as an autonomic urban entity, separated from its central old origin in Jaffa, Geddes approached his task by first dedicating a major effort for the preparation of his famous civic survey. The results of this important procedure was the 62 pages of his "Town planning report – Jaffa and Tel Aviv" that served as an inevitable part of what we know today as "Geddes Plan". Even the name of the document that Geddes had submitted declares his aspiration towards an overall regional perspective that sees the whole area of Tel Aviv as extremely relevant and as an Integral component of the final plan.

This debate between Geddes and his project commissioners actually demonstrates an inherent conflict within Geddes's plan. It is composed of the nature and aspiration of the Zionists and capitalists clients that saw the plan as an opportunity to develop and to market their purchased land as a development of a new form of Jewish urban pattern, alienated and completely different from its surroundings, along with Geddes's approach

67 See Allweil Y. (?), *Housing Before Street*: Geddes' 1925 Anarchist Plan For Tel Aviv, Technion IIT, published in Academia.edu: https://www.academia.edu/9344597/Housing_Before_Street_Geddes_1925_Anarchist_Plan_For_Tel_Aviv
that saw Tel Aviv as a segment of an overall regional complex that should be planned as a unite entity.\(^{68}\) What is evident today, that was also a result of physical, geographical and ethnical circumstances and of the original definitions of Geddes's commission, is that while his report performs an intelligent comprehensive analysis of the plan scope as a regional complex, the drawn document that Geddes had produced doesn’t include any new planning suggestions apart from the future expansion of Tel Aviv from the existed urban fabric along the Mediterranean shore to the north.

Scholars and researchers differs today regarding the role of Geddes and his plan in the creation and the fixation of the so evident physical, social ethnical and economical disparity between the planned north, and the unplanned and neglected south that accompanies Tel Aviv and Jaffa development till today. Some critic Geddes for not essentially suggesting any physical solution or any planned configuration for old Jaffa and its immediate urban environment, while others suggests that he didn’t actually had the time to complete his task in order to develop and implement his entire vision, and that eventually his plan was twisted and exploited by its Zionist commissioner in order to promote their own interests.\(^{69}\)

However, many aspects of both Geddes's report as well as his plan, that are still evident to this day, demonstrates his sensitive approach to urban planning and his inventive intuitions that had originated from his \textit{diagnostic civic Survey} technique, applied on Tel Aviv's area:

1. \textbf{An overall regional approach:}

   "With all respect to the ethic distinctiveness and the civic individuality of Tel Aviv, as Township, its geographic, social and even fundamental economic situation is determined by its position as Northern Jaffa...Thought the local industries and developments are not without distinctiveness, their fundamental conditions are one, and the due prosperity of each is closely interwoven with the well-being of all. Conversely also, the more efficient and well developed can be Greater Jaffa, the better for all its component quarters and townships and for their related districts also." \(^{70}\)

This opening sentence of Geddes's report, demonstrate precisely the broad perspective of his planning method. Moreover, all first 10 pages of his report are dedicated to the theoretical construction of this new regional unit he had defined as Greater Jaffa. His first proposals and mentions (although most of them are written propositions that wasn’t accompanied by any drawn documentation) all contained issues regarding the function and improvement of the regional system. He even further extend his point of view and provides a general observation regarding the position of Jaffa as a port city in the more extensive national and Mediterranean context as he mentioned the historical and traditional distance between different types of ports that allows them to thrive without interfering one another. He thus, recommends an additional industrial port, located north to the old Jaffa harbor in a spot that correlated with the general direction of the urban expansion he is proposing and an industrial rail system to connect the two harbors to each other. \(^{71}\)
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\(^{68}\) Marom. N. (2009), \textit{A city with concept: Planning Tel-Aviv}, Babel LTD, Tel-Aviv, PP.36-50.

\(^{69}\) Marom. N. (2009), \textit{A city with concept: Planning Tel-Aviv}, Babel LTD, Tel-Aviv, PP.43.

\(^{70}\) Geddes. P. (1925), \textit{Town Planning Report –Jaffa and Tel Aviv}, P.1

\(^{71}\) It is strongly evident from reading Geddes’s report that his proposals for the location of the second port was a "disappointment" as he writes to "many good citizens" that preferred develop an existing temporal jetty close to
But Geddes Regional unit didn’t conclude with urban relations between Tel Aviv, Jaffa and other settlements in the area, but was also further developed in other important elements of the plan. Geddes had included in his report an interesting reference to several fundamental geographical conditions that served as main anchors for his suggested layout. Most dominant in that matter is his analysis of the two main water basins in the area; The Yarkon river - the largest coastal river in Israel 27.5 km in length (Nahr al-Auja in Arabic meaning the meandering river), and the Ayalon river (Wadi Musrara) that discharges into the Yarkon 2.5Km before it pours into the Mediterranean sea. Both of these characteristic Mediterranean geographical components were relatively far from the existed developed area of the city, but Geddes assigned them an important function in the regional context of his scheme, in a way that turns their presence into a significant factor for the future urban expansion layout.

In a chapter titled: "The common boundary to eastward Wady Musrara "72, Geddes elaborating a new approach towards this type of geographical regional entities. He claims that although historically rivers and streams were consider as borders mainly for security reason as protection elements during wars, today there is no need to change that military traditional notion as cities should be striving to include their past borders in their future scope. According to this vision, even a small stream like the Musrara, remote more than a kilometer from the eastern border of Geddes's plan should be considered to become a geographical focal point for the future city, and should be treated as an urban asset to be used as a natural green open sequence for leisure, sports, cultural and educational activities.

The Yarkon River a much more dominant geographical entity served by definition of the purchased land as the plan northern border. Yet Geddes didn’t actually treat it as such and suggested to buy as soon as possible more uncultivated land (mostly sand dunes) at the other side of the Yarkon estuary in order to tone down the uncontrolled speculations and sharp Increase of land rates. He also suggested a rapid construction of a road that will reach the Yarkon bank and a bridge that will cross the river in order to stress the intention to settle also the Yarkon northern area.73 In his vision the Yarkon River will be bordered all along his margins with a small strip of open space and a continuous stretch of residential use. Along with the new harbor he had suggested next to the Yarkon River mouth, it is strongly evident that Geddes saw this geographical condition as an urban green system that will resonate the regional order inside the urban structure.

These two examples demonstrate Geddes's broad perspective and had contributed to one of the most fundamental strategic aspects of the plan - it's obvious linear and northern orientation, that although was dictated by other circumstances and

72 Geddes uses the Arabic names of the river as the today Hebrew names were probably not yet given at the time of his involvement in the area.
73 Geddes. P. (1925), Town Planning Report –Jaffa and Tel Aviv, P. 15 -16
constraints (such as the presence of Jaffa in the south for instance) was strongly reinforced by this regional system that Geddes had portrayed. It seems as although wasn't really asked to, Geddes had searched for *Tel Aviv's valley section* in order to even begin his proper planning of the allotted area which he was commissioned to plan.

![Image](image.png)

Fig. 21 Geddes’s plan layout reaches the Yarkon River

2. **The careful examination of the existed city:**

In an opening paragraph to a chapter titled "Quality of housing", and as a starting point for the demonstration of the preferable housing pattern that he designate for the future development of the city, Geddes makes a comparison between two adjacent housing buildings already built and present one next to another within the existed realm of the then Tel Aviv neighborhoods. One complex is a "Row of detached cottages and little gardens" and the other is a "large Tenement block of many dwellings together".GEDDES chose to approach what he probably fully recognize as the most controversial part of his plan; the type of housing layout he
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proposes and its derivative bay laws (in contrast to the already uncontrolled speculation rates and the economic aspirations of its project commissioners), by extracting a concrete example of "good and bad" housing solutions from the existed urban fabric. Besides the clear recruited character of this comparison and the obvious conclusion that Geddes reaches in favor of the detached garden city like layout, this rhetoric intuition of him attests his unique point of departure as well as the close examination he had conducted within the existed city context. He concludes this somewhat rhetorical discussion with the following statement:

"In summery then, this planning must essentially be towards continuing the Garden Village Tel Aviv began with; and bettering this as far as may be".75

This careful examination of the existing, and the extracting of an obvious preferred and valuated qualities from his plan context was also the point of departure from which Geddes began to describe his new proposed layout to Tel Aviv’s expansion in his report. Like an Arial-view act of scanning, he portrays the components of his new plan as inevitable direct developments that starts and generates from the excising urban fabric. Whether Geddes had thought about it or not, reading this type of description even today instantly provides the acknowledgment that this plan is a vital direct interpretation of its context and therefore strives to provide a most suitable mechanism for its future expansion.

However, the engagement of Geddes with the most detailed properties of the existed urban context was not made only for persuasion or descriptive proposes, as he additionally examined other issues regarding housing typologies, or social and economical issues that took place in Tel Aviv when he had conducted his survey. Geddes relates as well to matters that didn’t deal directly with conventional theories and practices regarding urban planning, but were analyzed by him as important to the vital progress of the urban development of the city although not necessarily directly related to his new layout. For example he describes in his report several types of informal urban phenomena such as the construction of barracks and tents as respond to the high demand for housing solutions, or the capitalist land speculation and the appearance of vacant plots as resolute. He treats these occurrences as indeed un-supportive to the progress of the new urban layout as well as to the existing fabric, but also apparently inevitable and for that not necessarily all negative. His proposed solutions although described briefly, contained for example an organized constriction of prefabricated living structures or even kind of regulation and rearrangement of the temporal living barracks but with the same temporal type of constructions. This demonstrate again his bottom up approach, that see even the planning of a new city extension layout as an act that can include also intervention in the existed urban fabric which take place in its most basic small social and physical units of the city.

75 Geddes. P. (1925), Town Planning Report –Jaffa and Tel Aviv, P. 15
3. **A clear and continuous liner northern expansion:**

Almost as an inevitable conclusion derived from his regional system approach and the careful examination of the existed urban fabric, stem a key fundamental aspect of Geddes's plan that deals with the way it develops the existed towards the new, the current city towards its future territorial and spatial layout. An examination of a Google map Arial-view image today can hardly revel where exactly Geddes's plan had started, what existed before it and what was built after and according to the its outlines. Only when the eye jumps from north to south a more clear distinction between old Tel Aviv and Geddes's urban structure is acquired. The reason for that obscurity related directly to the most fundamental planning actions Geddes had chosen to conduct, that derived specifically from his civic survey and its findings and conclusions.
The most obvious planned condition that Geddes's layout had demonstrated was a direct clear linear continuation from the existing urban fabric to the north. This of course had to do also with circumstances reality had dictated, such as the allotted limited purchased lands, geographical conditions and, as also Geddes had mentioned "Tel Aviv's general circulation is far more on north-south lines than from west to east". But such a gradual and moderated almost indiscernible transformation between old and new, between the existed urban fabric to its future development was, and probably still is, a most exceptional occurrence, the more so when regarding colonial urban planning. It is enough to think about so many urban extensions projects and their obvious fundamental character of detachment, by means of alienation or separation using all kind of buffering elements such as open spaces, infrastructure, zoning or even demolition of parts from the old tissues, in order to acknowledge the exceptionality of Geddes's scheme in that matter.

Without applying any kind of buffering or other separation strategy, Geddes's plan managed to capture the garden city character he had identified in the very origin of the city's primal layout and to transmit it toward the new development in the north. It was done by a moderate transformation mechanism that preceded the existing urban context dominant lines and general directions while also applying temperate small modifications in order to straightened up the whole road system as it progressed northward. This transformation method had created a new street hierarchy that held Geddes's new layout and its overall spirit of new residential environment.

Two major axes of the original "Ahusat Bait" layout; Rothschild Boulevard and Allenby Street had been extended and used as important components in Geddes's new layout. Allenby Street was stretched and lightly banded toward north in order to serve as one of the plan's great main thoroughfares, and Rothschild Boulevard was extended in its existed general direction but then curved westward towards the Mediterranean shore. Thus, eventually these two main fundamental axes actually crossed each other twice: first at the southern very origin of the city and then again at the center of Geddes's new layout.

To this elemental roads structure few more continuous main thoroughfares were added in a south north orientation as well as several perpendicular east west wide courses that had completed Geddes's advanced circulation system. This clear fundamental skeleton of main thoroughfares was the instrument used by Geddes to create his large city block - the most important residential unit of his plan also more familiar today as the super block. In these areas confined by the intersections of the main thoroughfares, the proper social anarchistic vision of Geddes is supposed to take shape through the creation of a radical garden city layout with an extreme reduction of inner block streets and a minimal building footprint given in return a maximum degree of open spaces privet and public.

---

76 Geddes. P. (1925), Town Planning Report –Jaffa and Tel Aviv, P.21
77 Such approach exists in many cities in Israel; perhaps the most prominent is the case of Jerusalem and the large urban buffer of open green space between the old city walls and the extension developments that took place since the mid 19th century. But also all over the world: Le Corbusier Plan Voisin for instance, or Plan Castro for Madrid Ensanche and so on.
Fig. 23 Geddes's plan linear extension from south to north - 1947
Fig. 24 – Geddes original drawn scheme - 1925
An Anarchistic urban structure

"Urban Planning cannot be made from above using general principles... studied in one place and imitated elsewhere. This way leads to Haussmanism. City planning is the development of a local way of life, regional character, and civic spirit, unique personality... based on its own foundations." 78

As anarchism and urban planning seems to exist in a contrasting ideological atmospheres, especially in the way conventional urban planning profession had been historically fixed as a top down centralized mechanism, it is astonishing to acknowledge that Patrick Geddes almost since the very beginning of his scholar and professional activity had aspired to combine these two parallel social vectors under one vision. 79

Geddes's anarchist planning vision was constructed essentially from two main axes that eventually were supposed to meet each other and perform a singular theory and praxis of urban planning.

One familiar concept that Geddes had developed originated from his theories in the study of geography. His method of regional analysis that eventually generated his famous valley section aspire to suggest the region as an autonomous geographical unit, fundamentally based on direct relations between geographical conditions and human economical and social activities that ultimately had dictated the verity of spatial urban or rural patterns in its regime. This of course contradicts the conventional modern centralistic order that was based on the state, the nation or the empire as the most elemental entities that control planning or urban development. Geddes's regional unit and its social and economical function meet elemental anarchistic ideas, such as Kropotkin's "communism without government – the communism of the free" that was inspired by the medieval city with its guilds occupational and social mechanism. 80

A second and less treated anarchistic aspect of Geddes's urban theories was developed by him on a totally smaller scale than his regional study, and dealt with the family, the house and the housing block as the basic social units that form the city:

The natural eugenic center is in every home; its young go out to make new homes; these make the village, the town, the city small or great, so the would-be Eugenist has to work at all these towards their betterment. Federate homes into co-operative and helpful neighborhoods. Unite these grouped homes into renewed and socialized quarters – parishes, as they should be – and in time you have a better nation, a better world... Each region and city can learn to manage its own affairs – build its own houses, provide its own scientists artist and teachers." 81

The most profound and complete way Geddes aspired for these social units to realize his anarchistic urban vision was by a direct action of urban dwellers building their own

---
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79 A most interesting and enlightening research regarding Geddes’s anarchist approach to planning and its embodiment in his 1925 plan for Tel Aviv, can be found in the work of Yael Allweil: Allweil Y. (?), Housing Before Street': Geddes' 1925 Anarchist Plan For Tel Aviv, Technion IIT, published in Academia.edu: https://www.academia.edu/9344597/Housing_Before_Street_Geddes_1925_Anarchist_Plan_For_Tel_Aviv
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houses. Geddes had practice similar urban activity already as a young scholar and educator in Edinburgh at the end of the 19th century, when after moving with his wife to one of the old city's tenements residential blocks they began to conduct minor local betterment actions encouraging all neighbors to participate as well. This clear bottom up urban renewal activity that soon was further intensified and augmented by the accession and involvement of more neighbors and other urban social entities (such as the educational program, the public open spaces committee, and significantly the Housing Guild), was the source and inspiration for Geddes's anarchistic urban vision, and he had carried and elaborated this vision further where ever he had arrived along his professional and scholar carrier.  

From Edinburgh Geddes had moved to India, where he continued to develop his revolutionary idea that anarchist social reconstruction could be approached, assisted and intensified by urban planning. During his years in India he provided dozens of reports for the colonial British administrations, criticizing their automatic top down planning approach towards Indian cities, involving swift slum clearance techniques and street openings that disregarded the profound civic and social nature of these urban tissues.

How then did Geddes anarchistic urban planning concepts were transmitted to his Tel Aviv's 1925 plan and urban report? What are the drawn outlines and planning decisions this kind of unique urban theory generates?

When arrived to Tel Aviv Geddes was already strongly imbued with both aspects of his anarchistic urban approach, and was determined to combine and implement them in what turned out to be his last, and most ambitious urban scheme ever to be realized. As was already mention, the first 10 pages of his report were dedicated to the elaboration of Tel Aviv's regional context and function, while in most of the other pages Geddes had systematically constructed an urban frame in which he wished to provide the suitable urban condition that will enable the development of his bottom up, social reconstruction urbanism. Regional and urban anarchistic theories were thus the ideological generators of Geddes's urban report and planning vision for Tel Aviv.

From the regional analysis Geddes had derived his plan general south north orientation and to a great extent, the fluent linear delineation of its skeletal circulation system, that had continued some of the existed elemental road structure only with moderate modifications and few east-west additions in order to adjust it to the general direction of the urban growth and for the creation of his desired new city block:

"...for upon this plan, there stand out the wide arterial roads, in the essential northward direction of the city's growth, and with the fewer secondary east-west thoroughfares required. Thus are clearly formed large city blocks. Their whole large interior areas laid out with minor streets for dwelling proposes".  

The most prominent character of Geddes's circulation system, clearly evident and strongly sensed even today, is its clear hierarchical order that makes a sharp distinction between main great throughways to internal small home ways. Geddes as well suggested to locate the central commercial area at a major crossroad between two
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main thoroughfares that creates the "Hexagon plaza" (as well the only place that a four storey building were allowed), and along the main north-south thoroughfare at the ground floor of its adjacent buildings, clearly emphasizing the intense urban character of these major arterial main streets and the north-south orientation, not only in circulation function, but also in terms of commercial activities. Thus, the main circulation Skelton creates the large inner city block and liberates it from heavy traffic, as well from commercial bustle. The inner block is planed with minimal and as short and narrow as possible inner home ways:

"For given main-ways carrying all through traffic, we can now plan the interior of each Home-Block with as few roads as possible, thus gaining ground from the long customary, but wasteful road-length and road space... ")) 84

It seems as all the key planed components of Geddes's layout are recruiting in order to create this large home block as an almost separate and autonomous urban unit, charged with an extensive area of open space minimally interrupted by other urban elements. For in these inner large city blocks the second and most important Geddes's anarchistic principal is supposed to take place. Here is the urban platform for Geddes's social reconstruction activity.

The manifestation of social qualities inside the large urban home blocks is directly connected to the quantity of the green open space they contained. As evident throughout his theoretical work, Geddes considered a most high social value to the involvement and contribution for the formation of new social-urban relations, through the proper act of a city made by its citizens. Nevertheless, he was probably also aware of the apparent difficulties that might arise as this idea will be attempted to become part of his Tel Aviv plan implementation phase. It is one thing to promote the physical involvement of city dwellers in their immediate public territory, but a vision that includes the construction of the dwelling unit itself by the dweller, limits extremely the type of future dwellers that can fit to the production phase of the urban layout. Therefore, in Tel Aviv, Geddes had assigned all his anarchist vision and ideology to be taken place in the inner large home blocks open spaces – the privets and to greater extent the public ones. And so, instead of self home construction operations, Geddes had promoted the activity of urban gardening as the generator motor for the involvement of citizens in their urban environment.

Within Geddes's large home blocks, an extensive plot size of 560m² was allotted, accompanied with a rigid set of bay-laws limitations to the built dwelling unit. Inside the privet parcel, a residential unit of up to one third of the plot area, with a permitted height of 9-14 meters was allowed. 85 The adjusted setbacks were strictly defined as well as 3m from street and 4 meters from the sides. The obtained layout was of obvious sparse and detached built residential units, dipped in a significant platform of diversified green. In fact the green matter of Geddes's home-block had received more elaborative description in his report, then the built units. This verity of open green spaces, public and privet were Geddes's try in which urban gardening activity was to perform its social reconstruction magic. He imagined there a true anarchistic life pattern, a utopia

85 Allweil Y. (?), *Housing Before Street*: Geddes' 1925 Anarchist Plan For Tel Aviv, Technion IIT, published in Academia.edu: https://www.academia.edu/9344937/Housing_Before_Street_Geddes_1925_Anarchist_Plan_For_Tel_Aviv
of social relations between the dwellers of the home-block and all the green that surrounds them, constantly reinforced by their involvement and reciprocity treatment to their inner green assets, and particularly to their shared, maybe even cooperative central public garden. This anarchistic dream, can be surly considered today as an extremely naïve planning concept, especially as it tries to engage social values of solidarity and voluntary activism to a spatial configuration constructed and implemented totally out of a capitalistic bourgeois origin. But, there are so many evidences regarding Geddes's sincere intention to promote and establish an urban model of consistent gardening culture and activism that it became almost an equivalent planning component of his Tel Aviv urban layout, a true physical ingredient that defines the home block and delineates its character like sidewalks and pavements defines the street.

More than 10 pages of Geddes's report dedicated to the elaboration of the unique gardening system in his large home blocks. The deep front seatback of the residential plot was deliberated towards the dual function of this threshold realm in the privet residential allotted area. Geddes suggested here fruit trees and vine plantings, stressing the elemental importance of the residential plot front garden as its representative element towards the public domain. In general, there is a strong sensation while reading Geddes's report that the large privet plot area is not exclusively directed to the complete personal ambitions and needs of its particular owner, but rather to a much more general common good. For example Geddes suggests the voluntary exude of a narrow strip from the plots that sits on the edges of the inner public garden (and therefore enjoys a direct access to it), in order to provide easy access to the block center for back plots as well; Certainly an inconceivable proposal, especially regarding today's Tel Aviv's urban standards. Or the suggestion to use the back garden of any residential plot for urban agriculture, as a vital economical instrument that will: "readily meet half the necessary vegetable consumption of its (Tel Aviv's) inhabitants..." 86.

The careful and particular formation of the large home blocks was another element of Geddes's plan that was supposed to promote social reconstruction through a unique urban formation. The repeated similar plots had been aggregate together according to what seems to be a one ordering principal that accumulate several plots to form sub-block units. These units were posted in a manner that had created the inner large home-block circulation system and the central interior garden.

However none of the home-blocks were similar to each other and even biggest verity is evident in the inner public gardens. This was intentionally outlined by Geddes in order to stress the singularity of each home block and to define each one of these urban units as a truly social self-sufficient entity that generates a rich and vital internal world. As Geddes writes on the subject, it is clearly evident that the diversity of inner-block layouts served as a key planning principle and a true schematic effort, directly intended to complete an anarchistic drawn urban layout, perhaps the first and the only worldwide planning of this kind, ever to be entirely outlined and practically promoted:

"In this form of lay-out of large Home-Blocks within Main-Ways, it will be notice that practically no two interiors aspects are exactly the same. Each has its own more or less different character, often indeed

distinctive. So the monotony of city block interiors hitherto is substantially abated, and even given a very appreciable degree of Garden Village Character; with local choice, and individualities of planting etc...Here then is unusual scope for gardening; and of all kinds, for beauty and use alike; and towards which the Horticultural Society can be of great service from the first. For each block volunteers for the common garden will be needed: thus forming a local group within the General Society.  

As will be later describe, it is a relatively common opinion that these extreme anarchistic ideas of Geddes didn’t survived even the first phase of implementation actions that had began shortly after he left Palestine. However, as described by Yael Allweil, there was an immediate, and as it seems unpredictable anarchistic implementation of Geddes's plan that had to do, perhaps by coincidence, with the internal politics struggle of workers groups in the city. These groups wished to fight and face the land speculation rates that was promoted and reinforced by the municipality means of territorial development and urbanization.

Till Geddes's plan was approved at 1926 by the planning board of the Mandatory authority, urban development in Tel Aviv was carried out in a gradual slaw crawl forward process, piece by piece always attached to the existed city edges, and accompanied by a direct deliberate policy of careful road and infrastructure placing that strongly enabled and supported the speculation activity. However and incidentally, at the crucial phase of Geddes's plan approval, the worker party received the opportunity to role for a short time of two years between 1925 to 1927. They saw the opportunity in Geddes's urban layout and used it in order to gain access to the housing market and to provide many workers organizations the chance to unionize and to cooperatively work towards land purchase and self home construction.

Geddes's plan provided the frame in which such actions were possible. Its broad territorial extension had introduced territories that were remote from the existed city and therefore not affected by the land speculations mechanism, maintaining a low price rate. Workers associations and cooperatives had managed then to buy these lands, at the edge of Geddes's plan, and develop it long before it was reached by infrastructure construction of the municipality. The small building size that the plan permitted made self-home construction possible, and engaged a process of cooperative organizations that were able to establish small, cheap and sometime temporal dwelling constructions, which were later followed by small housing units. These actions created in a relatively short time of no more than 10 years several workers neighborhoods that were established in what was later termed as a "housing before street" mechanism.

---

87 Geddes. P. (1925), *Town Planning Report—Jaffa and Tel Aviv*, P. 44 It should be as well noted though, that Geddes additionally claimed almost whenever addressing the subject of the large home-blocks layout, that there is equally a fundamental economical and pure geometrical reason to the diver arrangements of these interior layouts. It is done so in order to reduce as much as possible the quantity and dimensions of the inner home-ways, and at the same time to provide every plot it share of frontage façade.
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Fig. 25-26 – Geddes’s plan first implementation phase and approved percolation - 1927
A paradoxical vision

"The model and idea before us is that of the Garden Village. But this as no longer merely suburban; but as coming into town; and even into the very heart of the city block."  

As greater and complete our comprehension of Geddes ideas expressed in his plan and accompanied report, and although we can strongly relate today to many of his planning methods and concepts that seems extremely contemporary although suggested almost a hundred years ago, at the same time a most disturbing issue begins to rise that doesn't seems to reach a satisfied solution. It is an inherent paradox regarding two polar urban conditions that somehow are mixed together and fussed mutually to this one scheme. On the one pole of Geddes's plan stands his uncompromised and evident Garden city layout along with its extremely low density rates, broad plots size, low key building regulations and an extensive allocation of public open spaces, while on its other extreme opposite pole lays the evident centrality of its location constantly reinforced by the sharp increase of Tel Aviv's population and the unstoppable demand for housing and dwelling solutions. It is as Geddes puts it a "Garden village no longer suburban" a new urban expansion that is treated immediately as the updated metropolitan core, as a reconstruction action of the urban center.

As demonstrated in the small citation above, Geddes himself was perfectly aware to this new complicated condition, and the by definition anomaly of his plan from the most fundamental original principals of the garden city idea. Furthermore, his plan by its preliminary definitions was designate to provide Tel Aviv – an approximately 2.5 km distant suburb of Jaffa - the means for its territorial expansion and the increase of its population from 30,000 inhabitants to 100,000. That is, even in its basic axiomatic quantitative and spatial figures, Geddes's plan bluntly digress Ebenezer Howard's original intension, as it produce an urban entity that will contain more than twice of the inhabitants Howard had strictly defined, in a location not as one third as far from its central city origin as Howard originally suggested. Indeed the most basic math of Geddes's plan doesn't sum up sensibly, as the intention to inhabitant 70,000 people (the amount of the new expected added population) - more than twice than the original garden city recommended quantity in a new urbanized area of 3.58km² - a site only 1600m² bigger than the Howard's garden city prototype area, provided eventually a totally different density rate. How then dose Geddes resolve this so obvious paradoxical element of his plan?

Through many comments along his report it is extremely evident that Geddes didn’t see any kind of densification to his proposed layout and building regulation as even worth considering! On the contrary, in one of his remarks regarding housing typologies he makes a clear objection to any international existed variations on the garden city original detached housing layout:
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“Hence to speak quite plainly, I cannot and do not trust any other modern community than the south English (to which I do not personally belong), to make much good of continuous terrace of houses with back gardens; and so I must continue to plan them on the original and desirable Tel Aviv lines, i.e with houses as separate as may be.”

On another chapter of the report regarding the importance of his proposed layout large city blocks and their inner gardens, Geddes stress the highest value he asserts to social issues, and the preferable constructive civic and cultural function of his proposed inner gardens:

“I am well aware that such a scheme may appear at first sight "utopian" to many. But these are nonetheless verified and justified by experience of the past generation. For even in Edinburg and Dublin (cities in which the slums are slummy to a degree Tel Aviv can never fall to) such common gardens, and in the most unpromising of situations have long been providing a success...Such garden schemes are thus in no wise "Utopian Dreams", but Utopian Facts – the very best sorts of facts.”

Further than the varies repeated rhetorical and ideological efforts to promote the crucial vitality and necessity of the unique social anarchist sprit of his plan and its derivative urban layout, Geddes had also provided a sort of practical solution to what he himself had realized as an inherent tension between his extreme garden city urban pattern and character, to the brutal demographical tension reality had oppress on it. In a small chapter dedicated precisely to that matter under the title: "Note toward abatement of land speculation in Tel Aviv" he provides a probable solution to the problem by means of further and rapid urban expansion thorough acquiring more inexpensive lands at the northern bank of the Auja (Yarkon) River.

As it appears, there was no really an inherent solution to the sharp population growth and land speculation within Geddes's plan itself, but rather a suggestion for further urban expansion and duplication of the same urban system on the next immediate territories that borders the plan realm. Geddes preferred the "Utopian Facts" of his proposed layout (that indeed were practiced by him to a certain kind of success in several occasions) on top of the technocratic pragmatic calculations that might stand in his vision way. His all plan was enthusiastically orientated towards the accomplishment of a complete social vision that was fully embodied in his proposed urban layout along with an ideological enlightenment that was portrayed in the accompanied report.

This was probably the reason why the exact garden city spirit of Geddes's plan and in particular it's rigid building regulations and housing restrictions were the first to be brutally modified and as a matter of fact, totally extract from the plan implementation phase. Today there is hardly any trace for Geddes's garden village in terms of housing layout and density rates in the area where it was supposed to take place. Perhaps the only single place where a sense of garden city layout can be felt is exactly where this idea was first materialized in the original spot of of "Ahusat Bait" establishment along the first few blocks of Rotschild Bulevarde.

---

Fig. 27 – Aerial view of Geddes’s layout today, at the bottom left is old Jaffa and at the top the Yarkon River.
Haifa's Preliminary urban expansions and Abercrombie's Mediterranean New Town

Unlike Geddes, Sir Patrick Abercrombie most known contribution to the Israeli present social and physical reality had occurred actually after the state was founded, at a crucial phase, when the first national master plan (the only master plan in the world that covers an area of a whole country), was promoted. He then served as a close advisor to Arch. Arieh Sharon - the head and the founder of the Governmental Planning Department, a figure that is retrospectively treated as the state first architect. Under Sharon's leadership (that was a direct nomination of Davis Ben-Gurion - Israel's first prime minister), a team of planners had prepared and promoted Israel's first master plan, mostly known today as the Sharon plan. One of Sharon's plan fundamental products was the Israeli new towns; a small scale urban entities that were scattered all over the country in order to promote the plans main objective of radical population dispersal. Abercrombie contribution to that concept is most evident as he was developing a rather similar concept for his 1944 greater London plan.94

This is only mention here for the simple reason that Abercrombie plan for the Haifa bay area is probably a first version of the later Israeli new towns that were developed in Sharon plan. As was previously mentioned, by the time Abercrombie plan was submitted in 1936, Haifa urban settlement and its close environment were already strategically oriented by a strong colonial interest of the British Mandatory regime that saw Haifa and its adjacent area as an important international Mediterranean port and in a way, as a gate to Palestine and to their colonial territories in the Middle East.95 Therefore, Abercrombie's scheme was laid down on a complete different context than the situation that Geddes had encountered in Tel Aviv, and since its preliminary steps of implementation had generated an urban process that eventually produced an entirely different urban environment that had lead to an almost contrasted socioeconomic reality. But, along with the obvious distinction of both plans departure point, there are also great difference in planning concepts and methods that are manifested and operates in each scheme. It seems as that between Geddes plan for Tel Aviv and Abercrombie plan for Haifa bay it is possible to recognize an evident pivot point of transformation in the way both major key branches of early modern planning; the pioneering town planning movement (which both Geddes and Abercrombie considered as important contributors to its foundation), and the garden city idea were translated and engaged in practical planning activity. It is this transformation that makes the comparison between the two cases so interesting.

The position of the planer, to begin with, took a different shape in the case of Abercrombie plan for Haifa bay, in comparison to that of Geddes in Tel-Aviv. Although Abercrombie was invited by the Bayside Land Corporation and the Jewish National Fund - two Zionist organizations in Palestine, to propose a plan for the Haifa bay area, he was collaborating with another British planner - Clifford Holiday that was operating in Palestine between 1922 and 1925 on a twofold professional title; as a consult planner in the service of the British Mandatory government and also as a privet architect with his
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own practice. Abercrombie involvement in the preliminary expansion of Haifa project was also a second choice as far as Zionist organizations concerned, after the plan of Arch Richard Kauffmann was rejected by the British authorities. As a result, his project was perceived more as a compromise between Zionist territorial ambitions and the British mandatory government strategic needs regarding that area. In general it seems that the type of mutual appreciation and ideological enthusiasm that Geddes had sheared with Tel Aviv's leading figures didn’t occurred in the case of Abercrombie association with his commissioners in Haifa.

After Kauffman scheme along with its most crucial and elemental component regarding the relation between the port and the city was ruled out by the British authorities, Abercrombie plan was left to deal with the limb urban organ of the Haifa bay. It had done so by adopting most of Kauffman's layout urban qualities, yet with the addition of a large heavy industrial and infrastructure services zone that buffered between the existed city and the new expansion project.

At that critical moment in the history Haifa's urban development that was character by a most drastic population increment (an enormous growth from 15,000 inhabitants in 1917 to 100,000 in 1938), the transformation of this urban entity from a small Mediterranean coastal city to a forming metropolitan area was done through basically two typological urban developments that were promoted in the Zionist sector:

1- The development of garden suburbs neighborhoods adjacent to the existed coastal old town. Many of these new residential quarters were laid down on the western slopes of Mount Carmel. Paradoxically the planner responsible to a major part of these types of developments was Richard Kauffmann, the same planner that had proposed a decade earlier in his Haifa bay scheme to leave the Carmel mountain terrain in its pure natural situation, as a resort area for Natural Park and recreational activities.

2- The later development that was chiefly promoted by Abercrombie plan for Haifa bay area as a complete detached urban layout that can be read as a sort of Mediterranean new town. Here the typology of garden suburb was used as well as a basic key residential component, but with two major and elemental modifications that had marked this new urban development as a second generation product of the garden city original typology, and not as a byproduct customized solution like the garden suburbs were. First, it was not exclusively a garden suburb residential layout and other types of housing methods – such as apartment blocks for example were proposed in the plan. And secondly it was an urban development that was designated to occur in a totally detached urban fragment with its own autonomous center, commercial area, industrial zone and public facilities. The link to Haifa's old Mediterranean urban center was pretty

---
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loose through a chief course of combined rail and main traffic thoroughfare that had crossed the new urban area approximately in the middle.

In parallel to these two satellites urban developments on the outskirts of the central coastal urban core, a third type of planning method was promoted in particularly by the British mandatory authorities. It was a type of urban intervention that by then became more or less the automatic official British colonial planning strategy regarding existed local vernacular dense urban settlements all through the empire. As was done in many other colonies around the world, Haifa’s old center was treated as a dense unhealthy urban tissue that should be remediated by a series of physical interventions mostly of demolition.99

This strategy was also strongly advocated and exploited by Patrick Abercrombie, as he describes in one of his Town Planning Review essays from 1935: “Slum clearance an

planning – the Re-modeling of towns and their external all growth”. As the title of this article implies, Abercrombie saw in external urban growth and internal re-modeling of cities, as two aspects that together construct the very idea of modern planning, as a whole act of city re-planning. This complete task has to do also with a third aspect, according to Abercrombie; the country planning. Together, all three aspects form in Abercrombie opinion a more updated modern planning theory that is suitable to deal with his contemporary urban issues. In a way, the binding together of the act of slum clearance with urban external growth, adds to the original equation of Ebenezer Howard garden city another task – to provide new residential solutions for the inhabitants of the cleared slums areas in the old towns. This according to Abercrombie requires a rethinking regarding the housing typologies that will be applied on the new urban extensions, as it deals already with new type of population than the kind that were aimed for by the original garden city and the later modified garden suburbs inhabitants.

It is this precise rhetorical sequence that made Abercrombie's Haifa bay extension project, a preliminary model of an Israeli Mediterranean new town. This planning combination method of inner re-modeling applied simultaneously with external urban growth that was developed as a solution for the housing problem in England, was transmitted more or less in a direct manner, to be tested in Haifa's old town and external territories. This was done more intensely in Haifa than in other Palestinian urban settlements precisely because of its strategic important position, and the colonial interests that the British mandatory had in this area. Interestingly, it was also in Haifa where Patrick Geddes had proposed one of his only clearance designs planning, a straight thoroughfare that was supposed to cross the dense fabric of Haifa's old center from side to side (this project like others of Geddes's in Palestine was not realize at the end).

The last chapter of Ebenezer Howard's canonical book – Garden cities of tomorrow is called: "The future of London". It is a future death certificate for the existed London and its urban function. Howard dedicates the last chapter of his book for the description of his complete utopia, which occurs on a metropolitan scale. It is a scenario that starts with the massive establishment of new towns on London's exterior territories, but his final goal is to remodel the center of London itself. It is aiming to do so, by a mechanism of voluntary immigration that will deluded London’s population and its working community, and that will force landowners and other economical forces to adopt to a new situation of a depleted city center:

“For observe what must inevitably happen. A vast filed of employment being opened outside London, unless a corresponding field of employment is opened within it, London then must die - when the

---
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102 Howard’s original intension was to relief tension and congestion on the dense existing cities by the massive voluntary immigration that the new garden city will generate, a quite reverse mechanism to the re-inhabiting role that Abercrombie designated for his new urban expansions.
landowners will be in a sorry plight. Elsewhere new cities are being built: London then must be transformed. Elsewhere the town is invading the country: here the country must invade the town."  

In the same chapter at the books edition from 1965, a diagram of Abercrombie’s Greater London Plan’s new towns is presented with an accompanied text: “The garden city idea applied to London. Proposed sitting of eight to ten new satellite towns and reservation of country belt in Professor Sir Patrick Abercrombie’s greater London plan 1944.”

It can be assessed then, that as far as Howard perception regarding the full progress of his utopia, Abercrombie’s new towns formed its desired future. A future towards a total social and physical reconstruction of the entire urban environment, in a bi-directional process, that will initiate outside the existed city, but eventually revert itself to affect the old existed urban core.

The colonial version of this almost apocalyptical scenario can be traced down on Abercrombie’s scheme for Haifa bay. Only that here there was no time to wait for the voluntary migration to occur, in such a magnitude that will eventually engage an equal "voluntary" transformation process for Haifa’s old center. Therefore the two actions of new town establishment and slums clearance were promoted more or less simultaneously and had a tremendous affect on the urban future of Haifa's forming metropolitan area.

The way in which this "bay city" was drafted by Abercrombie, can be seen as a forming urban component that will later on be developed to become the Israeli new town, and therefore as a form of direct ideological continuation of Ebenezer Howard’s garden city idea. But this new town concept had also to be modified and adjust to its new context in the Mediterranean shore.

Fig. 29 – The two first master plans for Haifa and its area – 1934 and 1936

---

New town in a new scale

Besides the ideological continuation that the mechanism of new towns preformed in relation to Howard’s garden city idea, it is interesting to examine the physical and programmed components of Abercrombie’s plan for Haifa bay area and to compare them to the original garden city figures. The distance of Haifa’s bay new town from the old city center of Haifa was (and still is) approximately 7km (measured from the central area of the new town to Haifa's old city center). The plan is spread out on an area of 30,650m² out of which only 15,200m² are designated for residential quarters.

It is hard to estimate the density rate of the residential areas of Abercrombie's plan for there is no indication in its accompanied documents for any kind of population quantity. However it is still possible to appreciate the relation between the basic properties of Abercrombie’s Mediterranean coastal new town to the original spatial and programmatic guidelines of Ebenezer Howard’s prototype. It is obvious that the distance and the detachment quality of Abercrombie’s Bay City concurred essentially with Howard’s 10km recommended distance between the garden city and the old urban center, yet the size of Abercrombie’s new town totally exceeded the 2,000m² area of the 30,000 people garden city prototype. However, it is still possible to determine that these basic figures of Abercrombie’s Mediterranean new town were probably preferable by Howard as they demonstrate a possible decrease of density rather than the forced densification that Geddes’s plan for Tel Aviv had to deal with. In both cases the deviations from the garden city original figures were probably a result of land purchase policies of the Zionist organizations that had commissioned the projects.¹⁰⁷

Eventually, whether it was for the necessity to deal with an immense allotted area, or as an intentional planning principal, Abercrombie had developed his plan in a totally different method, and provided a drawn result that was rendered on an entirely different degree of articulation in comparison to Geddes's plan and report for Tel Aviv. The plan is drafted as a schematic overall territorial division that defines several urban categorical configurations to be outlined through the whole planed area. The accompanied written document is a conventional programmatic regulations paper that provides the required by-laws principles for each type of territorial configuration. It is the most direct implication of planning method that uses zoning as a key principle. It deals more with defining and indicating certain areas and uses in the planed territorial realm, than with the articulation of actual spatial and physical design for the future urban layout. The basic planed unit of Abercrombie scheme is a programmatic zone, and the plan defines six different types of them: Residential, Apartment house, commercial, Industrial, open spaces and public services. Each zone has its own by-laws regulations and is spatially defined by the schematic circulation system of main roads. There isn’t any sub division or a more detailed articulation of a specific urban block, nor any kind of outlining of the relation between the large different zones to the required open spaces of each urban unit. This type of rough schematic outlining creates extensive urban sells that in order to be actually built and developed necessarily calls for a future secondary planning action.

¹⁰⁷ Freund Itzhak - Consulting, planning and promotion of projects ltd, (2008), Master Plan for Haifa, Chapter 2 – The existing planning state - a review of past planning schemes and trends, Haifa municipality Ministry of Interior Ministry of Construction and Housing Israel Lands Administration.
The spatial distribution of Abercrombie’s plan creates a rough perpendicular transformation between the north south orientation of the metropolitan circulation system of main roads and a rail line, to an east west orientation of the more inner city main streets that leads from the metropolitan axes towards the Mediterranean coast. There is a prominent strong one centre to this new town – a thick strip of open spaces surrounded by commercial and public uses arranged in a small urban units at the center of the scheme. Adjacent to this major central area the residential quarters are located, as those that touches the central strip are typed as apartment houses areas and those that are located outwards towards the plan borders are the residential zones with a detached housing typology definition. Each programmatic zone was characterized mainly by the by-laws definitions and regulations that were elaborated in the plan accompanied instructions document. The detached houses residential areas are restricted to a minimum 600 m² plot size with a 20% built area on each plot. However an apartment houses typology is permitted on 15% of the entire zone according to future planning scheme. The apartment houses residential zones have no definition of minimum lot size but rather only a set of distances and set-backs definitions regarding the distance of the built mass from the plot borders. Here also a 20% built area is permitted and a maximum height of four stories or 16m.  
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The evolution of the urban model

From the moment the two expansion projects were implemented on the two cities external areas, a process of significant modification phases began. Because of the significant difference in planning method that each plan had preformed, the implementation and modification phases took as well different courses that had affected the built environment that each plan had produced.

Maximum Garden city

In the case of Geddes's plan for Tel Aviv, after the submission of Geddes's report and preliminary scheme in 1925, a final document was prepared by the Technical Department of the Tel Aviv Municipality and was approved by the city council at 1926. In this plan most of Geddes's preliminary scheme main factors were maintained and Geddes's super blocks were divided to plots. The general circulation system was kept according to the original layout with the clear separation between main throughways and inner home-ways, only varies streets straightening was done as a morphological modification especially at the northern part of the plan.

The second modification phase was the 1938 amendment plan that was actually the only approved plan for this area of Tel Aviv till the recently approved city master plan (approved in 2016). This plan already contained a radical alteration from the Geddes's imagined Mediterranean Garden Village. It is done so by modifying two main attributes that were outlined by Geddes. The elimination of varies inner block public gardens that served as a key component in Geddes's large home-block, and the acceleration of density rates and by defining a totally different relation between the built housing unit to the plot. Instead of maximum two housing units per plot that was indicated by Geddes this plan already permitted 9 flats per plot and a maximum height of three stories or 9 meters for residential housing units.

The modification of Geddes's original garden village residential environment continued constantly over the years in the same direction of raising the density rates by adding further height to the residential unit and thickening its built mass. The result of this process was the typical Tel Aviv apartment house that occupies the majority of Geddes's plan area even today. It is a residential unit of 3-5 floors with normally 4 houses in each floor. This type of residential unit occupies eventually the majority of the plot area. This is also the type of housing where Tel Aviv famous white city modern architecture was embodied. It is a dense excursion of Geddes's large home block, a maximum garden city layout where almost all area of Geddes's block was built up excluding from its original scheme its home privet gardens and many of the public gardens as well.

Two further major types of modifications to Geddes's layout should be mentioned here as well without getting deeper into their detailed characters. One was developed by
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110 Unknown Author, *Town Planning Scheme No.44 - Tel Aviv* (1936). Taken from the Israel Land Authority web site.

young Jewish architects that many of them had acquired their architectural education in Europe; some of them were also Bauhaus students. They came back to Tel Aviv and demanded a greater influence on the city built environment. They criticized Geddes’s layout and its extruded condensed outcome, and strived to perform a further elemental modification on Geddes’s large home block that will provide them a greater freedom in the position of building and in the dimensions of the built volumes themselves. The result of this process was the development of a new type of residential complex that was called "Meonot Ovdim" – Workers dwellings in Hebrew. These were usually constructed of several apartments houses blocks posted next to each other in a manner that creates a central public area surrounded by the housing units and were supposed to generate a strong sense of community within them.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

The third and more recent phase of modification in Geddes's original housing layout is today's insertion of the skyscraper typology into the existed urban fabric. This new typology that stands perhaps on the extreme pole of the garden city environmental characters is most prominent used along Rotschild Bulevard – the original main axes of Tel Aviv's initial settlement. It is inserted to the existing built environment usually at the background of an old housing unit. At this section of Tel Aviv's main boulevard, the existing buildings are usually protected under a sever conservation regulations, so in a way the immense income that the skyscraper typology provides is usually what finance the conservation of the front old building. Without further elaborating this recent development in Tel Aviv and its prominent effect on the city, it is only brought here as a demonstration to an extreme pole of the process of densification that had been constantly affecting the original Geddes's urban layout.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

All of these modifications were a direct result of several waves of population increase and land speculation activity that occurred in the history of the city since Geddes's plan was approved. It demonstrates an interesting process of adaptation of the original layout to new circumstances. Yet an important question needs to be asked: What was left from Geddes's plan? Can his anarchistic inspired garden city be traced today when walking the through the city streets? The answer is that although Tel Aviv today looks nothing like Geddes could have imagined, there is still a great impact of his plan that provides Tel Aviv even today its unique character. It is mostly sensed in the prominent hierarchy in Geddes's circulation system that was constructed to a great extent the way it was originally drafted. One of Tel Aviv's greatest futures is the clear distinction between a bustling and intense urban situation to a complete low key quiet atmosphere places that is located with great proximity to one another. The transformations between these two poles of urban environments can occur sometimes in a meter of simply crossing one street in order to switch between the two urban atmospheres. Another character of Geddes's plan that can be greatly experienced today is the inner block public open spaces that were originally supposed to serve as Geddes's large home block inner core. Although lots of these public open spaces were eliminated or greatly reduced in size through the constant modification process of the original layout, a sufficient amount of them still exists and provides the city a verity of surprising inner
small but qualitative public spaces. In general it is quite possible to state that although nothing of Geddes’s Mediterranean garden city character can be seen in the built mass of Tel Aviv today, his layout, and his original urban principles never stopped to affect the city and probably provide till today its known unique character.

**Filling in the Mediterranean New Town**

In the case of Abercrombie’s plan for Haifa’s Bay-City expansion project, the most obvious evolutionary phase that the plan had required was to fill in the large urban boxes that it had drafted. Abercrombie’s layout dealt mostly with the Indication of major zones of different programs that were framed by the plans core circulation system of main roads and public spaces. Therefore, the final built city was eventually drafted according to several following plans that dealt each one with a different large zone of Abercrombie’s preliminary master plan.

Without elaborating too much all the varies plans that were created during the years, it is important to mention here few of them in order to describe the urban reality that this kind of process had created, and the relation between Abercrombie’s preliminary master plan to the plans that followed it. The first obvious mechanism of this kind of stages planning process is that each plan that continued Abercrombie’s master plan had to develop a secondary circulation and open spaces systems that will arrange the inner urban relations inside the large zones that Abercrombie had drafted, depending of course the size of the zone that was planed. At several cases the general orientation that was originally drafted was preserved by the general orientation that Abercrombie had created and arranged an inner linear open public space that crosses Abercrombie’s large zone from its eastern edge and westward towards the Mediterranean Sea. This was done in a very clear and prominent manner in the several of the first plans that followed Abercrombie master plan, but along the years, that general orientation was
blurred and in other areas of the city it is hard to trace it down. For example the prominent central area that Abercrombie had created didn’t receive a compatible planning solutions in all of the continuing plans and today this center is spotted with buildings that interrupts the linear fluid continuation that Abercrombie had imagined. As more plans continued to follow up Abercrombie's design the situation became more complicated, as some of them didn’t even followed the same allotted borders that were indicated by Abercrombie. In some cases Abercrombie's original zone division is brutally ignored as several zones are mixed up together or cut in the middle by the plan that followed.

In contrast to the evolutionary process that involved an intense modifications and densification of Geddes's original layout in Tel Aviv, in the case of Abercrombie master plan for Haifa's Bay-city, revisions in the built environment hardly occurred, and in many areas of the city an almost similar situation to Abercrombie's original building instructions in terms of building heights and typologies can be encountered even today. This surprising almost freeze situation is probably a result of two combined elements in Abercrombie’s plan. The first element has to do with the entire detached metropolitan situation of Abercrombie's Bay-City and its immense allotted area. These two factors had both affected greatly the city's pace of population growth and densification. Abercrombie’s Bay-City was planned as a clear suburban external area that located 7km away from Haifa's historical urban core. It could have never competed with the natural attractiveness of its metropolitan powerful center, where the international port was built and where naturally all the important commercial and public services of the regional area were located. The further separation act between Haifa's original center and Abercrombie Bay-City by the aggregation of industry along the geographical border of the "Kishon" river located between the two metropolitan entities also intensified the detached situation of this Mediterranean new town.

Finally the fact that a large area of Abercrombie's plan was allotted for apartment houses blocks contributed as well to difficulty of introducing changes and modifications to the built environment. These areas received more strict regulations in Abercrombie's plan that had defined the exact relations between the apartment block to its plot in a way that any addition to its preliminary built situation will cause a too dense environment with unpleasant proximity between the existing buildings to new ones. As a result, the only way to change the built environment of these apartment houses blocks areas is by demolishing the existed buildings and re-construction of an entire section. This of course was a totally unprofitable process considering the extreme low land values of the area and the compensation mechanism that needs to be operated while dealing with each of these areas original inhabitants. The areas that did passes some phases of modification were actually the detached houses residential areas where significant additions to the original residential units had been constructed during the years, still in a relatively slow pace that didn’t resembled in any way the densification of the built residential blocks of Geddes’s plan in Tel Aviv.
Fig. 32 – Some of the infill plans that followed Abercrombie’s master plan. On the top left is a layout for detached houses residential quarter, at the top right a plan for a mixed typologies of apartment houses blocks and detached houses and on the bottom left a plan for coastal apartment houses with a staggered positioning method.
Fig. 33 – Infill project for one of Abercrombie’s plan detached houses residential zones - 1949

Fig. 34 – current view of one of Abercrombie’s apartment houses residential zones.
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