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ABSTRACT

The project I intend to carry out, will examine the issues of the division of a city; what happens when a previously integrated urban system is fractured and the political situation does not permit any contact between the two new systems that are created. What are the results for the city, both as a physical and social environment, when each part develops on its own.

My interest to the subject, comes from the very real example of the political division of my homeland, Cyprus, and its capital Nicosia, ever since 1974. The future of this city is unknown as the political problem is still unresolved. The United Nations Developing Program (UNDP), is currently coordinating and providing technical assistance for a Master Plan for the city, in which both parts are involved. The plan considers on a long term basis Nicosia as one unified city, but on the short term a divided one.

This City Plan project struck my interest; how can you plan for such a condition where there is a reality of a divided environment under present conditions, but accounting for a possibility of re-unification in the long future.

In order to better understand the issues of division of my "own case", and find out some guidelines for planning for the future, I have looked at two comparable situations outside my own environment. These are the examples of Berlin, the best known politically divided city, and Jerusalem, the re-unified city of the present times.

Nicosia's division is not similar in absolute terms with any of the above cases, and it is far less known and important to the world than the previous two. Nevertheless the issues are not dissimilar, nor are the consequences on the physical and social environment of the city.
I hereby wish to express my gratitude to my professor and thesis advisor Julian Beinart for his interest in my thesis and his very helpful recommendations, and my thankfulness to my advisor and thesis reader Gary Hack for his support and concern during the two years of my studies at MIT.

The author comes from Nicosia, Cyprus. She has graduated from the National Technical University of Athens, School of Architecture, (Diploma 1978), and has professional experience in Urban Design and Architectural projects in Nicosia and Athens.
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INTRODUCTION

Nicosia, the divided capital of Cyprus, the "island of love" and a "place of arms". (1,2)

Cyprus and consequently Nicosia, is the homeland of two people: the Greek-cypriots, consisting a majority of 80%, and the Turkish-cypriots, a minority of 18%, each considering as their mother-land Greece and Turkey accordingly.

Since 1974, following the Turkish invasion to the island and the occupation of 40% of the territory by the Turkish forces, Cyprus was divided de facto between its people. The two communities that used to live together in a pattern of interdispersion of Greek and Turkish settlements, scattered all over the island, were enforced to a spatial segregation with the Turkish community now living in the areas occupied by the Turkish army to the North and the Greek community to the South, with no free movement between them.

The Division line runs horizontally through the island, from east to west, and through its very heart: its capital. Nicosia emerged as a divided city, a frontier bastion and a dual capital, shared by its people. Thus the division does not only refer to the physical space, but as well to the human environment that turned into a dichotomization between these linguistically, culturally religiously different worlds.

The division of the physical setting and the dichotomization of the society of Nicosia is not a unique case and belongs to a more general category of problems of dichotomization within the urban setting of cities. Other cities are politically, ethnically and
racially segmented in different degrees and complexities. In such divided urban environments, the conflict is only rarely on one overall issue, and encompasses many urbanological areas. (Benvenisti, 1982)

Benvenisti ranges cities on a scale of conflicts, from the mild and normal micro-level conflict over allocation of public resources, through those which show macro-level dichotomy, to those where polarization resulted in complete physical partition. On such a scale, Boston is one extreme, Montreal is in mid-point, and Berlin, Nicosia and pre-1967 Jerusalem, are the other extreme. Jerusalem of today and Belfast, occupy a position of total dichotomization, but short of complete spatial partition, combining the problem of many cities ranged on the scale of dichotomization.

In order to get some perspective on this general category, in which Nicosia belongs, and examine if some comparable patterns can emerge, I have chosen Jerusalem and Berlin as comparable case studies.

My choice of Berlin as comparable example, refers to the similarity of the complete division of the integrated whole. Both cases of Nicosia and Berlin had a parallel development of the urban setting and comparable physical separation, along similar division lines: their development was an evolution of urban environment round a wall city forming the core of the new development and their physical separation, a tearing through this very heart, a breaking of the concentrating cycles of the urban pattern, and the structures of life. And then is the similarity of the situation where different socio-economic systems prevail in each side of the
dividing line, a lack of freedom of choice and movement between the two parts, the impediment of maximum interaction between people and their urban surroundings, that would characterized a physically unified city. And finally the similarity of disruption of the continuum of the city, relating to the past and projecting the future.

In the case of Jerusalem as comparable example is again the similarity of dichotomization of the physical environment, up to 1967, and of the social environment of nowdays. Nicosia and Jerusalem, both belong to the uneasy world of Middle East, at the cross routes of civilizations with a long history of conquests and cross cultural interactions. Both are the cities of two people. In the case of Jerusalem is the Jews and the Arabs, in the case of Nicosia is the Greeks and the Turks. In both the conflict is perceived by the inhabitants not as a micro-ethnic dispute but as a macronational struggle. The encapsulation of the bi-national conflict into the urban setting make Nicosia and Jerusalem comparable cases. More over Jerusalem has to offer an interesting example of re-unification and its results on both the physical and human environments.

Concluding, the three Cities offer three different but comparable cases:

Berlin is a politically dichotomized environment. It is two political systems, two ideologies but the same people and culture. The dividing line is a concrete wall separating what used to be one group of people.

Jerusalem and Nicosia is a dichotomy of two social
environments, two cultures and religions. The difference between them is that Jerusalem's physical environment is a fairly integrated urban system but Nicosia is still at war with both physical and human environments separated. The dividing line although technically only a cease-fire line, it has divided two people who never did actually constitute a single community.

The analytical framework developed to interpret the three cases, was a separate presentation of the urban development of each within its physical terrain, and the results of the fracture of each system and the consequences on all urbanistic levels. Then their adjusting to the new reality of division and planning strategies and ideological concepts guiding the development of each separated part. The description of the three cities is not strictly consistent, and more emphasis was given to what I consider crucial issues for each.

In the case of Jerusalem I am dealing also with the problems of putting the two parts together after its re-unification and the new planning concepts concerning the re-unified city. Finally, after presenting Nicosia in juxtaposition to the two previous examples, I present an outline of the Nicosia Master Plan and some thoughts on its implementation.

My difficulties in dealing with the above issues, concern a lack of personal knowledge of Berlin and Jerusalem and all my conclusions on the above cases might reflect my limited access to resources. In the case of Nicosia, being a Greek-cypriot myself, I am not permitted an access to the Turkish sector of Nicosia and I lack again a personal experience of the issues of division in that part of the city. Although I have tried to avoid it, my writing on
this subject might reflect my feelings of bitterness and injustice for the fracture of the city of my childhood.
PART I - BERLIN

1. BERLIN - INTRODUCTION

Berlin, the divided city; this is the best known description of the city today. People might not know of the river Spree, which intersects Berlin from southeast to northeast, but they know for sure, the Berlin Wall, which cuts it at its very center, and divides it into two integral urban systems.

Berlin, the frontier city, lies on the line dividing Germany, dividing Europe, dividing the political universe. East Berlin and West Berlin, is the culmination of the dichotomy of two worlds, of two economic, social, political systems. Berlin is in Europe, the city where a direct comparison of the two systems is possible, the ground where these two worlds come close enough, in order for their tensions and competition to result on the rupture of the border area.

Berlin of the past has played many roles through the course of its history that have affected accordingly its urban topography. Berlin was the commercial trade center of Middle Ages, the industrial center of 19th century, the center of science of the 20th century. It was subsequently the capital of the whole Prussia, the capital and metropolis of Germany.

Berlin of the past has served as a military compound and a fortress. It was also the heart of fascism, the city which Hitler wanted to turn into a an instrument of discipline and demonstration of power, composing of axes through which all the people were going to be directed to the center of the nation, the Fuhrer!
And yet Berlin was the humanist city of the 19th century, a center of Enlightenment and Romanticism, of Arts and Science, the host to many architectural ideas and achievements which radiated outwards over all of Germany and the world. Berlin, the "Athens of the Spree" (2).

Berlin of today, half of this urban complexity is still a capital and a showplace for East Germany. The other half being an island, has decreased in status, but nevertheless, remains the cultural capital of West Germany. (1) (Fig. 2)

Today Berlin:

- it is the east and yet the West
- it is the capital and yet a provincial city
- it is an "authoritarian regime" and yet a pluralistic society
- it is the center of Eastern world but lying behind "iron curtain" and yet the "isolated island" of the West, but an "open city".

2. URBAN DEVELOPMENT- A PARALLILISM TO THE TODAY’S SITUATION

The city ended up today almost as it began hundreds of years ago. At its state at birth for then, as now, it was divided into two separate municipalities geographically located on the east and west of the separating line. The difference is that then this separating line was the natural flow or bank of a river, the Berlin’s principal natural environmental feature, that acted not only as the commercial link of the two settlements to the rest of
provinces and Europe, but as well as the communication line to the outside World. Today, the separating line is a man made barrier, a wall to end up the free movement between the two sectors and diminish the role of the city as a meeting place between East and West, a center of contact and exchange of ideas.

The twin settlements of Berlin -Kolln, were established in the second half of the 12th century and served as a reloading point for the goods shipped along the historical trade waterway of Spree. This location, gave importance to the two settlements, the one being a transhipment town(Kolln), the other a trade center, that were growing up together, exchanging services and goods. In the course of the time they developed a road network that intended to integrate water transport and overland routes and which was the precursor of the system of parallel roads that grew up later. Recognizing the advantages of their unification, the two townships were finally amalgamated in 1307. (Fig. 3)

Today the two parts of Berlin are growing apart, developing different infrastructure systems, and network of utilities, fighting to overcome the results of the fragment.

The urban topography of the city was then determined by both physical and natural elements: the river, the island, the street. The island, determined by the flow of the river and one of its minor branches, is the site of medieval Kolln. The street was the connecting link from the castle of Berlin, (which in the meantime had become the official residence of the Electors of Brandenburg, and a fortified city), to the first overspilled outside the walls, towards west, the new district of Dorotheenstadt. This link,
enlarged later into an esplanade, was to become Berlin's grand
boulevard, and the spine of every new development towards West. It
was named after the lime trees which lined its sides into "Unter den
Linten". (Fig. 4)

Today the political topography of Berlin is determined by
demarcation lines, tank-traps, warning buoys, barbed wire and the
Wall. This "Ugly Frontier" is the "landmark" upon which the future
of Berlin's planning is hinged.

Berlin had never had an underlying uniformity, but represented
a collection of distinctive fragments. It was the result of the
conglomeration of separate townships, the product of the continuing
settlement of the surrounding areas, (as Berlin was growing into a
great power, ) and the policy of expansion of the Prussian kings, by
building new towns arround the fortifications. These produced a
diverse environment of discerned urban areas, each one developing as
a particular island, according to the ideals, speculations, planned
and unplanned decisions and events of their time. This would
complete the concept of the "City within the City", the city thus
being composed of many cities, of many places and locations. "It
was the city as a perfect text book in which each period has left
its mark" (Fig. 5) (A.Reidemeister and V.Lampugnani in Post-War
berlin, 1982)

But this did not represent a world of divided entities(3). There
was free movement, there were links and influence of of one
fragment to the other. There were even plans that considered the
whole environment together, Berlin one city, Berlin the capital and
metropolis. (4)
Today we still have distinct environments, but they are un-naturally and defacto cut off from each other. It is two cities out of one city.

In the process of its development, Berlin quickly grew into one of the largest towns in Europe, and into one of the leading economic and industrial centers. After the founding of German Empire in 1871, the former capital of the Prussian kingdom developed into an impressive metropolis, a center of political life and economic and intellectual hub.

Of decisive importance for the development of Berlin was the construction of the German railway system in the middle of 19th century. Parallel to this the waterway network was also extended and canals were constructed to provide southern bybass route around Berlin by water. (Fig. 6)

In 1920, sixty-seven surrounding towns and cities, recognizing the importance of the coordination, lost their political and administrative independence to merge with the capital of Germany, and encompass Greater Berlin.

Berlin gaining power in its unity, and its status as a capital and a center of culture and technology of Greater Germany, and the world, being central to commercial routes, having established a central railway system, radiating and opening to all directions, opening to influences and involvement beyond its boundaries, it became in 1939, the greatest industrial and commercial city on the continent of Europe and the sixth largest town in the world. It encompassed a very large area of 341 miles, with a population of 4,2 millions.
All these systems and functions of the city collapsed when Berlin became a divided and border city in 1948. Ever since, two administratively separate cities, two urban entities have led a parallel existence. It has two mayors, two currencies, two postal systems, two urban development plans, and two time zones.

Due to its large size, the result of the division of Berlin, was two urban systems, large and sufficient enough to exist as two separated and integral urban entities. But the very fact of the unnatural way this division was imposed on the urban fabric, carries with it political as well as urbanological consequences.

3. THE DIVISION OF BERLIN

3a. DIMENSIONS OF DIVISION ON THE URBAN COMPLEXION

The Wall in Berlin, is the most important determining factor of urban development for both parts of the city. For the East it symbolizes an Anti-fascist wall and for the West a tyrannical regime's moral bankruptcy symbol. But what it really is, is the break in the structure not only of the urban patterns, road network system and sewage plan, but as well as the break in the structures of life, history, culture, politics, ideology and economics.

The wall of 1961, has not only split Berlin into two separate cities, but as well as into two separate systems and ideologies. One city reflects the intentions of official Marxism-Leninism and the
other reflects those of official Liberal Democracy. The conceptual framework and the spiritual dimension to progress have very different focuses that can lead to very different results on the urban space. Each city is radiating its ideas and receiving its influences from only one direction. The open system has broken up.

RESULTS ON THE URBAN FABRIC

The demarcation line of the wall, that defines the division of the city, runs in a zigzag line from north to south, along Berlin’s district boundaries, tearing rather than cutting the city in half. If one looks at a map of Berlin right before the division, they could clearly identify the city’s concentric circles pattern of growth, with radiating streets, the traditional pattern of growth round an existing strong core. It is a spider’s web as Walter Nelson describes it, with the District Mitte (meaning "Berlin Center"), as the inner hub. This area used to be the heart and brains of Greater Berlin, containing the city’s functions as a capital and its significance for the world. (Fig. 7)

In the concentric circles which lie beyond, there used to be traditional city gates, of which only the Brandenburg Gate stands as a remnant of the old city walls. The "ring" formed by these city gates enclosed the oldest Berlin districts, actually suburban when first settled, but very built up and central today: Dorotheenstadt, Friedrichstadt, Luisenstadt, Vorstadt and Konigsstadt. The next concentric circle was formed by a circular railway, the Ringbahn, which enclosed six Berlin districts. From the center of this urban web, the city’s roads and railways, both the underground system of the U_Bahn and the surface and elevated lines of the S-Bahn, where
radiating. (Fig. 8a)

This urban system collapsed after all that has happened during the years following the separation of the city. The concentric pattern was disconnected, the physical connections were broken, the telephone lines were cut, and the essential life lines were interrupted: social contacts, railways, underground lines, the S-Bahn, electricity, gas, radio and television, food and trade, and the recreation too. The city that has been built and developed to function as one, with distinct separation of land uses and interdependency between the different districts, was cut into two. The old heart of the city, the center of business activity and host of some of the most important cultural institutions is now a border area within East Berlin. It has stopped to pulse at the rythm of the whole Berlin, as it was cut off its physical connection to the open recreation area of Tiergarten, and its social and official life centered upon Unter den Linten: its academy of Fine arts its opera and its museum that remained in the West Berlin. East Berlin was cut off this intellectual area, inheriting the industrial suburbs of north and east.

The main components of its urban topography, that use to make the urban scene of Berlin before, were either lost during the War or interrupted by the division. The structural symbols of its national and international stature were almost all destroyed by the War. The majority of its government and administration buildings, the embassies and legations of foreign powers, were obliterated. Stadtaschloss, the residence of the former sovereigns, and the landmark upon which the future of Berlin's planning was hinged, had
disappeared from the city's panorama. The core of the city itself, that grand central source of Berlin's power, whose impetus used to penetrate the country and far into the world, was all but a desert.

This destruction of the traditional urban patterns upon which the development of the whole Berlin was based, was completed by the division. Unter den Linden, the base line for every major expansion program towards West in the early stages of the urban development of Berlin and the link to the outer suburbs, had become a dead end street, ending against the Brandenburger gate. This gate, the very connecting node of the center with the suburbs, was transmitted into a patrol checking point on the border line. The connection of the center with the Tiergarten area was lost, and as well as the correlation of the Tiergarten with the Friedrechstadt that had always been one of the most characteristic attractions of Berlin. (Fig. 8b)

One of the most popular songs written around the turn of the century, when Berlin boomed, by Walter Kollo called "So lang noch Unter 'n Linden" proclaims:

"So lang noch "Unter 'n Linden"
Die alten Baume bluhn,
Kann nichts uns überwinden,
Berlin bleibt doch Berlin"

"So long as the old trees still bloom on Unter den Linden, Berlin remains Berlin and nothing can vanquish us".

SOCIAL SPACE

There is no free movement and freedom of choice of location in the divided city any more. (5) Daily passage through the Wall, without controls, checks or harassments of any kind is allowed only to West Berlin's sewage and the flow of the river. The city as a
meeting place for social contacts and exchange center of ideas, of goods, of service (6), cannot function as such any more. The maximum interaction of people and their urban surroundings is impeded. The human ties have broken and the known routes for social contacts and recreation are stopped. Physical environments that used to be familiar and protective are not accessible for all. Apart from these sociological consequences of the division are the psychological problems involved, of adjusting to the new situation.

TRANSPORTATION (Fig. 9)

Since the construction of the Wall, Greater Berlin's transportation system has also been divided. The circular railway system with the main railways and roads radiating from the center was cut into middle. The growth of Berlin during the nineteenth century was virtually rendered possible by the development of this railway traffic as a means of mass transportation. Thanks to the proposals of August Orth, the cities of London and Berlin have, since 1867, been developed as open cities with unlimited possibilities of extension, furnished with a radial rapid-railway-system going as far as the heart of the cities (Haupstadt Berlin, 1960). This openness of the city, was restricted after the division as each part of the divided Berlin, has limited direction of growth .

Some Western-run subways still run under East Berlin territory, while others, running along the border, have fallen into disuse. The proposed modernization of the run-down S-Bahn system and the extension of the subway system of West Berlin, run into difficulties because of the technical, economic, ownership and sovereignty
issues concerned. Even seemingly "technocratic", transportation issues are unable to ignore the boundaries of, and within, this unique urban scene. (Hiilenbrand 91, 1980). (7)

BOUNDARIES

The city as an open system has another meaning as well. It has weak boundaries as is a system open to issues coming from many different sources (including sources outside the city), and open to reach and channel back any resources available in its immediate region. The divided city, as a fragmented whole, has lost this flexibility as each part has no easy access to all resources available and is open to only one direction, as its boundaries are more strictly defined.

The boundaries of Berlin as a divided city have changed and increased in importance. No other city in the world is more aware and dependent upon its boundaries than West Berlin. East Berlin's city limits imperceptibly merge with the East Germany countryside, but West Berlin's are more precisely defined. It is an island, a fortified frontier cut off from its hinterland, limited to its growth and development within its own boundaries. West Berlin has no countryside to dependent upon for resources, and the road, rail and air "access routes" are all strictly defined. The possibilities for development and growth constantly run up against the new borders and the conditions of separation. (Fig. 2). (Hillenbrand 84 & 209, 1980)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The division affected also the economic development of the city which had to face also the economic destruction from the War. Five
years after the end of the War, Berlin was a city of unemployed workers, unhappy families, old people. The population had been reduced considerably. When Hitler started the World War II, the city's population was 4.2 millions and by the time he committed suicide, six years later it had been cut almost in half. With the division of the city the interdependency and interexchange between the two areas of the city, east and west, that could compensate for the loss, breaks. The supply of labor from East to West and the supply of services from west to east, stops. The supply of resources from the countryside to west was also affected.

EFFECTS ON EACH PART

East Berlin inherited the old center and the poorer suburbs of the north and east. Their economy grew much more slowly than that of the Western zones, and a mass exodus of skilled workers to West Berlin began. (8). The construction of the Wall in 1961, ensued stability and enabled the regime to implement the "construction" of East Berlin without any direct dialogue with the West. On East German maps of the city, West Berlin is blanked out, as if it were a lake such as that bordering Chicago. (Doug Clelland, Post-war Berlin, 1982)

West Berlin was more severely affected than East Berlin. 75% of its economic capacity was destroyed as opposed to 48% of the east part (Hillenbrand 108, 1980)

The insular situation of the city and loss of its functions as capital and the suffering of West Berlin with respect to structural adjustments, were events that marked its economic development. It is a city which cannot compensate for losses in the center of town
through suburban growth as the other West German cities. The natural supply and purchase areas around Berlin were cut off. The division marked life in the city with its external uncertainties as a "frontier city". This in turn affected economic and political strategies and investment plans due to the political uncertainties, and detracted from West Berlin's attractivity as site for industries. (9) (Hillebrand 209, 1980)

Gerhard Mensch (in the Future of Berlin, 1980), writes that the process of adaptation has not only damaged the Berlin economy, but also helped it, as the shift of investment away from economic areas that were only suited to the former functions of Berlin as a capital city and melting pot. East Berlin is a capital, but West Berlin has to find another role to play. The city tried to increase its share of services in the fields of higher education, research and culture and re-establish its role as an international center of such services. Today West Berlin has more institutions of higher learning than any other German city. Hillebrand suggests that Berlin can and should serve as a laboratory for urban innovation, but it should be built upon a realistic assessment of the resources of manpower, capital, organization and technology available in the city.

The insular situation has also affected its demographic development. West Berlin has the older population distribution in West Germany. It is a city of old ladies and the structure of its population reveals that the city is dying (10) (Fig. 10). On the other hand, East Berlin as the official capital of East Germany, the Haupstadt of the "German Democratic Republic", acts as a magnet
for the nation's youth and is more of a center for them than an outpost. It has that youthful atmosphere of a healthy and growing city. (11)

The division of the city, the economic development coupled with a high unemployment rate, have brought about a complete change in migration behavior and hence in population structure. More than any other German city Berlin attracted new residents. But the situation that evolved in Germany after the war reversed the tide of immigrants. Since 1972, the balance in the population exchange between West Berlin and West Germany has been negative: more people have left the city than have moved to it. Contrasting to this was the foreign immigrants constant flow in Berlin, . The concentration of such groups on the abandoned border areas has put a heavy strain on the social infrastructure. (Berlin, 1980)

3b. THE BERLIN WALL – SOME DESCRIPTIONS

Klaus Pascal Schoning, in Post-War Berlin (1982):

An ideological, social and aesthetic border. A death-line. A wall to isolate people from people who do not want to be isolated, cutting through families and friends.

An unexpected, unknown, shocking event, a break which you can't, you wouldn't believe, one which you don't want to accept. Its as arresting as an earthquake ravine or a flooded river; a natural yet hellishly unnatural thing. Such phenomena one can cross and see and then attain the opposite bank but this you can touch but you cannot cross.

But a unique and crucial part of the tissue of West Berlin

"Wall power": near the Wall people live another life as compared with that in the glittering parts
of West Berlin. Students, artists, freaks, poor people, political radicals and foreigners are attracted here because of low rents.

A lost area with people in it, with limited choices- to be criminals, to be anti-social, to be social revolutionaries, or more positively to contribute to the cultural underground.

Walter Nelson in THE BERLINERS

Five hundred thousand square yards of "forbidden zone ", and ten yards of "death-strip" on the eastern side. Dead-end streets, few people , empty fields, deserted neighborhoods, on the central downtown areas of the Western side. But still stores, workshops, inhabitants and a general air of normal life in some residential areas of the Western side.

Martin Hillebrand, in THE FUTURE OF BERLIN,1980

A negative factor in any realistic assessment of the strengths and weakness of the city

An evocative part of the city were that excitement of front-line atmosphere, still lingers on.

3c. DIVISION - SUMMARY

1. Two culturally, ideologically, symbolically urban environments emerged out of the division of Greater Berlin. The 2.8 million Berliners, who were living in the city when the War ended, and who were culturally forming a relatively coherent group of people were split into two. Eversince a divergent physical environment, a cogglomeration of different townships, but a much similar human environment was dichotomize. The result was a polarized society. The question is how different are the people who live in both parts of Berlin today? And is it the system that makes the people, or
the people impose their cultural rules to the system?

2. The Wall of Berlin is the most important factor that determines the development for both parts, economically and spatially. Especially West Berlin given its geographic position is more vulnerable than East Berlin.

Hillebrand writes: "Security is more than physical security; it also operates at the psychological level." And those who are expected to contribute to the long-range future of the city must feel secure in their lives and their investments.

3. The future of Berlin is not so sure. But in planning for this unknown future, Berliners must act on the basis of realistic assumptions. For Hillebrand the basic premise is that "for the foreseeable future, Berlin will remain divided, since the conditions necessary for reunification of the city in a manner acceptable to the West will continue to be lacking."

Given these assumptions, Berlin either in west or in east has to consider its weakness that come out of its division. West Berlin has to learn not only how to live with its vulnerabilities but turn them into sources of strength. East Berlin is a capital, a showplace for socialism, but West Berlin has to find a new role to play in order to survive out of its insular situation.

It is a sad irony that the Wall has become the most potently effective tourist attraction imaginable.
4a. PLANNING IN BERLIN AS A WHOLE

When the War ended, both parts of the city shared the phenomena of ruins and ashes. With the division of Berlin and the rupture of the urban fabric, each part had to be reconstructed in order to accommodate a self-sufficient level of services into an urban system, built and structured to function as an integrated whole.

Normally the growth of a city is a function of its position into a given landscape and natural environment. In the case of Berlin of the Post-War period, this will be also true only that the political and urbanological dimensions of its division will be the major factor influencing its development.

In this divided environment, normal urban growth and development patterns could not operate, and the location of commercial and other specialized areas was to be determined by different factors than in a unitary city. The same would be true of the organization and distribution of public transportation facilities. (Hillebrand 291, 1980). Reserved areas for the population and for the functions of the city as a whole, the axial planning system that dominated the planning concepts of the pre-war era, the spatial extension of the city toward's its countryside, all had to be reconsidered within this process of adjusting to the new situation.

After the division of the city, the political tensions between the two ideologies were increasing, but a reunified Germany, and therefore a reunified Berlin were still vital issues. Until the
Wall was built in 1961, planning was mooted for the city as whole, by both ideological camps. But both reflected in their own way their ideological belief of how progress towards human ends could be achieved (13), (Fig.11).

Eversince, competition of the two systems is the keynote in Berlin. And if West Berlin competes with West German cities, to regain its role as the cultural capital, East Berlin competes with West Berlin. East Germany works furiously at making East Berlin into a show-case for Communism. Political power, national prestige, and international status all are given more consideration than people. It is Planning at the service of politics. (Nelson)

4b. URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING IN WEST BERLIN

West Berlin has never accepted the division. The concept of unity was present in West Berlin’s planning proposals for the center of the city at least for the first two decades after the division.

Having lost its sharing in the center of old Berlin, which had always been the financial, business, and government heart of the capital as well as its fashionable entertainment center, West Berlin needed to establish its own commercial and cultural district. It has been careful, however, to avoid creating a rival "City" to the one East Berlin is now busy building. (14)

The first replanning proposals for the city of Berlin encompassed all the city, West and East, for the city was not
officially split until 1948. They were made by professor Hans Scharoun, one of the city’s leading architects and then building commissioner who was faced with the unlimited opportunities provided by the nearly destroyed Berlin. Recognizing this circumstance, Scharoun assembled a team to devise a completely new city, one which would serve generations to come. What is amazing about this early plan is that it is still followed in some ways today, despite the division of the city. (Nelson 358)

Part of Professor Scharoun’s plan consisted of two separate "belts", the one cultural and the other commercial, so situated that their buildings march inexorably toward, rather than away from, the old "City" in East Berlin. This was to follow the old idea of counteracting the shift of the city westwards with a strip or band structure. These belts may be followed today in the attempt of West Berlin’s planners to preserve unity with a succession of central public institutions known as the "cultural band" or "strip" and a parallel band of high-density construction and multifunctional activities (15). The idea was to link the Zoo in the West and the old city center and re-establish the traditional connection of Tiergarten with Unter den Linten and Friedrichstadt (16). The East Berlin authorities appear also to be faithful to much of Scharoun’s original plan. A Nelson notes, this means that, as far as the city planners are concerned, there is no wall, no artificial barriers of any kind (Fig.12a)(17). (Nelson 358, , Werner A.D. 1982).

In the years following the separation, unity seemed to be ensured by the idea of the Autobahn network, which was unofficially agreed by both sides in the mid-1950s and whose inner city tangents
were oriented to Berlin as a whole. (18)

But the concept of unity remained a blueprint in transport planning. In the late 1950s, all personal relations and unofficial agreements were broken. And although there were concrete alignment profiles, the two sides of the socialist fence began more and more to go their own ways (19). (Nelson A.D. 1982)

Nevertheless, although the concept of unity never progressed very far it remained an overhanging concept in West Berlin planning. It was evident in the organization of an architectural competition for the city center as a whole, in the late 1950s, which was still largely in ruins. It was one of the biggest tasks in the world history of urban planning.

The Competition, HAUPTSTADT BERLIN, that took place in 1961 was aiming to the reconstruction of the inner core of the city, to accommodate central location of specialized functions. Berlin of the future was to serve as the capital and metropolis of the whole German as it did in the past.

The traditional ties arising from respect for the peculiar historical features of Berlin, were to guide the direction of a new city arrangement (20). Part of the competition area belonged to the East Berlin’s sector, and so it was emphasized to preserve the conditions under which the future development of the city center remained possible in accordance with the conceptions gained from the competition.

Certainly West Berlin was looking for its lost urban identity emphasizing the links to its historic center from which it was cruelly separated. But with the then existing political situation,
the competition of Hauptstadt Berlin, could only be of demonstrative value for the concept of a Capital City.

What had really happened in Berlin in the following years, was a process of decentralization that favored subordinate centers, away from the traditional core that was now inaccessible. (Hillebrand 86, 1980)

Berlin had always had a polycentric structure—each city district with its own historic and functional center—and already before the war numerous functions shifted in the course of their own independent development away from Berlin’s center to other districts. In the absence of the usual downtown area, there was an increase in the importance of district centers in the years following division. Berlin as Dr. von der Ohe discusses, moved away from a sector model towards a multiple nuclei model, in the process of developing into two separate cities, with the polycentric structure gaining increasing importance"(21). (Willebrand 86, 1982)

Town planning in Berlin as a whole came to a halt in the mid-1970s, following the political development. At present therefore there are no common features in the two center concepts. In West Berlin the logical conclusion of autonomous development has been drawn, and in 1974 a competition was organised for the former diplomatic quarter south of the Tiergarten, the Hansa Quarter, which had been kept in reserve. (Werner, A.D.1982)

Once again the concept of unity was brought up, when in 1984 the IBA, the building exhibition in West Berlin, attempted to make up some of the loss of identity in Berlin civic planning. That meant concentrating on the city as a whole; through the location and
design of the West Berlin buildings in relation to the historical city center in the East, and especially in the confrontation with the architectural principles held in East Berlin. (Werner, A.D., 1982)

With respect to urban design and architecture in West Berlin, the period immediately before and for some fifteen years after the building of the Wall in 1961, was marked by some immense housing projects, major business, university and cultural "ghettos" and commercial redevelopment in the central area. West Berlin was reconstructed to meet the needs of a cultural city, an education center for West Germany and for all Europe. A preference for demolition that would mark a new start for Berlin, and a need for bricks cost the erase of many important historical buildings that although damaged had survived the war. The result was not only a city without a history but a city without a face; the emergence of technology and industry through hugely increased wealth, and standardised, prefabricated building systems for enormous new districts, produced the neutral and abstract qualities of Berlin of the post-war period. (Clelland, A.D. 1982)

One of the important decisions for the landscape of Berlin, the city planners made after the war, was to extend the green spaces. These do not only include parks and woods, but also trees along the avenues, grassy strips in the center lanes of the city's boulevards, flower beds everywhere, and lawns in front of most new apartment houses. Today, despite the desperate need of the city for space, two-thirds of West Berlin consist of woods, farmland, water, lawns, gardens, recreation and sports fields, and of landscaped "belts"
alongside downtown avenues and canals.

The phrase of a city construction official that Nelson reports: "we'd rather put up landscaped areas than hospitals", reveals the difference between the two systems across the wall, of how progress towards human ends can be achieved. (Nelson 361)

4c. URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING IN EAST BERLIN

While West did not accept the division, and was always seeing Berlin connected to its historic center, East was trying to establish it. As early as 1950, East Berlin presented independent plans for the city. In the planning concepts of East Berlin, the aim was not to link with the Western parts of the city, but simply to give the historical center new form and purpose. This aim was strengthen when the frontier was closed in 1961. (Werner, A.D.1982)

In contrast to the concept of the "cultural corridor street" of the western sector, which was to lead towards, rather than away from the old city center, the idea of the eastern sector was to shift the city center to the east. This decision was influenced by the fact that the old city center, and above all the former government quarter on Wilhelmstrasse, was now near the border with West Berlin, and on the periphery of the new capital. The new regime was in accordance with the old idea of counteracting the shift of the city westwards. In the first half of the twentieth century the city of Berlin had slowly but steadily moved westwards, while the eastern parts of the center with their old buildings sank
into economic decline. Now this idea was followed by the soviet authorities, but not in order to balance development with the other part of the city, but only to follow the only direction of growth available. (Fig.12b)

Along with this concept of eastward direction of development, the "Sixteen Principles of City Planning" were established in 1950 (22). With these principles, GDR decided in 1950 against the dissolution of the cities, against the garden city and against the row structure. Workplaces, residential areas and cultural and leisure areas were all to exist on an equal footing, one beside the other with green areas in between. Thus, traditional shopping centers, like the Friedrichstrasse district, were reinstated, while West Berlin was planning shopping and entertainment "strips", and cultural bands (23).

According to the 16 principles, the pattern of every big city was to be determined by its squares, main streets and public buildings. The Central Square with a Central Building and Central Axis, were to form the basic components of city planning, supplemented by further elements such as the S-Bahn railway and the course of the river Spree. The axis and the square were the spatial expression of the new forms of communication as they had been in National Socialist designs: demonstrations, announcements, parades, national celebrations (Fig.13), (24). (Werner, A.D.1982)

After 1961, town planning in the GDR began to orient to international standards, ie to technocratic models. The street network, especially around Alexanderplatz, was adjusted to take a greater volume of traffic; The Frankfurter Str. renamed Karl Marx
Allee, has been widened and straightened to lead into a much enlarged Alexander Platz. The demolition of the royal palace (Stadtschloss), enabled Unter den Linden to debouch into Marx-Engels Platz thus forming a location for a city center for East Berlin (25). The shift of the center eastwards, away from the border was becoming a reality.

In order to keep with the principles of urban construction in the GDR, residential complexes were built around the historical core of the city, especially after 1965. This was in contrast to the "capitalist" trend of west Berlin to move out of the city. And as West Berlin was decentralized, East Berlin center was becoming more dense, as the housing areas were located on the periphery of the new city center, at the same time forming a border on the southern side to West Berlin (Leipzigerstrasse). Furthermore, sections of the central axis were built to demonstrate the standardised industrial building method which was them being propagated: residential buildings between Alexanderplatz and Strausberger Platz and offices in Unter den Linden.

New building forms were adapted (e.g. curbed residential buildings); the population density was increased by means of residential tower blocks to make maximum use of the valuable inner city sites. The idea of the "forum" for the government facilities completes the effort to give the historic center new form and purpose.

At the same time the areas close to the border were almost abandoned. In the former government quarter in Wilhelmstrasse, in the western part of Friedrichstadt and very close to the border line, where an important number of state institutions were located
before the division, now only the Soviet embassy and Ministry of the Interior still stand.

Another important difference between the planning concepts of West and East Berlin, that originated from the 16 planning principles, was that while the Western sectors were rebuilt and modernized, East has decided to preserve its historical structure and create new elements by providing the comfort and hygiene lacking in older buildings. The new city of the GDR, was to be national in form, that is it was to take local architectural traditions into account. Berlin was to be the symbol of "national rebirth in a democratic Germany". (Werner, A.D. 1982)

Nevertheless, East Berlin is changing almost beyond recognition. The city is transforming into the great capital of GDR, using USSR as the "great model". The structure of the city center with its square and axes corresponds to the Eastern Bloc notions of the 1950s, according to which town planning and architecture were to echo the structure of power. Reconstruction, beginning in 1952 when the street then called "Stalinallee" was remodelled into a Soviet-style boulevard, has made little allowance for the old building substance of the city. On the site of the City Palace, the Hohenzollen residence for centuries, the urban planners built the Palace of the Republic. The old houses on Fisher's Island were also torn down and replaced by new apartment skyscrapers. The old Academy of Architecture, gave way to a new building for the GDR Foreign Ministry. (Berlin 1980, Werner A.D. 1982)

On the other hand, at the same time historical edifices along the avenue Unter den Linden were scrupulously repaired and restored:
the Palace of Emperor William I, the opera, the St. Hedwig's Cathedral, the old Royal Library and other.

5. SUMMARY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT ISSUES IN BOTH SIDES

Each side of the wall is going its own way. The concepts and urban patterns are very different and each part is developing in its own terms. The city is not any more the collection of two divided parts, but two cities in themselves, in all urbanological terms. Different political systems, different ideologies, different economic perspectives and sociological attitudes.

1). East Berlin is a city made out of political realities, different than those of the West. East Berlin stands as a symbol of a city built for the social needs of people, a city unencumbered by the uncertainty and stratification of a pluralist democracy. West Berlin is aiming to be a model for West European planning, a model for a creative modern city. East Berlin and West Berlin. It is social realism versus technology and design. (Clelland and Werner A.D.1982)

Each project completed in East Berlin is a step towards a socialist world and cannot therefore be appraised as architecture by other criteria. Each project completed in West Berlin is a success towards survival out of its insular situation, and a vehicle moving the city towards its establishment as the humanist city. "In
the West, despite similar pragmatic industrial pressure to those in the Soviet Bloc, radical ideas are beginning to lead to a wider conceptual framework than that of material progress, which is still the official dogma in the East. (Clelland, and Clelland A.D. 1982)

2). In West Berlin, the destruction of the old city was welcomed as the first stage in the creation of the new city, the modern city. Since the War there has been a massacre of historical buildings as no other German city. West Berlin is gaining its new modern "face". In East Berlin, reconstruction means preserving the tradition and architectural heritage. In the GDR they spoke of "building" and not "rebuilding" their cities after the war: they wanted to retain the urban and architectural structures they had inherited from the past but at the same time they wanted to eliminate the old faults, especially in housing. (Clelland and Leatherbarrow A.D. 1982)

3). In West Berlin they were emphasizing the intense greeness of the "green city" idyll, so much as it was unable to be urban. In East Berlin they were voting against the dissolution of the cities, against the garden city.

4) But East Berlin, is untypical as a city of other cities in the GDR. "East Berlin is untypical of life as whole." (Werner, 1972). East Berlin, due to its strategic confrontation with West Berlin, is understandably more extreme in certain respects than other Eastern European cities. In comparison with other Eastern capitals, it has a higher standard of living. On the other hand, although "there is today in West Berlin a provincial urban milieu when compared
with Western capital cities", and its residents have the lowest density of cars of all major German cities, West Berliners are better off than East Berliners. (Werner A.D. 1982)

5) Moreover, West Berlin is an open city; open to cultural and intellectual influences. Events in the economic, socio-political and cultural areas in West Berlin are closely connected with events in other regions. Martin Hillenbrand writes: "The fact remains that West Berlin, even without top-rank achievements and successes in every case, is one of the world centers—both as treasury and laboratory—of culture, and that East Berlin does not now play this role for Eastern Europe, although thirty years ago it appeared destined to maintain its leading position." (Hillebrand 282, 1980)

6) In terms of urban development, West Berlin is decentralizing while East Berlin is recentralizing. East is moving deliberately away from the border, shifting its center of activity eastwards, while West is trying to orient activities towards the old center, on the other side of the border.
FIG. 2 THE ISLAND POSITION OF WEST BERLIN
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Showing Zones of Occupation and German losses in the East
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Source: "The shaping of Postwar Germany" Edgar McInnis
FIG. 3. THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT OF BERLIN
13th and mid 17th century

(Source: Internationale Bauausstellung Berlin 194, Dokumente)

A. CITY MAP OF CÖLLN, beginning of the 13th century. Extension to the commercial trading street to a square; four parallel streets connect the street with the mooring stages on the tributary of the Spree.

B. CITY MAP OF BERLIN, the first half of the 13th century. Five major streets surround the market place.

C. CITY MAP OF BERLIN, second half of the 13th century.

D. PLAN OF BERLIN AND CÖLLN, 1652
E. BERLIN, 1688, based on a perspective view by Johann Schultz.

F. CITY PLAN OF BERLIN, 1685, based on an engraving by La Vigne. The map shows the fortification system built during 1658-83 to enclose Berlin-Colln and the new town of Friedrechwerder with the Royal Palace in the center. To the West the new settlement of Dorotheenstadt and its connecting link to the fortifications, the later grand boulevard of Unter den Linten.
FIG. 5: BERLIN AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS TOWNSHIPS
17th to 19th century

B. MAP OF BERLIN SHOWING EXPANSION FROM THE 17th TO THE 19th CENTURY
FIG. 6: DEVELOPMENT OF THE RAIL-BOUND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, 1846 - 1933

Source: Wolters

Source: Westernanns Deutscher Reichs-Atlas, Braunschweig 1933
FIG. 7: GREATER BERLIN BEFORE ITS DIVISION
FIG. 8: THE DIVISION OF BERLIN

Source: "The Shaping of Postwar Germany", Edgar McInnis.

Detail

Brandenburg Gate
Unter den Linden
Tiergarten
"The subway train on line No.8, leaves the last illuminated station in W.Berlin at Moritzplatz only to stop again 7 stations later at Voltastr. while passing six dimly lit and gun patrolled stations underneath the busy downtown of East Berlin. No.6 also runs under East Berlin territory stopping at Friedrichstr. station an onesided border checkpoint. These trips belong to the most memorable experience for anybody living in, or visiting Berlin." (Hillenbrand, 1980)
FIG. 10: WEST AND EAST BERLIN; DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

The Districts of Berlin (area and population)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berlin (West) district</th>
<th>area (ha)</th>
<th>population (1980)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Tiergarten</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>73,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wedding</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>135,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kreuzberg</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>130,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Charlottenburg</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>153,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Spandau</td>
<td>8,838</td>
<td>196,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Wilmersdorf</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>131,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Zehlendorf</td>
<td>7,058</td>
<td>84,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Schöneborn</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>142,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Steglitz</td>
<td>3,197</td>
<td>169,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Tempelhof</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>183,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Neukölln</td>
<td>4,490</td>
<td>280,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Reinickendorf</td>
<td>8,932</td>
<td>234,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Berlin (West)</th>
<th>area (ha)</th>
<th>population (1970)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48,005</td>
<td>1,896,230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Berlin municipal district</th>
<th>area (ha)</th>
<th>population (1978)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Mitte</td>
<td>1,070</td>
<td>92,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Prenzlauer Berg</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>187,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Friedrichshain</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>137,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Treptow</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>125,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Köpenick</td>
<td>12,730</td>
<td>128,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lichtenberg</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>229,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Weißensee</td>
<td>4,620</td>
<td>88,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Pankow</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>138,896</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

East Berlin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Berlin</th>
<th>area (ha)</th>
<th>population (1978)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,300</td>
<td>1,128,983</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Districts of Berlin

[Map of Berlin showing districts]
FIG. 11: CONCEPT OF UNITY IN WEST BERLINERS' PLANNING

1 Gerhard Siegmann: competition project ‘Round and about the Zoo’, 1948.

2 Spengelin, Eggeling and Pempelfort: winning scheme for the ‘Hauptstadt’ competition of 1958 including the centre of East Berlin.

3. Flächeunutzungs plan 1957
WEST BERLIN PLANNING CONCEPTS
CULTURAL AND COMMERCIAL BELTS, DIRECTED TOWARDS OLD CITY CENTER

EAST BERLIN PLANNING CONCEPTS
THE SHIFT FROM THE OLD CENTER
THE CENTRAL SQUARE, THE CENTRAL AXIS AND CENTRAL BUILDINGS

FIG. 12: THE PLANNING CONCEPTS IN WEST AND EAST BERLIN

WEST BERLIN
- Bismarckstrasse
  Cultural buildings
  (German Opera, Schiller theater)

- Kurfuerstendamm
  Europa Center
  Shops, theaters, restaurant

EAST BERLIN
- Marx-Engels and Alexander Platz
  The new symbolic and ceremonial center, with its central buildings

- Unter den Linden
  Much wider and enlarged, forming the central axis of development

- Kaiserdamm District
  Banks, wholesale houses office buildings

- Ernst Reuter Platz
  Tuchh. University, Academy of fine Arts and Music

- Lützow Quarter
  New hotels, theaters, restaurants

- Cultural District
  Philharmonic hall
  Congress Hall
  Libraries
  National Gallery
  Friedrichstrasse
  Pedestrian Mall in future
FIG. 13: PLANNING OF CITY CENTER IN EAST BERLIN
(Source: Architects' Journal, June 1970)

1 Plan of city centre before destruction.
The two long axes, Unter den Linden from the west and Frankfurter Strasse from the south-east, never came together satisfactorily. Unter den Linden ended in the square dominated by the royal palace, the cathedral and Schinkel's old museum. The Frankfurter Str found its way by devious means to the Alexander Platz.

2 Proposed plan of city centre. The new plan sets out to provide East Berlin with a symbolic and ceremonial centre of grandiose proportions (bold outline). The Frankfurter Str, renamed first Stalin Allee and now Karl Marx Allee, has been widened and straightened to lead into a much enlarged Alexander Platz. Unter den Linden now debouches into Marx-Engels Platz, deprived of the royal palace and with the old museum and new parliament building looking somewhat lost in the vast acreage. The square is bounded by the two arms of the Spree, but effectively extends eastwards as far as the Alexander Platz. The long vista is closed at the west end by the new Ministry for Foreign Affairs and is dominated at the east end by the 360m high television tower. (Number key to both maps: 1 Brandenburger Tor, 2 Humboldt University, 3 State Opera, 4 Palace of the Empress Victoria, 5 arsenal, 6 old museum, 7 cathedral, 8 royal palace, 9 city hall)

3 Model for the new Lenin Platz in an area north of the Karl Marx Allee which has been completely rebuilt. The square is roughly where the old Landsberger Platz used to be, and the garden to the north has been made into a hill—about the only one in what must be one of the flattest cities in the world—out of the rubble from war destruction. The new garden will be laid out as a memorial to the bombing, and a restaurant—the focal point to the north-south axis—will crown the top. The curved blocks of housing are a welcome departure from earlier rectilinear layouts, even if the relationships of built form to street pattern seem ill-considered.
The sign translates in English: "It is a pity that concrete does not burn".
West Berlin, 1965, with the Europa Centre and the rebuilt Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church

New housing in East Berlin, with statue of Lenin, 1971
FOTO 3: THE BORDER AREA OF BERLIN

Border with East Berlin at the Bethanienwall
A view of Brandenburg Gate in East Berlin over the Wall the GDR built in 1961
PART II - JERUSALEM

1. INTRODUCTION

Eternity, this is Jerusalem. This Saying of the Sages reflects the uniqueness of this Holy Land, and the ancient city of kings and saints.

The Jerusalem of the present, her hills and valleys, her rocks and trees, her wall and buildings are all in a way the residue of a sacred past. The Old City of Jerusalem is unique. Its religious, historical, archaeological and architectural treasures are part of the world's heritage. In time, this area became the active spiritual center of three world religious. Jews, Moslems and Christians consider Jerusalem their homeland. No other place in the world has so much significance for so many.

Traditionally, Jerusalem was considered as being the center of the Earth. It indeed lies geographically and culturally on a line dividing East and West. In the course of her four thousand years of unbroken history, the city has passed from the domain of the Eastern world to that of the West, and back again.

The eternal city, the holy land of the past and present, the administrative center for the whole Palestine under the British Mandate, managed to survive and retain its integrity, until 1948, when was divided between Jordan and Israel, between Arabs and Jews. The struggle of the city, being for thousands of years the foreign conqueror, and for the last forty years, the people for whom this is their homeland; the people of Palestine.

The city was again re-unified in 1967, under the State of
Israel. But although its physical barriers were removed, the city remained a dichotomous social environment. During the 19th years of partition, the diversified social environment of Jerusalem was polarized and two ethnically homogenous areas were created on both sides of the 1948 Armistice line.

Today, Jerusalem is the city of two people; the Arabs and the Jews, the only city where these two communities live in proximity. And here, more than anywhere else, one can sense the awful tragedy of the conflict between Israeli and Arab. (Benvenisti, 1976)

2. THE PHYSICAL SETTING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

2a. THE PHYSICAL DEVELOPMENT

The site of Jerusalem lies on the crossroads of important Middle East communication axes; lying on the ancient crossing of the north-south trade route along the crest of the Judean Mountains, from Nablus, Damascus and Asia Minor in the north to Hebron and Mecca in the south, the old settlement of Jerusalem provided the main outlet to the Mediterranean from the Jordan valley, via the east-west routes leading through it to Jaffa and Haiffa, from the Jordan valley to the Mediterranean coastal plain. Due to its important location, Jerusalem developed into the commercial and economic center of Judea, Samaria and Trans-Jordan.
The land of Jerusalem, being bisected by the north-south watershed, that divides it into two ecosystems, is not only a dual social environment, but as well as a dual physical and natural one. The dominant element in Jerusalem's natural landscape is the sudden sharp transition from the green shrubbery of the Mediterranean zone in the west, to the arid wilderness of the desert in the east (Fig. 14.3, 15). (Benvenisti, 1980)

The old city of Jerusalem, lies on the knife edge of this transition, as a man-made counterpoint to the starkness and intricacy of natural landscape. This harmonious relationship between the works of nature and man was always the strength of Jerusalem. The pictorial representation of Jerusalem in drawings and plans from the past, treat the city and its landscape as an organic whole and as part of a larger perceptual unity (Fig. 14.4, 16). (Kutcher 11)

This mountainous topography of valleys and ridges and the historical routes traversing Jerusalem have always dictated the planning of the city.

The Old City, sitting on a bowl ringed by hills, sits in the center of the trade crossroads. The city gates were located accordingly. The highway from Damascus culminated at Damascus Gate, while the main roads from the Coastal Plain and the Mediterranean in the west and from Hebron into the south, led up to Jaffa Gate (Fig. 16).

As Jerusalem began to expand outside the city walls, the main gateways were moved to the new boundaries of the built-up town. The gates were thus "shifted" to the city approaches situated on the
historical axes in the north, south and west. (Kroyanker 4, 1982)

The first overspill outside the walls occurred by the wealthy Jews in the late 19th century, but considerable development started only the following century. During the 1920s, the area south and south-west of the walled city was being built-up and by the end of the decade it had grown to sixteen times the size of the Old City.

In the 1930s and early 1940s, with the rise in Jewish immigration from Nazi Germany and other European countries, there was a growth in the city's population and a new expansion of the quarters outside the city walls, mainly to the west and south-west. The Arabs, too, started moving outside the walls and established several residential areas, particularly to the north of the Old City, separated though and distinct from the Jewish quarters. The Jerusalem outside the Walls was the projection to the arrangement of the inner core of the Old City. The area of the irregular square within the walls, approximately 900 by 900 meters, has been divided, in its development throughout the history, into four clearly defined quarters, differing both architecturally and ethnically: the Armenian, Christian, Moslem and Jewish quarters.

Thus together with the Old City, the division to the modern sections into distinct neighborhood units, formed the most typical structural features of Jerusalem. The city was for her inhabitants the sum of her neighborhood units, and not a unit in itself. (Efrat 3, 1971)

The population rose steadily. In 1922, there were 62,500 people living in Jerusalem, of whom 34,000 were Jews. (54.4%) In
1947, shortly before the departure of the British, and the division of the city, the population had grown to 117,000, of whom 97,000 were Jews. (83%)

2B. TOWN PLANNING CONCEPTS 1919-1949 (Fig. 17)

Proper planning for Jerusalem began only after the British conquest in December 1917. The first town plans of the mandatory period, recognized the uniqueness of the landscape of Jerusalem and considered the old city the principal architectural element, upon which the direction of planning was to be based. They set about realizing these principles by defining an inner and outer ring of protection around the Old City, where no building was allowed, and by directing the development towards west and south west, protecting thus the unique landscape and topography of the city by reserving the eastern areas from development. The green belt concept around the city, separated actually the historic core from the functions of its surroundings, but at the same time emphasized it as the architectural and spiritual core, an element which was to be lost, following the division of the city. (Efrat 4, 1971)

In the course of the years, the concept of the protecting zone around the old city remained in all the plans of the mandatory period, but the "prohibited area" was reduced somewhat on its south-west and north-east sides as the city expanded outside the walls and more area was devoted to development. (Kutcher 50)

The Kendall plan of 1944 further emphasized the historical approaches, to Jerusalem which time has barely altered. The plan set
a destination for Jerusalem to become a major communication center, as well as an administrative center and a meeting ground for British, Jewish and Arabs. The proposals on the communications network emphasized the four main highways leading into and out of Jerusalem, connected by a ring-road which encircled the new residential suburbs. All four arteries were terminating or starting from the two main gates of the old city (Jaffa, and Damascus gates) as a projection of the principles axes of circulation within the old city. (Efrat, 1971)

The British by the Kendall plan, further emphasized the concept of distinct separating neighborhood units inhabited by different ethnic and religious groups, a characteristic of Jerusalem. This separation of the communities, was in favor of their administration of their colonies. (see also example of Nicosia). The plan made a clear distinction between the Jewish quarters and the Arab neighborhoods, the former lying in the west the latter in the south and east.

But time did not allow the realization of these planning concepts for Jerusalem. The division of the city, was a new and tragic reality, that no plan could anticipate for.
3. THE DIVISION OF THE CITY

3a. THE DIVISION IN GENERAL

The division of the city was the result of the 1948 War, initiated by six neighbouring Arab states when the state of Israel was established, in May 1948. In January 1949, the War ended and the armistice lines broadly followed the cease-fire lines, running north to south, which bisected the city at its very center. The area west of the line, namely the whole of the new city and including Mount Zion, came within Israel. The area to its east, including the Old City, fell under Jordanian control. Jerusalem became a divided city (fig. 18).

With the traditional trade routes cut off, Jerusalem ceased to function as a central city and lost her role as a commercial center and a market place for the surrounding area. Jerusalem became a border city as well.

Two almost homogenous areas came out of the partition into east and west of the previously diverse physical environment, at tremendous human and material cost. The barbed-wire fences separated the landscape and the topographic characteristics that use to make the scene of Jerusalem. They separated the people from each other and the modern city from its historic center. They left the East with the desert, the sanctity of the old city, the traditional oriental way of life and all the Arabs; they left the West with its greenery, its secular aspect, its modern occidental life-style and all the Jews. The city being separated, each sector followed its own
development, not accounting for the preservation of the integrity of the city.

3b. THE DIVIDED CITY - THE ISRAELI SIDE

During the years of its division, Jerusalem of the west side, developed a special character. It was the result of its being the capital of the new state of Israel, a university city, a spiritual and religious center but at the same time a border city, isolated from the centers of population and economy in the coastal plain.

ECOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

The waves of Jewish immigrants that started arriving to the new born State of Israel, from all the countries of Asia, Africa, Europe and America, doubled the population of the city, reaching a number of 197,000 by 1967 (1). Nevertheless the population of Jerusalem increased more slowly than that of Israel as a whole, resulting in a constant decline in the status of the capital (2). Due to its border location, West Jerusalem was not in ecological relationship with its hinterland, "an urban complex located without regard to ordinary economic facts of life....The administrative offices of the government of Israel, the Hebrew University, or the various administrative branches of world Jewry were located in West Jerusalem by choice, not economic imperative."(Pfaff, 1969)

The border situation of Jerusalem, had a negative result on its economic status as well. Most of the industrial concerns in the capital were small, even though over the years there was a trend towards a concentration of larger ones (3). Tourism in Jerusalem,
"the "City of Pilgrims", did not develop as might have been expected. The percentage of overnight stays in the city's hotels declined (4). Hundreds of the city's youngsters left and moved down to the coast, because of difficulties in finding housing and a livelihood.

But still Jerusalem was the Capital and the Government was the largest employer in the city. Together with the Hebrew University, Hadassah Hospital and the Jewish Agency, it employed over 30% of all wage-earners. Institutions of learning, culture, and adult education were developed and Jerusalem in a way developed its administrative and scientific-educational functions, Kendall has dreamed about in his plans. (Benvenisti, 1976)

SOCIAL SPACE - ADAPTING TO THE SITUATION

Despite the enormous growth in population, Jerusalem remained a tranquil, introverted provincial city, and did not benefit as much as it might have, from its status as the Capital of Israel. (Benvenisti, 1976) Its social life concentrated in its neighborhoods, which retained their own special character, each possessing a clearly defined character, way of life, and communal composition. For the most part, the older Jewish quarters maintained their pre-State character; the abandoned Arab neighborhoods were populated by immigrants from the same country of origin; and in the new quarters the residents were also homogeneous groups. Although the Arabs have left, the framework of closed social groups continued and there was a certain isolation between these neighborhoods. This might not only be the result of the desire of the inhabitants to live in a neighborhood that suits
their way of life, but also the result of that special frontier atmosphere of Jerusalem. It was in a way a psychological immune to the dangers of life on the border. (see table)

Nevertheless, after the 1948 War and the partition of Jerusalem, the Jewish inhabitants quickly adapted to the existence of walls and barbed wire fences in the heart of the city. Apart from minor incidents near the demarcation line, the inhabitants on the whole, did not sense the anomaly of living in a divided city. For political reasons the attention of the inhabitants of Jewish Jerusalem was turned away from the border line, and as the years passed, there was a gradual increase in the number of citizens who had no personal knowledge of the Arab sector. Only for both old-timers and religious immigrants, being cut off from the Western Wall and the ancient synagogues in the Jewish Quarter was the lost of the Old City, an open wound. Jewish students were taught little or anything about Arabs, their history, language, and culture. The two communities that used to live together, sharing the same love for the city, were alienated from each other.

The prevailing feeling was that the city's unification would not be achieved in this generation and the city was looking for a new spiritual, cultural core away from the Old City. (Benvenisti, 1976)
This acceptance of the city’s partition found notable expression in its physical planning, in the 1950s. Jerusalem’s Master Plan, drawn up in 1955 and approved in 1959, moved the city’s center of gravity from its historic position—the Old City and the areas around it—to the western part of the city, the only direction remaining as an outlet for expansion due to the city’s encirclement on three sides by Arab-controlled territory (Fig. 19). (Efrat, 1971)

The geographic center of the western city became the campus of the Hebrew University, where an artificial urban node was created. This was an area which, until 1949, lay far to the west of Jerusalem’s municipal boundary. This new urban node, which housed all the prominent public institutions, was indeed the geographic and architectural center of city, but never its functional center and many functions were left at their former site, on the periphery of the new town. The new town for the western section bore insufficient account of the possible reintegration of the city (5).

Moreover the demographic center of gravity was also moved westwards over the years, as the population of the city’s older neighborhoods thinned out. The planners neglected the old neighborhoods in the center, which had, in part, become border areas, and allowed them to deteriorate. New areas on the hilltops to the west were developed, much safer than the areas to the east of the Jewish Jerusalem. The road network was planned according to the post-war situation, whereby Jerusalem became the terminal of roads from the coast, rather than the meeting place of roads covering the whole length and breadth of Palestine. (see Kendall’s plan, 1944)
Jewish Jerusalem was expanding during this period a great deal. Being a national capital, it had to accommodate a reasonable number of inhabitants, public institutions, parks and public spaces. On the other hand, as a border city it had to be big enough to be able to defend itself. The master plan envisaged a target population for 1985 of 250,000. The plan made provision also for some industries, although these were not so much emphasized as for other Israeli cities.

But still many problems could not be solved within the existing municipal boundaries. The available land reserves were not sufficient for further construction. According to the new outline scheme, the city was supposed to develop along the western spurs of the Judean hills, an area highly unsuitable for urban development. In the mean time military considerations dictated that additional engineering works, communication centers, industries and defence installations were to be located in the western hills, as far as 6-7 miles away from the city, without building up the intervening space. It was the concept of the Jerusalem Corridor. (Efrat 8, 1971)

Thus the planning concepts adopted in West Jerusalem were a direct result of the unnatural conditions imposed on the city. Whatever effort was put into this plan, the bisected city, developing in an ox-bow shape, with its central business district at the top and the residential neighborhoods along the two flanks, could not function as a sound, well integrated organism.

The divided city was:

"a captive of its dream, sitting solitary, a wall in its heart".

("Jerusalem of gold", abstract of a poem by Naomi Shemer.)
3c. THE DIVIDED CITY - THE ARAB SIDE.

3c1. The issues of the division

ECOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

After the War of 1948 the West Bank of Palestine was annexed by what was then the Emirate of Trans-Jordan, which thus became the Kingdom of Jordan. Following this annexation was a complete change to the geographical and functional status of East Jerusalem. Having been cut off its trade routes to Mediterranean, East Jerusalem had to be dependent on importers in Amman, the only supply line open to the border city. This economic subordination to the East Bank, coupled with the sabotage of the development of Jerusalem by the Jordan government in favor of Amman, led to an economic decline of the city. Only in tourism, Amman could not combat Jerusalem. (Benvenisti 59, 1976)

Unlike Jewish Jerusalem, which was cut off from its hinterland after 1948, Arab Jerusalem maintained links with the surrounding area. East Jerusalem remained the focus of the commercial, communications, and transportation links of the northern and southern parts of the West Bank. Thus, the city was a vital part of the economic structure of the West Bank. Together with its suburbs, the city maintained its position as the largest town on the West Bank. It concentrated a number of government institutions, together with religious institutions, and courts and became a service center for the entire West Bank. (Benvenisti 60, 1976 & Pfaff 34, 1969)

The mass flight of the population after the war, followed a constant emigration flow of the political, professional and economical elite of East Jerusalem to Amman, which became the
undisputed economic and political center of the Kingdom. This emigration to the East Bank coupled with the emigration overseas, reached about half the rate of natural increase. The number of inhabitants of Amman—61,000 in 1948—had increased fivefold by 1967, reaching 311,000. During the same period, the population of Arab Jerusalem increased by only fifty percent. Jerusalem turned into a provincial town, with influence only in its immediate region. (Benvenisti 28, 1976)

SOCIAL SPACE

This emigration of the elite of the city, together with a migration into the city specially from people from the Hebron region, brought about far-reaching changes in the city's social structure. The absolute rule of the leading families has crumbled away, and common families and rural immigrants accumulated great wealth, which also gave them political influence.

The increase in the number of the city's inhabitants, by this immigrations, together with the intolerable living conditions that existed in the Old City, where a great number of refugees from the Jewish part has concentrated, brought about a further worsening of the housing situation. Gradually, people started moving into houses in no-man's land while new housing quarters were built on the slopes of the hills towards west and south-east. Due to the loss of the Jewish-Arab commercial center, a new one was developed during the 1950s, facing the old City walls. (Benvenisti 46, 1976 & Efrat, 1971)

All this development activity had to be restricted within the relatively small area of available built up land, within the Arab
Municipality. Out of the six square kilometers of the jurisdiction's area, the continuously built-up area did not exceed three square kilometers (8).

As a result of the shortage of building land within the city, people began to build houses outside the municipal boundaries to north and east, spreading in directions which were undesirable from the town planning point of view. As a result, "ribbon development" suburbs appeared, which were inhabited by the wealthy people, who could afford to purchase land in these areas. This exodus of the rich to the suburbs, resulted in impoverishing even further the Arab Municipality. Since there was not enough space for commerce and trade, new areas formerly assigned to residential uses in the north of the city were converted to this purpose (9). (Benvenisti 47, 1976)

3b2. PLANNING CONCEPTS IN ARAB JERUSALEM

In an attempt to solve the severe planning problems created by the expansion of development outside the municipality, the government of Jordan decided to extend the Jerusalem's urban planning zone. An area of 34,750 acres, bounded by the Qalandia airfield in the north and Bethlehem municipal boundary in the south was incorporated in a new outline scheme, which assigned the main land uses and included also arterial roads to Amman, Ramallah and Bethlehem, and designed the Mount of Olives as a public open space, a site for religious institutions and a nature reserve. (Efrat 13, 1971)
The new town plan for East Jerusalem was based on urban dispersal along the mountain ridge and the development of new settlement nodes on the flat mountain spurs. These nodes were to be linked by means of a main north-south artery, bypassing the Old City. In addition, an eastern traffic artery to Trans Jordan was designed. As in the case of West Jerusalem, the East part of the city was forced too, to abandon its natural economic center in the west, which was too close to the borders. Here too military considerations dictated the entire development which was designed as a ring encircling the Israeli part of Jerusalem from the east, while linking the north and south of the West Bank and connecting the two with Amman (Fig. 19).

But in contrast to the Jewish Jerusalem, very little detailed planning was done. It was not easy to plan the rural areas incorporated within the new outline scheme because of the highly fragmented land titles. Local transportation facilities were still to be planned while the increase in the private vehicle fleet was not matched by a corresponding expansion of the road network in and around the city. (Efrat, 1971)

3d. SUMMARY OF DIVISION

1. Jerusalem: the land of co-existing opposites was turned into a polarized society as a result of its division.

Two completely different economical, social, and cultural,
linguistic settlements merged out of the separation of Jerusalem. The status of the city as a meeting place for both Arabs and Jews, as a trade center, as a Holy Land for everyone and in other words as a center of the Earth, changes. The Old City, the heart that gave the pulse and meaning to this eternal city, can not be shared by all, is not accessible to everyone. Neither part was able to make strong its presence in the world, like the integral part of Jerusalem. Neither part was able to establish its status not even within the country that belonged to.

2. Jewish Jerusalem is a capital but nevertheless the efforts of its Israeli government, which for political considerations was trying to establish the status of the city, is still a border city, abandoned by economic interests and its youth. Arab Jerusalem, is an accessible holy land for Arabs, but not their trade center anymore. Having been cut off its commercial routes and abandoned by its government, the city lost its functional importance and turned into a provincial city.

Jewish Jerusalem, with its status as the capital of the new state, became the center of Jewish immigrants from all Europe. Arab Jerusalem, having been turned into an economic bankrupt, suffers from emigration of its educational, technical and money-bearing elite. As a border city, it could not develop a safe economic and political climate.

3. In both parts this social mobility meant far reaching changes in the city's social structure. The fluctuations of population in and out of each part, and their different social and economic backgrounds, had tremendous consequences to the already
suffering from dichotomy, social environment.

4. The division destroyed the Palestinian society of Jerusalem. The policies adopted by both governments, Israeli and Jordanian, were geared to maintain ecological, cultural, social separation, to fight cohesive processes by forced segmentation. The two communities were alienated from each other, from each one history, language and culture.

5. The enormous differences between the Jewish and Arab part of the city in way of life, standard of living, residential and economic conditions, and consumption, can be illustrated in the following figures. (Table 1)

6. The two parts were not only falling apart economically and socially but also physically, having to adjust to the new situation created by the division. Due to the special topographical conditions and landscape of Jerusalem, the land available for urban development was restricted on the slopes of the hills, surrounding the city. Moving away from its natural center of gravity, abandoning the historic core, each part was encroaching on areas not suitable for urban development in the course of creating new urban nodes, new residential areas while former affluent areas became slums.

This unnatural development was also dictated by military considerations. The limited area was even further restricted by additional military works, and protecting zones.

7. Planning was always dictated by topography and location. The city divided, the topography divided, the importance of the
location lost, the unnatural conditions imposed, irrational development follows.

8. And more over, no part was planning with consideration for the case of re-unification.

Had this process continued, the outcome could have been the creation of two cities, one to the east, the other to the west, with a desolate mined area in between (no man's land). These processes were stopped by the re-unification of the city in 1967.

4. RE-UNIFICATION

Jerusalem was re-unified in June 1967, after Israel's victory in the Arab-Israeli war and an unilateral action by Israel. Thus Jerusalem became a single municipality under Israeli administration.

4a. THE NEW JERUSALEM

The main considerations in drawing the boundaries, was a "defensible border" with a geographic security belt and secure direct access to 'Atarot airport - the only one in the Judean-Samarian massive- and including as little of the rural Arab population as possible (10). These dictates of security and
demography caused conflicts between the dictates of urban needs. The state boundaries were made identical with the city boundaries, and the boundary line was too restrictive not ensuring sufficient reserves of land for urban development.

Nevertheless, the post-1967 boundaries, when compared with those of the divided sections, appear to be eminently satisfactory. Jerusalem is no more the marginal city, a blind alley, and new traffic arteries can now be developed to connect it with the road system of Judea and Samaria. It has again free access from north to south and from east to west. The "raison d’être" of the city restored (the center of commercial crossroutes), Jerusalem can function again as a central city and re-establish its economic status. Moreover, it is no longer confined in its growth to one single direction. Now that the natural physical conditions have been restored, more rational trends can begin to operate. The expansion of the city, instead of encroaching upon the rural areas of Jerusalem corridor in the west, and following a ribbon development in the east, can follow a more comprehensive physical development. With the 26,250 acres it disposes today, it has considerable land reserves for a big population and for the countrywide functions of a national capital (Fig. 20). (Efrat 14, 1971)

4B. HEALING THE WOUNDS

Soon after its re-unification, the city had to face the problem of healing the wounds of its division. It was the restoration of the physical connection between the two parts and the social and economical integration.
4b1) Removing the physical barriers

The process of planned physical unification included the task of removing the barriers that separated the Jewish and Arab population, meeting security as well as practical problems. No-man's land was still full of scattered abandoned buildings, barged-wire fences, barriers, tens of thousands of mines and communications trenches. Roads between the two halves of the city had not been paved, and three of the gates to the Old City (the New Gate, Jaffa Gate and Zion Gate) were blocked by reinforced concrete walls. The barriers dividing the city of Jerusalem physically, came down on June 29, which was followed by a "peace festival" or "mutual invasion" of thousands of Jews pouring into the alleyways of the Old City and hundreds of Arabs making their way through the streets of the Jewish city, to the residential suburbs of Qatamon, bak'a and Talbiya. But still the social and economical barriers, had a long way to go, until they would be removed and a complete integration of the city to follow.

4b2) Removing the economic barriers

The unified Municipality, was too extensive and heterogeneous and as I have mentioned before, a tremendous difference existed in terms of standard of living, education system and municipal services between the two parts of the city, as a result of their different economic and social development over the years of their alienation (11). The municipal officials planned a process of equalizing services, that involved a revolutionary change in the standard and extent of services of East Jerusalem, in order to bring them up to the level of those in West Jerusalem. (Benvenisti 133, 1976).
The immediate result was a complete interaction of the city's economic system as the general economic prosperity was divided evenly between the two halves of the city. The Arab population's purchasing power increased by 50%, while the city benefited from the relatively high purchasing power of 250,000 Jewish citizens, and of hundreds of thousands more from the coastal plain who pour in on Saturdays and holidays, to visit the accessible now Holy land. 

(Benvenisti 1976)

The effects of unification were especially evident in the changes in distribution of income between different groups of wage earners of the Arab community as the low Jordanian wage scales were adjusted to the relatively egalitarian Israeli equivalent. The standard of living and per capita income among Arabs increased by 100% in real terms compared to pre-annexation level, although the gap between Jews and Arabs remained wide (12).

The efforts made for the rapid construction and development of the city brought about a relatively faster growth of both communities. Since 1967, Jerusalem has been transformed from a dormant, provincial town, into a dynamic expanding city. The accelerated rate of development is ever since changing Jerusalem's traditional character.

As Benvenisti says:

"Like Siamese twins, the two communities nourished each other, and were obliged to advance at the same pace. The true beneficiary of the efforts directed towards development was not the Jewish community, nor the Arab one, it was the city as a whole".

But nevertheless the technical improvements and modernization of the Arab sector of the city, the Arabs of Jerusalem were not
happier. This modernization of their neighborhoods meant not only better municipal services, health facilities, and public schools; it also meant a cultural interaction that the Arabs feared would lead to a decay in their moral standards. And moreover after economic conditions in East Jerusalem were improved under Israeli torelance, the Arabs feared that they would be forced out. (Pfaff 47, 1969)

The Arab community remained a minority within the unified municipality and was swallowed up within the Jewish economic system (15). It lost its independent staying power, without broadening its economic basis, which was very narrow due to the policies of the Jordanian Government. (Benvenisti 1976)

4b3) Removing the social barriers

Jerusalem was physically re-unified but remained a polarized society, separated distinctly into Jew and Arab community (16). The pattern of segregated ethno-religious communities characterized the city from the very old times. Christians, Armenians, Moslems, Jews Orthodox, Jews cecular and many other different lived together and managed to co-exist. The Arab- Jewish division, which is a political one is not historically the principal division but it has culminated by the cataclysmic events that followed the partition of the city. (Benvenisti 179, 1982)

During the 19th years of partition, this diversed social environment of Jerusalem was polarized and two ethnically homogenous areas were created on both sides of the 1948 Armistice Line (17). The long separation and alienation had aggravate the differences
that existed between the two communities, and after the Israeli occupation of the whole Jerusalem, the bi-national conflict was encapsulated into the urban setting. (Benvenisti 1982)

The polarized societies of Jerusalem interact in the market and work places, in construction, in factories. But these are only small and scattered islands of socialization, while a complete segregation of cultural, educational and recreational activities prevails, together with the residential clustering (18 & 19).

Rapoport gives an explanation of this difference in economic interaction versus the social separation:

"Cities may have different and even segregated social networks, but social and economic interactions remain strong just because of spatial proximity."

4c. PHYSICAL PLANNING

The overriding principle underlying Jerusalem's planning after the re-unification is the realization of her unity. In order to achieve this goal, two courses of action were adopted: a) healing the wounds inflicted on the urban fabric of the city as a result of its division, and patching up the disrupted systems, and b) building up the city in such a way as to proclude the bi-polar emergence of two national communities and forestall any possibility of re-dividing it along such lines. The systems concerned were road networks, utilities infrastructure, public gardens and the main commercial center (20). (Kroyanker 3, 1976)

The historical core of the city having been restored as the
central area of the unified city, the planning considerations were turned again to the town center. The policy adopted was that of development and restoration ensuring the preservation and enhancement of the historical treasures and landscape, and reaffirming the important physical elements in the long geopolitical history of Jerusalem. The aim was to strengthen the historical corridors and approaches and the corridor to the Coastal Plain. These three corridors, North, South, and West, form the skeleton frame for the proposed plan.

The importance of the "reconstruction" of these historical axes lies in their aim of housing a linear continuity of activities that will prevent the city from being bisected into separate entities.

The most critical of these corridors is the North one, which passes through the previous no man's-land, in the line of junction between East and West Jerusalem, in an area stretching from north of Damascus Gate to Eshkol Boulevard (21). This district that has been named "seam", is a link between the Old City and the northern suburbs on one hand, and the western and eastern neighborhoods on the other.

The very name chosen for the place -"seam"- indicates the objective, that of "sewing" together the parts of Jerusalem that have fallen appart as a result of her division into a single urban web, and create a homogeneous texture of urban activities. The "seam" project plays a major role in strengthening the ties between the two parts and affirming the status of Jerusalem as a united capital (Fig. 21 & 23). (Kroyanker 5, 1982)

This goal can be achieved by ensuring not only continuity of
construction and roads but as well creating focal points of urban life where the two populations can meet and become better acquainted. The elements of the plan is road Highway no 1, which will link northern Jerusalem to the center and at the same time serve as the city’s northern access road. This highway forms part of a new road system, with several east-west through-arteries, that will play a significant role in cementing the union between the two parts of the city.

Highway no.1, will also serve as the spine of an all-urban functional axis that will be developed from north to south- from Eshkol Boulevard to the heart of Jerusalem, the Old City. Urban institutions such as hotels and commercial centers will line this axis. The emphasis on commerce is because it is the activity that traditionally served as a bridge between the two communities.

In a personal conversation that I had with prof. Steiniz, (Harvard University), he mentioned that other elements that can be used as mixture elements is transportation, (link for example the two existing bus stations into one) and higher education. Central university is an important issue of politics and nationalism. But still this effort recognizes that is very difficult to overcome the cultural and religious differences of the two communities.

Prof. Steiniz mention also that concerning recreational activities, the role of time is something on which they can capitalize. There is a time dividing schedule between the different religions, and by making a time plan, there can be a central place which all ethno-religious groups can share, enhancing thus the notion of common facilities.
The plan for Jerusalem recognizes that separation is the basis for residential life of the city. Teddy Kollek, the mayor of Jerusalem, says:

"Experience has shown that nothing is gained by trying to blot out the geographical demarcations between groups of different ethnic origins and cultural backgrounds." (Kroyanker)

The Jews, in order to forestall any possibility of re-dividing the city along such line as the Armistice Line of 1948, they tried to create settlement facts by expropriating land in East Jerusalem and locating housing projects, in "strategically located" areas. These projects, were planned, constructed and settled as homogenous Jewish areas, among the Arab neighborhoods. By 1980, they housed 60,000 Jews, (as compared to 115,000 Arabs who resided in East Jerusalem) with plans to accommodate more than twice this figure, as the expropriated area covered almost a third of the total area of East Jerusalem. (Benvenisti 181, 1982)

The construction of these vast housing projects, as well as recent attempts to put up Jewish suburbs next to Arab villages, did not change the pattern of spatial segregation, although the Jews were declaring that this spatial organization "will provide possibilities for spontaneous encounters between the two peoples" (Teddy Kollek). In fact it made segregation more tangible, and dramatic in its physical and social expressions. Jews housing developments consisting of five to eight stories residential buildings are built a short distance from single-story traditional Arab dwellings. All Jewish neighborhoods contain their own shopping centers. Schools, community centers, are planned to cater exclusively for the Jewish residents. Roads and utilities pass
through Arab areas, connecting the new developments with the main city system, but with no connection to the primitive Arab network.

- Two separate business districts function in the city.
- Two public transportation systems
- Two electrical grids
- Two different voluntary land-value scales (one for transaction between Jews, another for transaction between Arabs) as inter-ethnic voluntary land purchase is almost non-existent.

5. UNIFICATION - CONCLUSIONS

1. After the re-unification of the city, the physical barriers were removed, and the economic ones became lighter. But the social barriers still exist and in a way became more evident. Benvenisti discusses that:

"the old mandatory dual society structure, that existed before the division has been recreated, but with a fundamental difference. Instead of equally ranked social systems, a superordinate, subordinate status hierarchy has been created."

(Benvenisti 85, 1976)

The separate but unequal principle is employed in all sectors:

a) ecological: by the creation of the Jewish neighborhoods, the settlement regions, the towns, the separate infrastructure in West bank.
b) cultural, c) economical, d) political and, e) military.

2. The perceptual changes in the two communities and the realities of Palestine, almost 20 years after the Israeli occupation, have created an internally generated conflict. Palestine today is a deeply divided or polarized society.
But yet the economic vitality became stronger than nationalism.

"...under conditions of hostility and mistrust, every matter appeared to be political at first... Slowly, both sides learned to distinguish economics from politics, mistrust was reduced, and relationships were stabilized."

(Benvenisti 184, 1976)

And I think this is an important lesson in every effort of bringing together two segregated and opposing groups. People might be ethnically, culturally, religiously, even linguistically different, but they all speak the same or similar language of economics. Commerce, commercial entertainment, business and consequently supporting elements such as transportation, are bridges that can bring people together.

3. The example of Jerusalem has also shown that the effort undertaken by the Israelis authorities to distribute new homogenous Jewish neighborhoods among Arab settlements, did not change the pattern of geographical demarcations between the two communities of the city.

Segregation among different ethnic groups is used as a defence mechanism not only to protect from physical threat but also serves to preserve group identity from alien cultural influences. (Benvenisti 173, 1982). And this has always been the case in Jerusalem.

4. The question raised by the example of Jerusalem is how can a city function under such conditions of polarization? And is this polarization the only trade-off possible in order to have a "unified" physical environment with free access and movement, and a chance for a more comprehensive planning? If internal conflict is
such an issue for the city, is it finally a complete separation a better solution?

Perhaps the answer can be found in a quote from Benvenisti, when referring to terrorist acts and violent demonstrations in the city, as expressions of national awakening of the Arabs:

"...Nevertheless, surprisingly, daily life continued on a relatively calm basis. Jews and Arabs strove for opposing goals, but life proved stronger than ideology.... They, (the two communities), progressed a bit on the road to peace, though they were still very far from any point of no return. It was clear, however, that the two nations living in Jerusalem had no desire to return to the point at which they had started."

(Benvenisti 356, 1976)
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FIG. 15: THE URBAN LANDSCAPE OF JERUSALEM
Source: Kutcher, 1975

Aerial view from the north-east. The Old City sits in a bowl rimmed by hills.

Section through the Jerusalem plateau looking north: A. The plateau; B. The Central basin; C. The Old City basin; D. The Old City.

Detail of 6 showing the Old City (D) and its surrounding hills.

Section looking east: A. French Hill; B. The Old City; C. The Mount of Evil Counsel.
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FIG. 17: PLANNING CONCEPTS IN JERUSALEM
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Source: Kutcher, 1975
Fig. 18: Plan of the Divided Jerusalem

JERUSALEM: THE DIVIDED CITY
1949 - 1967
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Jerusalem Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Arab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>84,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source:
Jerusalem, Kraemer, 1980
FIG. 19: PLANNING CONCEPTS IN WEST AND EAST JERUSALEM
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FIG. 20: JERUSALEM'S PLANS, BEFORE AND AFTER THE DIVISION

OUTLINE SCHEME OF JERUSALEM (1944)

Legend:
1. Residential Zone
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5. Main Road
6. Railway Line

SOURCE: EFRAT, 1971
1. The project area within the Jerusalem vicinity
2. The project area and the proposed road No. 1.
1. View from the Damascus Gate towards the proposed open space, promenade and new shopping arcade.

2. View from Road No. 1 towards the Old City Wall and the proposed park in the Damascus Gate area. This was former no-man’s land between 1948-1967.

3. The Southern Section of the "Seam" Area - Proposed Design Principles.
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FOTO 5: The border fence dividing the village of Beit Safafa from 1949 to 1967

FOTO 6: The "Seam" Area; former no-man's-land (1948-1967) before the completion of recent large-scale improvements carried out in the Damascus Gate area.

Source: Benvenisti, 1976
The "walls" that divide Nicosia and elsewhere on the island, however significant they might be locally, and although lying in a very sensitive area of international politics, they come to the world attention far less than the Berlin Wall.

This is true for the whole of history of the island of Cyprus, for which Nicosia is the capital. Cyprus, with its strategic location, follows the historical events happening in the surrounding area, but never takes a significant part in them. (1)

But the "walls" of Nicosia, are indeed the evidence of a conflict between two worlds: the Greeks, and the Turks. The island of Cyprus with a large Greek majority of 80% and a Turkish minority of 18%, was the last place where these two opposing worlds co-existed (3). Nevertheless the two communities of Cyprus used to share cultural and social identity till external influences, initiated by the British colonists, started a process of ethnic differentiation. The result was the gradual growth of Nationalism that culminated into communal conflict. The Turkish invasion of 1974 and a forced separation of the two communities, completed the dichotomization of Cypriot society (4).

Out of this situation, Nicosia emerged as a divided city, lying on the line dividing these two linguistically, culturally, and religiously different worlds; half of it being the capital of the so called "Turkish-cypriot state" (5), half of it under government control but nevertheless considered the capital of the whole island.
But the conflict in Cyprus is not only intercommunal or binational. It is also the realization of the expansionist policy of Turkey, and as well as a game of the international policy of the great powers of the world. All the people of Cyprus, either Greek or Turks, perceive their island as a battlefield of imperialism. The division of Nicosia is the encapsulation of this conflict into the urban setting. And as Greek-Cypriots are considered traditionally more westernized than Turkish-Cypriots, Nicosia plays also the role of the frontier between western and eastern cultures.

2. NICOSIA - OUTLINE

"The physical and spatial arrangements characterizing urban development -indeed the entire man-made environment- are the unique products of a particular society and culture, operating within a given distribution of power."

Antony King
"Colonial Urban Development"

Indeed the rich history of the island of Cyprus, lying on historic crossroutes and near the strategic and cultural meeting-point of Europe and the Middle East, and its long history of interaction with other important cultures, have left their marks on the urban form of Nicosia, which played the role of the capital, continuously for over the last 1000 years. Nicosia being the
capital, the administrative and political center of the foreign power, was perceived, structured and utilized according to the value-systems unique to the culture in power.

It is notable, that Nicosia is leading a parallel history of conquests and development with that of Jerusalem. And it is an irony of fate that both cities have been or are presently divided between their people. It is an irony but at the same time an evidence of how the present is in immediate relation with the geographical position of both cities.

2A) NICOSIA OF THE PAST AND PRESENT - A PARALLELISM TO THE TODAY'S SITUATION

Nicosia of the past: the administrative center of the Byzantine rule; the glorious feudal capital of the island kingdom of the Lusignans; the military fortress and renaissance model of perfection of the urban form, and the center of the colony of the Venetians; the oriental capital and the seat of the Turkish governor under the Ottoman rule; the colonial administrative settlement of the British; and then finally the capital of the Republic of Cyprus.

Nicosia, of the past came into the limelight as an important settlement and became the capital due to its central location, in the very heart of the island, on good agricultural land and abundance of water supplies. Due to its inland position, within a rim of a circle of sandstone hills, (which open out only to the north east,) Nicosia was well protected by searaid and piratical depredations. The capital was easily accessible and had easy communications to the west, east and south parts (Fig. 23.b).
Nicosia of the past had different rival cities, which being main ports, as opposed to the mainland position of Nicosia, acted as the gates of entrance and exit into the island. Famagusta and then later Larnaca were such rival cities, important trading centers for the Mediterranean world, inhabited by Europeans and more independent from the foreign rule than the capital.

Ever since the British administration rule and the importance assigned to Nicosia as an administrative center, Nicosia has been growing as the leading city of the island. The improvement of the road system, the other technological changes involved and the establishment of the Nicosia International Airport in 1949, that gave direct access to the capital from the outside world, made the capital more central than ever. By 1960, when Nicosia became the capital of the independent state of Cyprus, it was clearly dominant economically compared with the other towns of Cyprus. Its primacy started with the increasing significance of being the center of government of the new state and then the location of the headquarters of the major commercial firms and credit, insurance and other auxiliary commercial establishments that followed (Fig. 24 & 25).

From these functions follow the other aspects of the dominance of Nicosia. Since commercial and invisible earnings are now the most important mainstay of the economy, (trading, foreign spending and remittances from abroad) the fact that the institutions dealing with these functions are located in Nicosia has important secondary economic consequences. (see tables)

Nicosia of the post-independence period becomes a strong
regional center, centralizing a number of economic functions to a very high degree, with a sphere of influence far beyond its boundaries, open to all directions. It becomes the main shopping center of the island and this commercial prosperity, has resulted not only in a proliferation of wholesale and retail trading, but also, due to the dearth of other avenues of investment, has stimulated a boom in residential, commercial and office building.

Connected with the fact that Nicosia had up to 1974 the only international airport of the island, was the importance of the capital as an tourist resort and entertainment center; the majority of all hotel accommodation on the island was therefore attracted. Nicosia played also the role of the educational locale of most of the specialized educational institutions of the island.

In July 1974, Nicosia, following the partition of the island was divided, divided between its people, divided from its landscape and topography, divided from its history, and from all the factors that made it the capital of the past.

**Nicosia of the present** is a border city, half of it on the government land, half of it under Turkish control, at the end of traffic corridors. It is the least safe city on the island, exposed to the danger of the "enemy" (6). It has been cut off its agricultural land (the Mesaoria plain), and its connection from coast to coast.

During the course of its history of conquests, the island was economically, socially and culturally divided into two separate and distinct sections: that of the foreign settlers and that of the native population in the background of political events.
Nicosia of the past, with its fortified walls, represented an entity, differentiated functionally, aesthetically and socially from the countryside. Today, the history of the island is again split, but this time is between the Cypriot people. Nicosia of the present, has been split horizontally between these two people and is not any more differentiated by activities and geometric design, but dichotomized, with a buffer zone lying between the two worlds.

2b. PHYSICAL - SOCIAL DIVISIVE ELEMENTS IN THE URBAN SCENE OF NICOSIA

The buffer zone is a newly introduced divisive element in the urban scene, while Nicosia of the past used to have other physical elements, manmade and natural, that could serve as a dividing line. One was the river Pedieos, that used to bisect the old city in its very center, before its route was changed by the Venetians (7). The other was the existence of its city walls (Fig.26) (8). Lusignans and Venetians used the walls to differentiate their royal seat from the countryside, the Turks to control the movement in and out of the city, and the British as a physical barrier to differentiate their new colonial settlement outside the walls from the indigenous walled city. During the period of independence of the island and the rapid expansion of the city, although the round pattern of the walls acted as the core of development, it formed at the same time the solid barrier and the moat the physical one to integrated growth of the old and new settlements. This walled city and the lack of town
planning dictated the form of urban development of Nicosia (9). Today another factor has been added: the dimension of the division of the city.

The division line does not run along the river or round the walls, the above mentioned divisive elements. Its a third dimension of division running vertically to the river, but along its old bed within the old city, and bisecting the walled city through its very heart. It enters from the west Gate and exits from the East gate, the main doors of communication import export activities of the past, between which the main axis of development of Nicosia evolved. Along this axis, the main landmarks of the past can be traced (Fig. 27).

Walking along the division line, within the Old City, there are reminders of the past and present in every step; the same as walking along the Berlin Wall. The great cathedral of the Lusignans and now the great mosque of the Turks and a symbol of a glorious past; the Venetian bastions, built to protect the city and now bordering elements, as the defensive line lies across the walls; the Museum of National Struggle, with memories of the guerilla war against the British, for independence of the island; the Ledra Palace Hotel, once counted among the most famous in the Levant, a tourist spot and a socializing place for the two communities, now housing the soldiers of the United Nations, functioning as a neutral zone and the meeting place for intercommunal talks.

The line within the walls, follows for a great part Hermes street, the major commercial spine of the city ever since the 12th century (Fig. 24). This market area, formed as well the area of contact and socialization for all the people of Cyprus. Today, the
area is designated as a "Green Line", a no man's land, a death strip within the very heart of the city. The flags of four nations, the red crescent of Turkey and the "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus" on the north side, the blue and white of Greece and the yellow and white of Cyprus on the south side, confront the United nations' flag in the middle.

2C. SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The social division of the urban environment of Nicosia into the two communities of Turks and Greeks, initiates during the Ottoman administration of the island, from 1571 to 1878, when the Turkish community was established on the island, among the cohesive environment of the Greek community, which goes back to the 14th century BC. The two communities maintained in a great degree their cultural differences and separate languages and never integrated into one another. Nevertheless, the two communities were living through a phase of traditional co-existence, their differences never really being of political significance. For years, Greek and Turks in Cyprus lived together in peace, in the same towns or villages, under conditions of religious and cultural tolerance, relations of personal friendship and economic co-operation. (10)

It was not until the British colonial rule, that followed the Ottoman occupation, that we observe a substantial transformation of the Cypriot society and institutionalization of the differences between the two Cypriot communities. The British government on the whole showed itself more ready to make use of the existing division
between the two ethnic groups and the classic British policy of divide-and-rule soon came to destroy whatever common Cypriot culture existed. (11)

The phase of separation and conflict, did not end even when the British left the island, and Cyprus was declared an independent republic. The constitutional framework the Cyprus government had to adopt in exchange for its independence, institutionalized separatist tendencies in its provisions for ethnic voting and split municipalities in all major towns of Cyprus (12). (Kitromilides, 1976). In this way the development of sub-cultures was explicitly encouraged and the lack of any integrative institutions and common political process separated even further the two communities (13). Nevertheless, on the grassroots level, the two communities still lived in mixed towns and villages, worked and socialized together with friendships cutting across religious or ethnic lines.

2D. ECOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONED BY THE SOCIAL DIVISION

The existence of this social separation, conditioned the ecological development of Nicosia together with its economic concentration and population increase, which follows steadily since the beginning of the 20th century. Nicosia concentrated 50% of the Turkish-cypriot urban population, which formed the 23% of the total population of the city in 1960. (see table of ethnic composition of Cypriot population). (Attalides, 1981)

Within Nicosia the two communities maintained a great degree of spatial segregation. In Nicosia within the walls, the Turkish
sector was developed mainly on the north side, around the old palace of the Turkish governor, and the Greek sector on the south side, around the Greek Archibishop's palace. The expansion of the city outside the walls was a reflection of this dual environment. The Turkish community overflowed northward around the Turkish village of Orta Keuy, while the Greeks were settling south and southwest of the walled city, towards the surrounding greek villages. Quite a high degree of ethnic concentration was maintained. (Fig. 29)

The 1960 constitution of the country made provision for separate municipalities within the five main towns. The Turkish municipality was a very poor one and the Turkish quarters of the town remained in bad condition with poor facilities.

When later in 1963 serious violence erupted between the two communities, the Turkish population of the city was induced to isolation in military enclave by its leaders, and a neutral zone, called the "green line", was set up separating physically and socially the two main ethnic groups of the capital. Free access and movement was not possible eversince and this polarization of the two societies, has led to physical polarization and uneven development of the South and north part (Fig. 30.1) (14).

For example the road northwards from Nicosia to the coast was not accessible to the Greek population and residential development along it has been limited to Turks, thus limiting the rate of growth of the town northwards as the Turks were on a much lower level economically and arithmetically.

Meanwhile the greek sector was prosperiting and expanding
towards the other directions open for development, along the main roads leading to the other towns of the island and which radiated from the center. (Fig. 29)

In the process of this development the inner walled city was gradually deteriorating. The demand for commercial space became choked off by-congestion and new, smart shopping centers developed outside the walled city. As residential areas were created outside and around the old city, lower strata of population was increasingly occupying the walled city, which together with the fringe areas formed the "slum" areas of Nicosia. This is another dimension of social segregation that existed and still exists in Nicosia, apart from the social segregation in ethnic groups.

The Turkish invasion of 1974, completed the scene, of the physical and social separation, when an essential amount of the Greek sector, including the industrial zone and the north residential districts fell under the control of the Turks, and Nicosia became a divided city.

Ever since, Nicosia is developing into two separate administratively, politically, culturally, physically environments.

3. NICOSIA - DIVISION

---------------------------------------------
3A. IN GENERAL

Nicosia, the capital, Nicosia the heart of the island,
Nicosia, the cultural, entertainment, and service center,
Nicosia, the leading city, the main commercial trade center, the industrial estate,

Nicosia, the divided city, the green line.
Nicosia, the main refugee camp,
Nicosia, the wound and the rupture of the urban system.

Nicosia, of the past, of Lusignans and Venetians.
Nicosia, of the present, of Greeks and Turks.

Nicosia, the other side; the captive of the dream for both of its people of the present. For the Greeks it was the lost of north greek suburbs, the industrial zone, the link to Mesaoria plain, the access to the northern and north-eastern coast, the lost of half of the old city and its monuments, and the connection to the past. For the Turks, it was the lost of the modern areas of commercial and residential activity, the access to the Troodos mountain and the mountain resorts (15).

3b. THE ISSUES OF THE DIVISION

ECONOMICAL ASPECT- THE DIFFERENCE IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO PARTS

The post-independence rapid economic and social progress of the whole island and the heavy infrastructure investment were abruptly halted by the invasion. (the rate of growth of the National Income was amongst the highest in the world.)

For the capital, and specially for the south part, the consequences of the partition of the island and the division of the city can be summarized as follows:

- Nicosia was disconnected from the Mesaoria plain, for which was the major trade center
- Nicosia lost its major industrial zone, and its international
A great number of its inhabitants, living in the northern suburbs, became refugees, to them added 60% of all the refugees of the north part of the island.

-Nicosia from a central city became a frontier city, at the end of the traffic corridors.

Nevertheless the severe damage from the division, Nicosia remained the main economic center of the island, for both sides, and the strongest pole of attraction for population.

Being in the past a strong regional population center, with a sphere of influence reaching all over the island, Nicosia had a well organized infrastructure of credit, banks and auxiliary facilities, so as the remain the leading city even after its fracture.

COMPARING LEVELS OF GROWTH

In general levels of growth, the Turkish side has not succeeded in making use of the vast property, capital equipment and resources seized from the Greek-cypriots. The rate of growth of the Turkish cypriot side was 3.2% annualy and that of the greek side 6.5%/ The per capita national income of a Turkish -cypriot was around $1,287, four times lower than that of a Greek-cypriot. There is a more uneven distribution of social services and a sectoral composition underdeveloped, as compared with the one of the greek side (16). (Vassiliou, 1982)

In Nicosia, the difference in the development of the two sides, pre-existed in a way before the division. Been actually separated since 1963, Nicosia developed an uneven pattern of growth of its
south and north parts. Since the Greek-cypriots had much readier contact with the west, they "westernized" quicker than the Turkish-cypriots, who were isolated in their enclaves. Now this phenomenon is more apparent, as the part under occupation of the Turkish army is considered a not accepted situation by international laws.

The Turkish-cypriot professor of psychiatry, Dr Volkan, describes his visit in the enclave in Nicosia in 1968:

"The contrast between one side of the green line and the other was impressive. The Turkish side looked as though it were in ruins; the streets were pitted, and poverty was evident everywhere".

From a visit of Greek-cypriots journalists in the Turkish sector of the walled city in June of 1985, I learned that nothing has changed today, from 1960. In contrast the Greek sector of the walled city was under a process of transformation and "modernazation" affecting its architectural and historical appearance.

RESULTS ON THE URBAN FORM

Nicosia appeared as an important urban center during the period of 1946-1960, which is regarded as the "Spring tide" of urbanisation in Cyprus. Nevertheless, the scale of Cyprus is such that commuting to one of the towns is within an hour’s drive and urban values and institutions are easily diffused into large sections of rural population so that a "mental urbanisation" was taking place. Nicosia being the only town central to the island, concentrated the most of this rural-urban migration but never actually developed into a large urban center (18).

So one of the objectives of the island plan of 1972, was the
stimulation of further urban growth, in order to achieve more equitable distribution of economic activity and social services between regions, strengthening the existing urban areas. Nicosia was to retain the apex position in the hierarchical pyramid of the urban centers that existed, (see fig.) with an optimum size of 250,000 people, reached by the year 2,000 (Fig. 25).

This change came earlier than what expected. The partition of the island, the occupation of half the number of the towns of Cyprus, and 40% of the whole territory by the Turkish forces, the exchange of populations, that followed, overloaded the capital, and especially the south side. Traditionally being the focus of the island’s urbanisation tendencies, Nicosia continued to play that role again. 26% of the Greek-cypriots that were forced out of their houses in the north, settled in the urban area of Nicosia, that created tremendous problems on the existing infrastructure of the city and the water and housing supply. By 1982, the total population of the area had reached 187,000, meaning an increase of 50% within ten years of the pre-invasion situation.

The spread development of the city towards south and southwest, being the only direction open for development, was accelerated. Nicosia having no plan, (19) continued the piecemeal and fragmented development of the previous years with an admixture of incompatible land uses, and encroachment on good agricultural land. Although the population had increased, the overall town density had dropped from 24ppHa to 16ppHa, due to the spread development form. The refugee camps, established on the fringe areas of the city where cheap or government own land suitable for development of large scale could be
found, worsen the process of spread urban form of the city, and counteracted the declarations of the 1972 plan for consolidated growth. (Fig. 31)

Due to the importance assigned to the towns of the south coast, with the new conditions created after 1974, the existing arterial routes towards these settlements acted as ribbon development corridors up to 10km away from the center of the walled city.

The overpopulation, the location of refugee camps and as a consequence the primitive development of some fringe areas and the limited directions of growth, aggravated even further the problem of high land values and the speculation of land, and the uncontrolled location of activities.

The existence of the "Buffer Zone", a completely inaccessible area, provides a physical barrier for development. The situation caused a bi-polarization of the central area functions away from the "green line" and the historic area, where congestion and urban deterioration were already causing land use changes to take place prior to 1974. The existence of the buffer zone has led to the declining of the old shopping areas located near it, leaving properties unused or with low economic output and overall declining in importance. The Central Business District, of Nicosia in the south, has been expanding very fast to more easily accessible areas outside the walls, away from the frontier area, but in a scattered and rather disorderly manner. In the north, Central Business District activities are concentrated still in the Walled City, facing serious constrains due to limited availability of space.

Nicosia of today lacks any identity. The existence of the
Buffer Zone, the "spread form" of expansion, the lack of continuity in development, the under utilization of existing infrastructure and the underprovision of services, are the main issues of Nicosia of today. The walls and the monuments of the past, ceased to evoke a strong image as landmarks in the landscape. The economic and population growth, but most of all the political situation have brought changes in the urban environment which detracted from the perceived image. Now to the elements that used to provide legibility of the physical environment and give the sense of the boundaries and enclosure to the city, like the Pentadactylos range (now inaccessible to greeks) have been added the fences, the gun emplacements, the minefields and trenches.

CIRCULATION AND ROAD PATTERN

Nicosia used to be the hub of the transport network with roads radiating outwards from it to all parts of the island. Before the events of 1974, which caused the creation of the buffer zone right across the urban area of Nicosia, transfer of goods between the western plain and the ports of Famagusta and Limassol and vice-versa, was conveniently done through the urban area of the town.

After 1974, movement in the north-south direction has practically stopped and at the moment only east-west regional traffic passes through the urban area (20).

The existence of a buffer zone and the division of the urban area of Nicosia into two separate sectors, had many repercussions on regional transport. As far as Nicosia is concerned there is a bipolarisation of the regional traffic movement. In the north part, Nicosia still remains central having a good east-west link with
other towns via the newly-built road, located 3km north of the walled city. In the south part the situation is quite different. Through traffic passes via the urban area, existing routes are inadequate and this causes traffic delays and environmental deterioration. In fact, in the south the town has seized to be "centrally" located for the rest of the area.

The Nicosia International Airport has been closed to air traffic since 1974 and at the present time lies idle within the United Nations protected area, in the buffer zone. The existence of the Nicosia International Airport, the only passengers airport in the island, used to make Nicosia the entrance-exit gate to all air-traffic in Cyprus, with considerable gains in the transit over-night stays.

Since 1974 passengers and air cargo traffic from the southern sector of the city have had to use a newly developed airport situation over one hour's car drive away at Larnaca, whereas traffic in the north has also had to use a new airport but situated 12 km to the east of the city. The closing of the airport had impacts on the social and economic life of the city and the wider region and it was the main reason for the decline of tourism of Nicosia (21).

Today, Nicosia is more isolated than ever. With its frontier situation, is the terminal of roads from the coast areas, rather than the hub of traffic circulation. Visitors, entering the island through sea routes or air to enjoy the lovely beaches, might not even get to know the existence of this very viable in other aspects, city.

INTERCITY MOVEMENT
The urban area of Nicosia was served by a radial road system, originating from the medieval times when traditionally all important traffic attracting activities were concentrated in the town center. In many instances this radial system has been broken by either the construction of by-passes and ring roads or by the juxtaposition of routes linking traffic attracting uses located outside the town center. These however had been intuitive attempts to improve the existing road network and satisfy new demands in terms of traffic circulation.

The circulation problem was further aggravated with the division of the city. The collapse of the radial system, the sudden increase of the population of the city, the existing tendencies, specially in the south part, to locate activities away from the "frontier center" and for high density commercial development alongside the main traffic arterials, and increase of commuting from the fringe areas, have reduced considerably the traffic capacity of the existing road network. Traffic congestions encountered in the Central Business District, (specially in the north where the CBD is located within the walled city), lack of adequate car parking provision, vehicular-pedestrian conflicts and results in the overall deterioration of the living and working environment are some of the issues of the today's situation.

In the north, the problem is mainly difficult for the walled city, where most of the offices, as well as commercial enterprises are situated. With the existence of the buffer zone the only entrance to the walled city permitted to drivers of the north part is the Kyrenia gate, through which the major portion of the traffic
now enters the walled city, and filters through various narrow streets. For the south the major entrance is the opening through Elefteria Square, to the south, while east-west movement was affected. Paphos Gate, the major gate of entrance to the walled city before the division, that permitted the west-east movement, established from medieval times, has almost come to disuse, as it is now on the border area. The passage below this old gate belongs to Greeks, while the checking point just right above it belongs to Turks. The comparison of the figures of peak flow in the walled city in 1960 and 1982 is very interesting (Fig. 32).(22)

SOCIAL SPACE

On the scale of division, Nicosia is an extreme case of polarized societies. The bi-polarity that existed between the two communities and the psychological distance as being members of a different group, was carried even further. (Volkan, 1979) The new generation is growing in each community, deprived of the right to get across their homeland, deprived of the right to know the other part of their physical and social space. There are no common experiences or any kind of political or economical processes that could bring the two people together. There is a kind of post-war culture (war in this case is considered the events following the Turkish invasion to the island) and a danger of complete separation that would make even more difficult the integration of the two communities, if a future political situation would permit it.

To the above alienation another dimension of the problem of the social urban space is added. For the greek side is the dimension of the refugee problem. The psychology of the refugee, the
rural "immigrant", the social division of the Greek-cypriot population into refugees and non-refugees, the bitterness of "why", the nostalgia for their home area. It is also the feeling of unsafety, the unsecurity, of living in a divided city, with boundaries so close to the enemy.

For the turkish side, if they have been transferred from the southern areas of the island, is again the feeling of being deprived of the right to return to their home, their friends and social and physical connections. It is again the accepting of the new inhabitants, the "Anatolians", the "barbarians", having been transferred from the deep inside areas of Turkey in order to change the demographic characteristics of the population in favor of the Turks.

The question here is how far can these two communities of Greek and Turks fall if isolated and how much close if they were in contact? The past has proved that a degree of differentiation always existed, as being members of different religion and cultural groups. But it proved also that co-existence was not impossible, and if the two communities are left alone, without external influences, they can very well co-operate and interact (23). Within Cyprus other minorities do exist, maintaining religious, linguistic and other cultural differences without it resulting in a political problem.

DEGREE OF DIVISION

The two sides have different culture, religion and language. They use different currency, rules and laws (25). They have different airports, ports and social economical, commercial spaces (26). There is no interaction of any kind. The telephone lines
cut, the communication not allowed. The only factors which still maintain the unity of the town, are the common electricity and the water networks. The green line, is a social, physical but as well a visual obstacle. One has no acknowledgement of what is happening to the opposite site, as if the city was not once an integrated whole.

Even the surrounding physical environment had to be shared between the two communities. The location of Nicosia, in the heart of the Mesaoria plain, the only island town of Cyprus, the poor urban visual environment and the lack of areas with a natural character, as well as its hot and dry climate imposed a great mobility of the population towards other recreational areas especially during the long, hot summer. Now all these areas are divided between the two people of Cyprus, each part not being accessible to the other. The south part has the most important mountain resorts, and the north the most beautiful beaches and the most interesting coastal areas (27).

The Turks are attempting to an eradication of greekness in the part they control. All the greek names of streets, squares, suburbs have been changed, and unlike the situation in the Republic, there are no bi-lingual signs. They are even attempting a change of the demographic structure of the population. As Hitchens mentions: "In a decade or so, if things go on as they are, it may well be possible for a visitor ignorant of history to arrive and to imagine that there have always been two states on the island. "
C. ACCEPTING THE DIVISION

Though the division has been established on the ground, it has not been established in the hearts and minds of the Cypriot people.

The south part of the city, where I live, continues to live and function as nothing actually has happened. A visitor, in the greek side, does not realize the real situation unless he goes close enough to the "Green Line", to see the barriers, the "alt" signs, to see the Turkish soldiers, walking on the city walls, holding their guns, chatting, shouting, cursing and even to hear the hotza (the Turkish priest) to pray to Allach every dawn and afternoon.

"By day, if one takes the promenade down the busiest shopping street in town, there comes a point where the advertisements, the bars and the inducements simply run out. There is no point for most people, in proceeding further. They retrace their steps, and find another turning with more promise." (Hitchens, 1984)

The Greeks have developed a psychological attitude of living close to the "borders", not understandable to the foreigner. For example, the greek drivers seemed to ignore the only Turks they are allowed to see, when passing under the Paphos Gate, or when they are playing tennis in the tennis courts of the moat, under the very careful eyes of the "enemy". All around the Green line, within the walled city, cultural centers, art centers, pubs, cafeterias, tavernas started to make their appearance lately, as if to react to the mental death of the frontier areas. A type of frontier atmosphere, like the one in Berlin, an intermixing of artistic, theatrical, and underground situation where poor people are attracted by the low rents, and artists by the special climate the "wall power" as Schoning names it.
4. SUMMARY OF DIVISION

4A. SOME CONTRADICTIONS OF THE DIVISION—NICOSIA OF THE SOUTH SIDE

Nicosia: divided and most severely damaged economically and socially and yet the leading city, the overconcentration of administration, credit, and auxiliary services, of commerce and trade. (Only tourism has declined)

Nicosia: the frontier city, the danger, the uncertainty of the future, and yet the new investment in business, the fine restaurants, the hotels, the discos, the overnight entertainment centers, the social life of the bourgeoisie.

Nicosia, the border area: the dilapidation and abundance, the poor people, the refugees, and yet the cultural centers, the artists, the theatrical and underground situation, the high society meetings in the taverns, the race club.

4b. SOME CONCLUSIONS AND THOUGHTS

1. The division of Nicosia affected its social and physical space more than its economic one. Today Nicosia is an extreme in scale of polarized societies, polarised in terms of ethnic composition, cultural and social performance, perception and development of the physical, social, economic space.

2. Nicosia is a dual physical, social, administrative, linguistic, religious, political, economical environment.

3. The level of division, is not only a problem of local
conflicts. It is also the encapsulation of the bi-polarity and conflict into the urban setting of:
- Greece and Turkey
- Western and Eastern cultures
- Europe and Asia
- Christianity and Islam

4. **Nicosia of the past** became a capital of one state due to its central location and it developed into the hub of transport network.

**Nicosia of the present** is considered, at least by the Turkish Cypriots, a capital of two "states", not being central to any of them, the end of traffic corridors.

Nevertheless, Nicosia survived economically from its new insular and border situation. And this is in a way connected to the fact that the capital of Cyprus is still central to its surrounding uneasy Mediterranean world. The events of Lebanon had made many overseas companies, located in Beirut, to choose Nicosia as their new location, and many other rich Lebanese to come and establish in Nicosia. But this issue has another opposing dimension. Nicosia lies in the center of conflicts, and the wave of uneaseness affects the political and social life of the island.

Nicosia is now a frontier within its own country, but still a centrality in the Mediterranean world of Middle East. The geographical distance relations cannot change. Only the local relational conditions.

5. The **Buffer Zone**: the physical barrier to development, the social barrier to contacts and the visual barrier to the realization of the existence of the "other side".

The **Buffer Zone**: the bi-polarization of the central area functions away from this dead but central to the urban setting, zone, away from the historic area.
The Buffer Zone is not the only physical divisive element in the urban scene of Nicosia. The existence of the walls create another barrier to integrated physical growth for both sides.

The social division is not only between the two communities, there exists also in the refugee camps and fringe areas of Nicosia in the south. Especially the refugee camps have been developed into guettos of poverty, bitterness and misfortune (as the refugee camps provide housing for the most economically needy and those having lost a member of the family during the events of 1974.)

6. The difference in level of economic growth between the two sectors of Nicosia. And yet, the Turkish sector is considered more modern and westernized than other parts of Turkey. See example of Berlin East and West, where although East Berlin is less developed than West Berlin, it is the most developed capital of eastern world.
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FIG. 23: THE GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING OF NICOSIA

FIGURE: Map of Cyprus indicating the area occupied by Turkish forces since August 1974.
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FIG. 26: THE WALLS OF Nicosia
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EXISTING URBAN FABRIC OF LUSIGNAN NICOSIA

THE VENETIAN WALLS OF NICOSIA
The figure shows the ecological development of Nicosia. Within the Venetian Walls the main structures of the past, acting as landmarks for development. Along the old commercial axis, traversing the walled city from west to east, the main market area of the city till 1974. Through the first opening to the walls made by the British in 1882 to lead to the colonial administrative buildings, the expansion trends of the commercial areas of today followed.

The administrative boundaries of Nicosia before its division. (Source: Department of Town Planning and Housing.)
Map of the central area of Nicosia. To the north of the division line is the occupied areas by the Turkish forces.
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FIG. 30: THE PARTITION OF NICOSIA

1.

Diagram of Nicosia indicating Turkish Enclave and Walled City in Center
Source: Department of Town Planning and Housing

2. The division of Nicosia in 1974
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### Table: Ethnic Composition of Cyprus 1881 and 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>% 1881</th>
<th>% 1960</th>
<th>% 1881</th>
<th>% 1960</th>
<th>% 1881</th>
<th>% 1960</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia</td>
<td>11,536</td>
<td>95,515</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larnaca</td>
<td>7,833</td>
<td>19,824</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limassol</td>
<td>6,131</td>
<td>43,593</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>658*</td>
<td>34,774</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varosha</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>34,774</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>34,983</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrenia</td>
<td>1,192</td>
<td>49,489</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Population of Nicosia and the Other Towns 1881 and 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1960</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicosia</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrenia</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famagusta</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>34,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larnaca</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limassol</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphos</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table: Population of Nicosia 1881-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>96,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>110,000 (estimate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(Sources taken from Attalides, 1981)
FOTO 8
THE BAZAAR AREA TODAY, one block of buildings away from the buffer zone.

FOTO 9
LEDRA STREET TODAY: The main commercial street of the walled city, ending against the Greek guard. In the background the Turkish flag indicates the occupied area.

(The pictures are taken from the Greek side, Summer 1985)
la. POLITICAL FUTURE

How the future of Nicosia is envisaged under the above described uncertainty of political, administrative, and socio-economic issues?

In attempting to assess the future, I think one has to begin with certain political assumptions, and see how realistic these could be.

The future of the city, is in direct relation with whatever political solution is achieved for the whole island. The political scene of today is as follows:

The greek side has accepted a framework for the solution of the Cyprus problem that envisages a federal Cyprus. The Turkish Cypriots will form one wing of the federation. The secretary general of UN, acting as a negotiator, is working under this formula, to achieve a solution accepted by both parts. What complicates the situation, is the refusal of Turkish-cypriots to conform to the greek-cypriot demand for the settlement of some issues before any other agreement is signed. These are: the withdraw of the 40,000 Turkish troops from the island, the return of the Turks settlers to Turkey, the right for property and free movement.

Under this condition, the most likely alternatives for the
political status of Nicosia for the near future become:

1. either the situation remains unsettled, with no free movement or communication between the two parts, and each sector of the city continues to develop on its own, being a capital to its own state, or

2. political agreement is achieved, and Nicosia becomes the capital of the federal state of Cyprus. One part of the city will be under the administrative control of the Greek-cypriots, the other under the control of the Turkish-cypriots. Free movement is allowed, and the borders disappear from the political scene. But yet social and physical segregation does persist. A situation, where a complete integration is achieved and the city becomes one unity is very unlikely, at least for the foreseeable future.

1B. THE NEED FOR PLANNING

Whatever the political future of Nicosia, the city is in imperative need for planning control. The capital, ever since the first overspill outside the medieval walls took place in 1920s, is expanding without any planning control, apart from whatever development the building and streets regulations, could regulate (1). The division, and the overpopulation, due to the occupation, have aggravated the problems that existed (2).

Fortunately enough for the sake of the city, both sides have realized the importance of co-ordinating efforts in planning for the future. On a meeting between representatives of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities of Nicosia, on 24th of October 1979, both sides agreed "to co-operate for the purpose of examining and
finally reaching conclusions for a Master Plan of Nicosia, and technical assistance will be requested for this project from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) under UNDP principles and procedures. The fact that the proposed study area, considers the whole urban area of Nicosia as a unity, is an indication of what kind of future for the city, Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots are looking forward to. The weight of the co-existence of the past and the love for their city seems to be more determining than the reality of the present, "circumscribed by dividing lines, leaders and the institutions they impose on followers, barbed wire and military organization".

3. THE NICOSIA MASTER PLAN

2A. THE PROJECT

The Nicosia Master Plan, as it has been mentioned before, involves the active participation of both the communities of Cyprus, the Greek Cypriots and the Turkish Cypriots with the co-ordination and assistance of UNDP.

NMP is not dealing with the political problem but the obvious assumption of the NMP, is that the separation of the present will be re-settled in some way, and there is going to be free movement between the various parts of the city. The existence of such considerations as separate civic centers and a federal center located on the present area of the Buffer Zone, reveals that NMP considers Nicosia of the future the capital of a federal state.
Bearing in mind that intercommunal discord has been the lot of Cyprus for many years, and that Nicosia is a divided city, I consider this planning task a very difficult and unique one.

-It is the task to plan for the harmonious development of Nicosia, the divided capital of the present, aiming at the preservation of the unity of the capital of the future, so that in any case the city can function at its best given the circumstances and constraints prevailing.

-It is the task to bring the two communities in co-ordination to cast aside bitterness and misgivings and to work together, for the future of the city as a whole.

-It is the task of providing a plan flexible enough to deal not only with the unavoidable degree of uncertainty in the social and economic sphere, but as well as in the political sphere. To deal with the uncertainty of the political future of the city and the country for which it is a capital; to deal with the unknown status of Nicosia, as a capital of a unified Cyprus, or a divided city with each part being a capital in a different state

-It is the task of preparing a realistic and most of all, an implementable plan for an existing city with all its special characteristics, needs, possibilities and constraints

The two sides are working separately and meet between them and their experts of the UNDP, at Ledra Palace Hotel, which is lying on the Buffer Zone area, and it is used for all intercommunal talks and meetings (3). The result of these subsequent meetings and work with the assistance of the UNDP, was the publishing of the final report of the NMP in July 1984. The detail report is still in the process of publishing.

As I said before, the study area is considered the whole urban area of Nicosia and does not distinguish between various parts of the city (4). The planning horizon is 20 years (1981-2001), to "enable provision to be made for the long-term planning of future development and especially of the development of the major road system." (NMP report)
The projected population for the year 2001 is 260,000, as compared to today's population of 188,000 (5). Nicosia is assumed to continue its leading role as the capital and the major economic, service and trade center of the island. The study area will continue its importance as an employment center and that productivity will grow in secondary sector. Nicosia will continue to be the educational center and focus for the third level and special education while the potentiality for "high technology industry" is examined. Based on the above, are the assumptions on the land needs and infrastructure facilities.

All these assumptions are not far from reality, as Nicosia has already proved its dominance as the leading city in any respect and under any political conditions.

The proposed physical plan concerns a physically unified urban environment with a radial road system, conforming concentric cycles around the today's fractured core of the walled city. The plan follows the concept of activity spines, located along main streets, radiating from the center, to accommodate commercial activity and office space. Nevertheless the CBD will be strengthen and increased as compared to the today's occupied area (Fig. 33).

The major objectives of the NMP are summarized as follows:

- consolidated and concentrated urban growth and encouragement of priority development areas

- allocation of appropriate land for the development of primary land uses and coordination of infrastructure facilities.

- flexible communication system

- restructuring the city, by subdividing it into districts

- provision of an interlinked network of landscaped areas
-conservation and rehabilitation of the walled city

2B. DEALING WITH UNCERTAINTY (6)

Although the study area is considered the whole of the city and the NMP report does not deal with any alternatives of political solution, the uncertainty of the political future of Nicosia and its buffer zone, is reflected in the preparation of the NMP:

i) First by the preparation of two physical development plans, the one with the buffer zone which is dealing with the today’s situation and the continued existence of the buffer zone and the other one without it. The plan with the buffer zone is considered as an initial stage of future development, and becomes phase one of the NMP, so that when political reality permit it, will permit also the development of the final stage of NMP, the plan without the buffer zone, and the town to function in a unified manner with its parts interlinked and development taking place within the buffer zone. As a consequence two major road network solutions have been prepared (7). (Fig. 35,36,37, & 38 )

ii) The uncertainty of the future political situation is also reflected by the provision of a duality of services, located in respectively suitable areas of south and north, that will give an independence of function to each part of the city. Two civic centers, two stadium, two race courses, two administration and public utilities, two cultural areas, and a federal center lying within the buffer zone area. This in a way implies for a possible political arrangement of a federal state of Greek and Turkish
Cypriots, with separate administration on the local level.

iii) In order to meet the changing economical and most important the political realities, the NMP is intended to initiate a continuous planning process and it is kept under constant review while it will be periodically updated, every five years or sooner if conditions call for a revision.

2C. SOME THOUGHTS ON THE NMP

i. Dealing with uncertainty

The uncertainty of the political and administrative future of Nicosia provides the major constraint in dealing in depth with some issues, that would guarantee the integration of an urban environment. For certain reasons of diplomacy by both sides, the major physical, social, economic constraint for an integrated growth, and that is the present division of the city and the existence of the buffer zone is not given so much of importance in the NMP report, neither it consists the major issue of constraints. The possibility of the continuous existence of the buffer zone is only presented in drawings and not discussed at all in the report.

For example, although is recognised that:

"predictions can never be an exact science and precise forecasts unattainable" (NMP, report)

given the dimension of the division of the city and the unknown political and administrative future, there are no alternative estimates given of future land needs and functions, to deal with the different possible outcomes of the political future. I recognize the difficulty of dealing with these issues, but
nevertheless I could argue that a time schedule of achievements of goals and different assumptions on the growth of the city should be made, in order to deal in some respect with this uncertainty.

Given the diplomacy used by both parts, in dealing with the concept of unified urban environment while being separated, many things remain unclear. For example the assumed projected population for the study area of 260,000 by the year 2001, is based on average annual growth of 1.5% of the today's population. Given that 25% of the inhabitants of Greek Nicosia today are refugees from the occupied areas, the assumption that political circumstances will permit the capital to function as one city in one state, whether this is a federal state or a republic would also include the possibility that a number of the refugees will return to their homeland.

The re-use or not of the Nicosia International Airport, which according to NMP is to develop into an International transit center in the East Mediterranean region will have enormous impacts for the capital, and is one uncertainty of the economical future of Nicosia the plan is not dealing with.

The status of the city, and consequently its economic development will be a direct factor of the future political conditions. The future development of each part would be influenced by this political future, and the development of the whole area would not just merely be the sum of the two parts at any moment.

ii. Urban environment

Due to the uncertainty of the future, the NMP is being realistic enough to deal only with those issues under which the plan can be implemented, whatever the political future of the city.
this respect, and depending on political achievements, the NMP is dealing with the problems regarding the present situation on both sides in such a way that the physical integration of the two parts will become possible in the future; how the road system can function better to serve both parts of the divided city but as well as the city as a whole, the linkage in the transportation pattern, certain common functions, land uses in each part so that they will form a unified urban environment when time will permit but as well as, deal with today's problems. Consequently the institutional arrangements that are suggested for the implementation of the plan concern only the physical aspects of the plan.

Although the plan considers a unified physical environment, the social and economic integration are not discussed at all, and I think an essential part of the implementation is missing if these issues are not taken into consideration. The integration will not only come by the simple removal of the physical barriers, but as well as by removing social and economical barriers.

For example, nowhere in the plan, appear the different socio-economic conditions prevailing in the two sectors of Nicosia, the different degree of development and the difference in skilled labor availability (8). If we consider the case of the re-unification of Jerusalem, one of the major concerns was the process of equalizing services between East and West Jerusalem (9).
3.PROBLEMS TO BE OVERCOME IN PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE.

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF BERLIN AND JERUSALEM

3A.PROBLEMS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE NMP

While the overriding, undisputed principle underlying Nicosia's planning is the realization of its unity, considering the present political reality, the most critical phase of the NMP is implementation. I would like here to discuss some issues that I see to stand in the way for implementation (10), using the experience gained by examining the examples of Berlin and Jerusalem.

1. Political will. NMP report recognizes that "a concerted political will is necessary to ensure the effective implementation of the NMP". This is very important, given that the two communities of Cyprus have not reached any agreement concerning the future of the capital and the island as a whole, for the past 12 years. Here we have the example of Berlin, where the two sides were working together on plans for twenty years, in order to retain the unity of the transportation system, but separately on the implementation of tasks. Competition between the two systems was the keynote that guided the plans of this period, so as today the city landscape is reflecting the political landscape: to each his own, both parts ignoring the fact that they have a common frontier.

Given that the Cyprus problem is not primarily a problem of intercommunal conflict, but more a problem of an invasion and occupation of the territory of the island, and considering the external influences and the interests the great powers of the world have in it, the political reality becomes even more complicated.
2. **Security.** With whatever political agreement, both parts should feel secure. And as Hillebrand writes for the future of West Berlin, "security is more than physical security; it also operates at the psychological level." The inhabitants of Nicosia and those elsewhere who are expected to contribute to the long-range future of the city must feel secure in their lives and their investments.

3. **Demographic change.** The bi-polar community of Nicosia had gained another dimension after its division. Both cohesive structures of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities of Nicosia, have changed a lot, the years following the separation. To the Greek community a great number of refugees of the southern areas now occupied by the Turkish army, was added and had divided the Greek-cypriot community into refugees and non-refugees. If only a part of these refugees will have the right to return, then the feelings of bitterness of those remaining might block the way to integration.

To the Turkish community a number of immigrants of Anatolia was also added, following the efforts of Turkey for colonization of the island. These people have not shared before a common culture with the Greek-cypriots. It is like the case of Jerusalem where, the factors which divided these people initially became even more pronounced during the separation (11).

4. The existing bi-polarity of the two communities of the city that might block the effort of unity and integration. Here we have the example of Jerusalem, where although the Israelis policy was the integration and swallowing of the Arab community within the Jewish economic system, and although the Arabs were better off after the re-unification of the city, they had never accepted their defeat and were more isolated within their neighborhoods, with
feelings of bitterness and unjustice that stand in the way of the integration of the people of the city.

The question then becomes, not only how to preserve the concept of unity in plans but also how ready are the two communities to implement it in reality.

3B. IS CO-EXISTENCE IN THE FUTURE POSSIBLE AND DESIRABLE

The Greek-cypriots have never accepted the division of their capital, and of the whole island and are emphasizing the importance of Cyprus as one state, Nicosia as one city so much as West Berlin was trying to show the world the significance of its unity, organizing competitions for the planning of the whole Berlin. The Turkish-cypriots leaders are satisfied with the present situation (comparing with their past status as a minority in the city ), and they try as much as East Berlin to establish division by creating facts. (12)

I do not know how the Turkish cypriot population feels about this, because being a Greek-cypriot myself I cannot visit the other side". But I can use as objective judgment what a Brigadier Harbottle, who was Chief of Staff of the United Nations Force in Cyprus, wrote:

"The myth of deep animosity between Greeks and Turks is one that has been perpetuated by those who seek to convince their fellows and world opinion that the two communities cannot love together; but it is a myth long overdue for exploding."

(Attalides, 1976).
My parents and especially my grand parents, who were too living in Nicosia, as I do today, lived in peace with the Turkish-cypriots, under relations of personal friendship and economic co-operation. Although the two communities had never actually integrated into one another, and had retained their independence, symbols and customs, and their distinct meeting places, yet traditionally, Turkish and Greek Cypriots retain bridges of interaction, like the market place, work-place and through trade, and even through some entertainment areas.

Attalides, describing the traditional coexistence of the two communities, is trying to prove that the distance and conflict which developed between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities was not intrinsically due to the different cultural make-up, but rather due to the development of nationalism, political organization including external intervention, and the economic structure of the two groups, all being issues that can change and influenced by political means. And in this way, he was trying to come to a conclusion rather hopeful for a future perspective in Greek and Turkish Cypriots relations.

The long intercommunal discord and separation has led to alienation and after the division of island, the complete physical separation and the need to adopt to severe stress arising from political pressures have widen the gap. The division of Nicosia has destroyed its community base as in the case of Jerusalem, and I would not imagine that the simple removance of the buffer zone can make the city function as before. The integration, and if not so the economical, the social one will take years to come.
But nevertheless, the separation had some positive effects, if these can be called so. Benvenisti, in describing the life in Jerusalem after the re-unification writes:

"Perhaps most important of all, is the fact that both sides became fully aware of the existence of the other, an existence which one had tried to ignore and the other had seen merely as something to be overcome."

This is very much the same as in the case of Nicosia, after its division in 1974. Especially for the Greek Cypriots, who being the dominant group, both numerically and economically, had never actually before taken seriously the existence of the Turkish-Cypriot minority of the city. Now all Greek Cypriot political leaders agree that there must be a "turn to the Turkish Cypriots."

Within the Turkish Cypriot community itself, opposition has been growing against its leadership. The fact that the degree of unemployment and poverty which exists is a new phenomenon for the Turkish Cypriots can only be attributed to the leadership and the occupying army by the mass of the Turkish Cypriots.

For all these reasons, there is hope for relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots yet, but only if left to themselves. When a U.S. Senate sub-committee took a look at Cyprus in 1976 they wrote:

"... the Cypriot Turks in the occupied northern part of the island seem to have joined their compatriots in the south as victims of Turkish aggression and occupation. This perhaps explains the growing feeling of latent "Cypriotness" on the island, in both the Greek and Turkish communities. How deep this runs, and what it means, is extremely difficult to measure. But it does represent a new nationalism of some kind." (Attalides 69, 1976)

This hope however, in order to turn into reality if however
political achievements will permit in the future contacts of any kind between the two communities, will mean, an imaginative social planning, necessary to heal psychological traumas and unsecurities, efface the antagonism of cultural symbols. It will mean also a supportive physical planning to enhance such opportunities of contacts. And this is an effort both sides have to start long before integration.

And returning once more to the example of re-unification of Jerusalem, Teddy Kollek adds to this:

"Tensions do exist in the city and nobody can deny them. But it was a much less happy city when walls and barbed wire divided it; and it was certainly a more violent city than it is today. We have made progress toward a city of tolerant coexistence in which common interests are emerging, and we have established crucial principles that make continuing progress possible." (Kraemer 4, 1980)

Maybe we need to establish our principles for the Nicosia of the future. But not only as a city of tolerant co-existence but as a city of integrated and happy co-existence.

4. PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE OF NICOSIA USING THE LESSONS DERIVED FROM BERLIN AND JERUSALEM

4A. IDEOLOGY

In planning for the inner core of the whole Berlin, in 1961, the concept was that the traditional ties arising with respect for the peculiar historical features of Berlin, would guide the direction of a new city arrangement. And that the political
realities will force West Berlin to seek a new role in order to survive.

In the planning concepts guiding the planning and development of Jerusalem, it was emphasized that "both on the functional and the spiritual level, one must never lose sight of Jerusalem's development in ancient times, so that in building a present and a future we will respect the values of the past."

In the case of Nicosia's planning I would say that the question becomes: "What kind of conceptual approaches we can identify, given the reality of the present, the desire for the future (for both sides), and the heritage of the past."

The heritage of the past, apart from the preservation of the historical monuments, also means the traditional co-existence and symbiosis of the two communities within the same circumference of the medieval walls, the shared social and cultural identity, as in the case of their common participation in the commercial and religious fairs, their economic and social interaction in the market place, the food market, the hamams (Turkish Baths), the coffee shops for men, the women's bazaar for women. It also means the ethnic identity, the non merging cultures, the spatial segregation at the neighborhood level.

The reality of the present, is the physical separation and the buffer zone, the disconnection of all the systems of urban life. It is also the social alienation, the psychological trauma and unsecurity, the mistrust to the "other side", the bitterness. It is also the unordered and scattered development, the uncontrol expansion, the deterioration of the walled city and the areas close
to the buffer zone, the lack of public open space, the traffic congestion.

The desire of the future is the unity of the physical environment, and yet the autonomy and the accommodation of basic ethnic needs in a bi-national secular society.

4B. MY ROLE AS A PLANNER

I see my role as a planner, assuming a responsibility in planning for the future of Nicosia, given the reality of the present division of the city, and the concept of unity of the NMP, to plan in such a way as both the reality of the present and the desire of the future can work, each not against the other. To control the growth of the divided parts and preserve those conditions that will make easier the integration in the future, when it will come.

Assuming that, regardless of sovereignty, whether it be undivided, divided, limited or joint, Nicosia of the future will have no borders and there is going to be unrestricted movement of people, goods, capital and labor, then I see my role as a social planner, to create the conditions that will permit social integration. To build in other words, small bridges of communication and contact that will bring people together again, to
I see my role as a physical planner the identification of the systems concerned and the provisions for them, so that the possibility of re-unity is ensured. In other words the systems that will support a possible physical and social integration. More or less the systems with which the NMP is dealing with, but more emphasizing those that are essential for the preservation of the unity.

The goals that should guide any planning, in order to achieve a city of not only "tolerant coexistence", but as well as integrated co-existence should be:

- Unhindered development of life in all sections of the city, ensure equal governmental, municipal, and social services in all parts of the city
- Increase cultural, social and economic contacts among the various elements of Nicosia's population.

4C. PROPOSALS WITHIN THE NMP CONTEXT

1. Building bridges of interaction

First I will have to assume a strategy of implementation in three phases, following the political achievements in the area.

1a) The first phase of these kind of bridges, as the Greek mayor of Nicosia Mr Lellos Demetriades proclaims, should be established even before the re-unification is achieved to prepare the ground of integration. These may concern matters which do not require the acceptance of any kind of sovereignty such as technical problems,
utilities, municipal services. A proof that this can work is the recent co-operation of the two communities for the sewage treatment of the city.

During this phase the international role of Nicosia, as a service center in the Middle East, can be emphasized more, so as to turn the vulnerability of its location in the center of conflicts, to an asset. To change the role of Nicosia into offering such services that are over and above intercommunal conflicts. The "Center of Middle East Studies", located in Nicosia, is proposing a role for the future for Nicosia, as a center of international conferences and overseas companies and as center for higher education for the surrounding countries.

1b) The second phase will assume a political achievement where interaction between the two communities is permitted. During this phase the economic interaction can be more emphasized. I should emphasize the existence of a free and safe zone for all the people, where some bridges should permit economic interaction. The example of Jerusalem’s re-unification can demonstrate how easier is the remove the economical barriers rather than the social ones. Within this zone some of the international services Nicosia will be offering, will be located.

The present buffer zone area could very well act as such free zone of communication. The policy of the NMP for this area, is to turn the present dead strip into a glueing element of physical and social space, by locating appropriate and compatible land uses, of common interest to both communities, when such development becomes feasible by local circumstances. Such "linking objects" can be the
market place, commercial centers, bazaar. This zone which is currently under the protection of the UN forces, can continue to be so, for a period of time, till future conditions will permit the complete removance of physical barriers.

Another important "linking object" that can connect the Cypriot Greeks with the Cypriot Turks, is higher education. The establishing of a university in Cyprus, that is currently under study, can very well serve as a space of social interaction of the youth of the two communities, that have been, growing completely alienated from each other. The University can function as a bridge before even the solution of the political problem, as an international zone where all people of Cyprus and people from all Middle East and Europe can interact. The dividing line of Nicosia, and of the two worlds of east and west can very well turn into the sewing element of all opposing and in any way different words. But all is a matter of political will.

On the other hand, the university can very well turned into a point of great friction. Not if the two communities are left alone, but if external influences continue to interfere.

The re-use of the airport, currently located within the buffer zone area, may function as an international place, and a bridge of interaction.

The third phase will assume a re-settlement of the political problem, free movement and abolition of physical separating elements. Here more emphasis on social interaction will be given, in order to start leaving mistrusts and misgivings of the past aside.

An area that can very well serve as a mixture element, is
transportation. Prof. Karl Steiniz mentioned that in Jerusalem are now working towards incorporating the two existing bus stations into one.

Dealing with entertainment, is more difficult to establish bridges because of the problem of language and culture. Traditionally areas of entertainment where the two communities of Nicosia used to interact, were food-enterprises, dancing halls and the race club, today located very closed to the buffer zone, on the south side.

It would be extremely naive to imagine that all the above resolutions can be implemented with ease. But I do not think we must abandon the idea of integrating the urban life for the all people of Nicosia.

II. Physical planning and the concept of unity

Preserving systems concerned - The NMP

The systems concerned have already been identify implicitly within the NMP, although not discussed as such. They include: the use of the buffer zone itself, the proposed road network, the Central Business District and the revitalization of the walled city.

IIa) Buffer Zone

The concept of turning the buffer zone into a glueing element of physical and social space, is very much the same concept as the concept of the "life line" for the Berlin Wall and "seam" area in planning for Jerusalem. In the case of Jerusalem the strengthening
of the ties between the two parts of the city, is believed to be achieved by ensuring continuity of construction and roads but as well as creating focal point of urban life. An interesting idea of Jerusalem's planning is the cementing of the union between the two parts of the city with several east-west through arteries, that cut across the seam area.

In Nicosia, due to the reality of the division and absence of communication between the two parts, and given the existing radial road system, this idea of cutting through arteries is not applicable for the time being. But this idea, of turning the buffer zone into a spine of all urban functional axis given so abstract in the NMP report, can be worked out further in order to become integrated in the city function. This could be achieved if the "glueing element" of the buffer zone is more linked to other systems of day-life of the inhabitants of both parts of the city. Here the "belt" concept of Sharoun's plan for Berlin, can be implemented to help the cementing of the union of the city. Cultural, commercial, office, entertainment "belts" can be planned and directed towards the center and the buffer zone, from both parts of divided Nicosia of today. The idea is to build a "life line" radiating and reaching all over the city. (see suggested Fig. 39)

11lb) Walled City

The round pattern of the walled city is acting as the heart of the development, a physical existing unifying element of the present and future urban form of the capital. The historic center of Nicosia is an outstanding example of international architectural heritage and the NMP recognizes it as an irreplaceable heart for the
city. (15) It is the same concept that is guiding Jerusalem's replanning after the reunification and also the concept that is apparent in the planning efforts of West Berlin in 1984. (16)

Especially consideration is taken in the NMP for the use of the buffer zone within the walled city. This dead strip covers up to the 10% of the walled city's area.

"The buffer zone in the Walled City is the most important "glueing" area in the functional integration of the city. Its development should assume its original but enriched role as the hub of activity for the benefit of the walled City and Nicosia as a whole. It is proposed to extend pedestrianization, in the buffer zone area by creating a linear route along the historical axis from Famagusta Gate to Paphos Gate, with a variety of activities, open space, squares, etc., located along this route. The traditional continuous shopping axis from the southern end of Ledra Street to Kyrenia Gate should also be re-established". (Fig. 38) (NMP report)

In planning for a University of Nicosia, with a proposed location in the buffer zone outside the walls, special consideration is given to the option of location some faculties or appropriate departments, such as Fine Arts, Archaeology and historic Studies, etc. within the buffer zone in the walled city.

I agree with my professor Julian Beinart, that at an initial stage of integration, the buffer zone can serve as the "glueing element", but at a later stage, even if a federation is formed, the walled city to stand as a symbol of unity. To ensure its integrity and unity of urban space with no buffer zones and boundaries. It should be an "icon" actually and symbolically belonging to both federations, to both communities, to all the people of Cyprus.

The round pattern of the walls will serve as a visual and physical existing unifying element of the present. The existence of
historical monuments, valued by both communities, the heritage of the past.

As part of the revitalization program of the walled city, and the policy to widen of opportunities for low-cost public and private housing development, is the housing schemes within the walled city. Such a project is being currently carried out, within an obsolete area very close to the buffer zone.

These revitalization efforts of the walled city, and especially of the areas very close to the buffer zone are again very important. The concept of "injecting" life in the walled city to its dead strip and outwards, instead of the periphery, is something the NMP has to look at, more carefully.

IIIc) Central Business District (CBD)

The Physical Development Plan of the NMP is a center-core oriented plan with a very strong centrally located CBD with a form related and integrated to the Walled City (17). The NMP recognizes that a strong CBD, is a prerequisite need for the success of Nicosia as well as its traditional lifestyle no matter the problems of today. Improvement to the physical environment and to the communications system, will provide an identifiable and easily accessible center to the city (18).

Maybe instead of having two bus terminals as proposed in the NMP, in respective areas in the south and north of the city, put them close enough so that if future situation will permit it, they can act as one intermixing element of transportation.

The policy of the NMP, is the establishment within the CBD, of three major civic centers in order to satisfy the requirements for
civic and community uses as well as for federal activities. The civic centers will become focal points and add interest and vitality and life to the CBD.

IIIId) Road network

The road network is a very essential concept in preserving the possibility of re-unification. The proposed primary road network of the NMP, is a radial system supplemented by ring roads. This is an improvement of the existing radial system, that developed out of the existence of the core settlement of the walled city, that used to function as the hub of the transport network.

In this respect the NMP is not recognizing the reality of the present and near future and treats Nicosia as an integrated urban environment. The dilemma in the planning efforts is very obvious here. It is the dilemma to be realistic enough and accept as a projection of the future the present situation or an improvement of it, but where still there exist two separate entities within the Nicosia area. In such case the plan that could safeguard social and physical integration of two different urban systems could be a proposed system of two separate road networks but with strong connections and arteries cutting through each part (like the planning concepts of Jerusalem). Moreover this policy could facilitate the transport movement towards the center and the "glueing zone" of the two systems, in this way ensuring it to function as a meeting place and safeguarding it from decline.

The other dilemma is to be optimistic for the future or not to accept the division as something that is possible or natural to continue and plan in the same terms as the NMP planners are.
Landscape

As part of the concept for an interlinked network of landscaping, the proposed green belt notion round the city would not only give a recognisable edge to the city, as is stated in the NMP report, but will form as well an outer ring of a physical unifying element, to complete the notion of the inner ring of the walled area.
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FIG. 39: THE "BELT" CONCEPT FOR NICOSIA
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F: federal center, CC: civic centers

Note: The number within the cycle indicates phasing.
FIG. 41: NMP, DEVELOPMENT POLICY FOR THE WALLED CITY WITH BUFFER ZONE
FIG. 42: NMP, DEVELOPMENT POLICY FOR THE WALLED CITY WITHOUT BUFFER ZONE
CONSTANZA BASTION: The walled city on the right side. Within the moat an athletic field and parking lot.

Tennis courts within the moat.
PART V
CLOSING REMARKS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE ISSUES OF THE DIVISION IN ALL THREE CASES

Having come to the end of my study, and looking back with a comparative look on all three cases, I can justify my first assumption that, although the three cases are very different urban environments, made up of different realities, the results and issues of their division are not dissimilar.

a. In all three cases, two culturally, ideologically and symbolically different social and physical spaces merged out of the division of the urban environment.

In Jerusalem and Nicosia, the social division pre-existed but with the separation it turned into a complete polarization of societies. Berlin of the past was composed of the same German people, and yet the result was again two very different environments from all aspects. From this last example one could argue that is not only the culture of the people that creates a social and physical space, but also the ideology imposed on them plays an important part. In the case of Berlin the ideology is socialism versus capitalism. In both the cases of Jerusalem and Nicosia, the ideology is nationalism.

And this is proved by the fact that in all three cases the division has a symbolic meaning greater than that of local interest.

b. The division line imposed on all three urban environments,
runs through the very center of the city, composing the most important factor determining their future development. The market forces drive away the new development from the "separating walls". The authorities of West Berlin and Greek Nicosia, never having accepted the division, are looking towards the revitalization of the old city center, which is falling apart as being a border area to the present urban environment. Jerusalem authorities are rebuilding the center, "sewing" the two parts together.

But is not only the authorities who have not accepted the division. A special "frontier atmosphere" has developed in both the border areas, close to the dividing line of West Berlin and Greek Nicosia. An intermixing of poor people, attracted by the low rents, and art and music lovers, revolutionaries, liberals and capitalists, all attracted by the many cultural and art centers, growing in the area, the pubs and fine restaurants. A type of "wall power" as a reaction to the mental death of the area.

c. The division has destroyed the societies of the three cities. The new youth of East Berlin is made up of different believes and ideologies from that of West Berlin. The social differentiation that existed in Nicosia and Jerusalem was turned into polarization.

d. The "verbs" of the division in all three cases:

**Physical Space**

- the tearing of the urban pattern.
- the breaking of the city's heart and core.
- the disconnection of the urban space from the countryside
- the elimination of traditional landmarks as a hing
development.

**Social Space**

- the **isolation** and **alienation** of the people living in each part.
- the **dichotomization** of common culture, of sharing experiences, of the perception of the urban setting.
- the **ending up** of common economic and social development.
- the **cut through** friendship and neighborhood ties.

e. After the separation, the two parts not only develop different social environments but as well economic ones. The economic difference that exists between the two parts in all three cases is a very obvious one. East Berlin is poorer than West Berlin, Arab Jerusalem used to have lower standards of living than Jewish Jerusalem; the same is true for the two sectors in Nicosia.

In all three cases, the city had to change its role in order to adjust to the new situation and meet the severe constraints for development imposed by its division.

f. How viable is each part that is created after the division of a whole? Maybe the size and topography of Berlin, but as well as the international interest have supported the creation of two separate systems. But in the case of Nicosia, neither the size nor the role of the city in the international political topography could support such a situation.
2. THE CONCEPT OF UNITY IN PLANNING FOR A DIVIDED CITY

What can be an approach in planning for a divided city in the short run but with the concept of unity in the long run?

Some recommendations on things to avoid or look after, that came out of the examination of the issues of the division and the planning concepts in Berlin and Jerusalem:

a. Start with certain political assumptions making a realistic assessment of possibilities and probabilities.

   Use imaginative policy to capitalize an assets and overcome handicaps, so that planning for the reality of the present, will not block the conditions for the possibility of unity in the future.

b. Be aware, so that politics will not turn against planning decisions. (We have many examples from Jerusalem).

c. Identify all alternatives concerned in planning for Nicosia of today. Create not only the conditions for the "glueing" up of the two parts to be possible in the future, but as well as look for the alternative in planning that will not break any further the city into separate units. Try and identify the planning method that sees the city as a continuous urban fabric which permits gradual developments in all major directions, and still strengthens the center (even if this is now a border area) and is feasible under present conditions.

d. Consider the systems concerned that will provide the unity on a long term basis and the proper function on a short term. What are the systems people can share, and what elements
(functional, historical, cultural) can bring people together so that both a physical and social integration can be achieved.

e. And finally plan for the future, respecting the past and realizing the present. Nevertheless, "history is not only useful because we can recall the past in it, but because as well in it we can read the future".
INTRODUCTION

1. Cyprus is called the "island of love", because according to the Greek Mythology, Aphrodite, the goddess of love, was born in Cyprus.


PART I - BERLIN

1. INTRODUCTION - URBAN DEVELOPMENT

1. West Berlin lies nearly in the middle of East Germany, cut off from its countryside.

2. Liselotte and Oswald Mathias Ungers, in Post-War Berlin, call Berlin the humanist city. The term humanist as applied to a city refers to a place in which the traces of the past are vivid and evident, a city shaped by intellectual and physical efforts. Later they write:

"The architecture and urban design of the humanist architects, was basically a morphological concept, interconnecting architectural concepts, the romantic as well as the classical, the city as well as the garden, the rational as well as the emotional expression. This did not separate the world into dichotomous entities but united contradictions within a universal view. " It was the opposite concept of what was to become of Berlin in the following years. The division of one entity of city life and population into dichotomous entities with different symbols, ideals and expressions."

3. In encyclopedia Brittanica, under Berlin, the appearance of the city is described where a functional distinction between the different districts of the city was apparent. The oldest part of Berlin was together with that portion of the town lying immediately west, the center of business activity. The west end and the southwest were the residential quarters; the northwest was largely occupied by academic, scientific, and military institutions; the north was the seat of machinery works; the northeast of the woolen manufactures; the east and southeast of the dyeing, furniture, and metal industries; and the south of railway works. The social and official life of the capital centered upon Unter den Linden, running from the former royal palace to the Brandenburger Tor.
4. The need to plan for the city as a whole, was recognized as early as mid 19th century, when Schinkel attempted an organic coordination of the several sectors of the city into a unified total and harmonious urban environment for commercial and civic life in the very heart of what was to become the divided and ruptured urban area of the 20th century.

Hobrecht plan attempted a connecting radial link between the several suburbs, while the competition of 1910, included for the first time the condition of providing a structure for the whole of the Berlin metropolitan area, including its suburbs. The main task set in the competition, was the reorganization of the rambling and chaotic urban area, the improvement of the living conditions of the lower income-groups, the alignment of the railway lines, and the creation of open spaces and recreation areas. The recognition of these complex and involved problems contributed to the foundation of the administrative union of Greater Berlin in 1920.

DIVISION

5. In 1964, a pass-issuing office was set up for urgent family affairs, enabling West Berliners to visit their relatives in the Easter Sector, on such occasions as birth, marriage, death and critical illness. In the following years, the Quadripartite Agreement had reached practical arrangements to safeguard and improve access to West Berlin, to strengthen the ties of the city with the Federal Republic of Germany, make life easier for the West Berliners and facilitate their communications with their surroundings. (Berlin, 1980)

6. A definition for the city given by Christofer Alexander, in THE CITY AS A MECHANISM FOR SUSTAINING HUMAN CONTACT (1966)

7. Only seven of the original 16 pumping stations were in Western territory, which required a substantial investment plan in order to assure adequate water supply. The same situation with the energy system. Disconnected from the West European electric power-sharing network, West Berlin- which used to buy 35% of its electricity from outside the city limits until the separation- had to adjust to the new situation. (Hillenbrand 135, 1980)

8. These emigrations westwards, which had occurred as a constant phenomenon throughout Prussian history, due to the fact that greater wealth was accumulated there, continued throughout the 1950s, causing East Berlin an important lost in skilled and educated labour force. (Doug Clelland in Post-War Berlin, 1982)

9. The isolation of West Berlin and resulting circumstances such as limited building sites have pushed real estate prices and building costs so high that improvements in the infrastructure have become much more expensive and weight much heavier on the budget in West Berlin than in other federal states in West Germany. (Berlin 1980)
10. The ratio of 23% of the population over 65 in the western part of the city lies considerably above the average of somewhat over 15% in the Federal Republic of Germany. In the age group under 15 years old the ratio of 15% is equally unfavorable compared with an average of 23% in the Federal republic. And women account for ca. 56% of the total population. (Berlin, 1980)

11. The aftermath of the war and the special geopolitical situation resulting from it had considerable effects on the city's demographical development. Berlin, which had 4.3 million inhabitants at the beginning of World War II, lost over one third of its population during the war; in 1945, the population had dropped to 2.8 million. Although it increased again in the decade following the war, it has been declining continuously since 1958. In 1980 West Berlin had ca. 1,998,000 inhabitants. In 1979, East Berlin had a population of ca. 1,130,000. (Berlin, 1980)

12. In 1980 ca. 233,000 foreigners were registered in West Berlin. More than three quarters of them are foreign migrant workers and their families who had been recruited from Mediterranean countries in the 1960's and early 1970's when the expanding German economy desperately needed workers. a

URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING

13. "... the authors of the plans identified their preferences of political patronage according to which sector they chose to live and work in. While the plans often look neutral, their meaning, was eminently a reflection of political preference between Soviet "Direct Democracy" and Western "Participative Democracy". (Clelland A.D. 1982)

14. West Berlin, having been cut off the old city center, with its historical and cultural continuity gone, is looking for an urban identity. The flair of Kurfurstendamm and the biggest trade fair center in Europe (the International Congress Center) is an effort towards this direction but is not enough. Frank Werner states that if "West Berlin wants an urban identity the question arises of its attitude to Berlin as a whole and its building in relation to this."

15. Although this seems hard to imagine, the very fact that this area continued in many places for some years to be empty of buildings, indicates that West Berlin authorities were saving this section for the future. The new buildings permitted into this central part of West Berlin are all admitted because they conform to the architectural plan of the future; like the Excelsior project at the ruins of the former Anhalter railway station and the new business center at the corner of Friedrichstrasse and Lindenstrasse. (Nelson 358)
16. Future city plans include a transformation of the Friedrichstrasse from Mehring Platz to Bahnhof Friedrichstrasse in East Berlin into a beautiful pedestrian mall, closed to all motor vehicles. Once Berlin is reunited, it is to become a shopping and entertainment boulevard.

17. The financial institutions that are today established on the Hardenbergstrasse, near the Kurfurstendamm, are expected some day merely to augment the ones which are again to be re-established in the Eastern "City". (Nelson 358)

18. This tangent quadrangle of highways were suggested to be the traffic arteries of the inner urban area. They would both absorb motor traffic entering at the outskirts of the city destined for the downtown area and serve as by-pass roads for the major part of through traffic. Serving these two functions, they would form the basic principle of the arrangement of private traffic in the city. (Haupstadt Berlin, 1960)

19. In West Berlin interest now focuses almost exclusively on north-south traffic in the Tiergarten and east-west traffic in the Friedrichstadt area (east of Kreuzberg). This is in basic contradiction to the aim of unity and disregards the original concept.

20. The center of cultural facilities was to be Friedrichsforum with the Technological institutions in the center of gravity of the political and cultural zones. Friedrichstadt was going to be the center of economic and social life while the Parliament building was to be located within the curve of Spree river, the traditional place of sovereignty. The historical axial cross-roads of Unter den Linten and Friedrichstadt was to be maintained.

21. These models attempt to describe the process of urban growth by analyzing the differential functions and evaluation of urban space.


23. This was with accordance with the Marxist economic theory that a competitive concentration like shops and stores is senseless.

24. The Central Square (or Zentral Platz and later Marx Engels Platz) was laid out where Stadtschloss, the symbol of past oppression stood, which was demolished, in order to create a symbolic and ceremonial center of grandiose proportions. The central axis was laid in a westerly direction along the old axis to the
Stadtschloss (Unter den Linden). The importance attached to this street enabled the intended shift eastwards. A number of designs were produced, especially for the Zentrales Haus (Central Building), but the economic situation made it possible to erect only a few buildings in the center. However building did begin in the eastern part of the central axis in Stalinallee.

After 1950, the new structure of the city was still oriented to the basic layout of the main streets and squares, but the utilisation of land changed completely. This can be seen most clearly on the site where old Collin lay. Remains of old buildings which had survived were demolished and apart from some important buildings, such as the opera house and, very few of the old buildings in the center were preserved. (Clelland, A.D. 1982)

25. The two long axes, Unter den Linden from the west and Frankfurter Strasse from the southeast, could never before come together satisfactorily.

PART II - JERUSALEM

DIVISION

1. At the end of 1947, 100,000 Jews lived in Jerusalem, but nearly one-quarter of that number abandoned the city during the war. The first census held in the State of Israel, in November 1948, registered some 84,000 inhabitants in Jerusalem. Until 1951, this number reached the 138,000, and by 1967 the 197,000. (Benvenisti 31, 1976)

2. Whereas the Jewish population of Jerusalem comprised 12% of the Jewish population in Israel in 1948, it had declined to 8.2% of the total Jewish population by 1967. (Benvenisti, 1976)

3. Jerusalem did not cover the needs to its own population, and more than half of its consumer products were imported from outside.

4. At the beginning of 1967, there were only 1,000 hotel rooms in the city.

5. Meron Benvenisti writes about this: "The planners cannot be blamed for their westward orientation, as it was the only direction available for development. However, instead of moderating this process, which perpetuated the city's partition, the planners and
their political mentors encouraged the process and speeded it up. The master Plan made no effort to expand the city’s commercial center, to build up the vacant areas in the east, or to rebuild the border regions, which were thinly populated before the war and now became slums. "(Benvenisti 39, 1976)

6. When the cease-fire agreement was signed in July 1948, only 33,000 of the original 64,000 inhabitants remained in the Arab part of Jerusalem; half of the city’s inhabitants, especially the wealthy Christians and Muslims, have left the city. (Benvenisti 48&27, 1976)

7. The East Bank, especially Amman, became the undisputed economic and political center of the Kingdom and this was a fact that the inhabitants of the West Bank, whose standard of economic, social and political development was higher than that of the inhabitants of Eastern Jordan, could not ignore. By emigrating to the East Bank they had chances of reaching important positions in the political and economic life there. (Benvenisti, 1976)

8. This was due partly to the city’s Master Plan of 1944, which banned any building on the western slopes of Mount Scopus and the Mount of Olives and left the Kidron Valley slopes as open space. Another reason was some Jewish-owned land lying among unparcellated plots of land, which were thus restricted from "land settlement" (Benvenisti 46, 1976)

9. In the east and southeast the terrain was highly unsuitable for urban development, so that building took place mainly along the saddle of the Jerusalem Hills, on both sides of of the Jerusalem-Ramallah road. New housing quarters were built towards the eastern flanks of the Temple Hill, to the Valley of Kidron, the Judean desert and the busy route to Jericho and Amman, as well as along the traffic arteries to the north and south. Little development took place towards the south, as the direct connection with Bethlehem was severed. The winding road subsequently built on the eastern flanks of the Jerusalem hills was hardly conducive to urban construction. (Efrat 11, 1971)

RE-UNIFICATION

10. The precise line was drawn according to clear tactical criteria, ensuring control of hilltops and passing through defensible valleys. (Efrat 2, 1971)

11. "The Israeli authorities found East Jerusalem in a deep economic crisis as a result of the war. Over a third of the work force was unemployed; all the hotels, the city’s main source of income, were
closed; travel restrictions between Jerusalem and the West Bank had disrupted commerce with the hinterland; dislocation from Jordan and other Arab countries prevented the flow of money. The uncertainty with regard to future, the lack of liquidity, and the absence of income brought investments to a halt. The economic crisis was accompanied by sharp price rises, due to contact with the Israeli economy." (Benvenisti 177, 1976)

12. The ratio per capita of Jews to Arabs was 4:1 in 1967. In 1972 it was 3:1 at the most. (Benvenisti 148, 1982)

13. Before 1967 East Jerusalem received water only three days a week; in 1969 fresh water was available daily. The electrical system of the Jordanian sector was also being modernized and its capacity increased. In short, the city was being modernized. (Pfaff 47, 1969)

14. This also meant neon lights, cabarets, Western music, and the end of a lifestyle which the Arab of East Jerusalem cherished. (Pfaff 47, 1969)

15. There has been a Jewish majority in Jerusalem since the end of the 19th century (NOTE: before the partition, 1947, the Jews were 66.6% of the city, and by the end of 1967, there were 200,000 Jews to 50,000 Arabs in the East Jerusalem municipal area.

The Israel Government preferred to make maximum use of Arab labor in Jewish concerns, due to a manpower shortage, and did not devote sufficient efforts at establishing Arab enterprises in the city. (Benvenisti 181, 1976)

16. Benvenisti writes about this issue of polarized societies: "The basic differences between societies at war and polarized societies is that at war both real and perceived environments are dichotomized. In Jerusalem (and Belfast), the real environment is still a fairly integrated urban system. Perceived dichotomous communities strive to concretize dichotomization by creating a dual physical and social environment..." (Benvenisti 4, 1982)

17. After the re-unification and until 1970, this dichotomous environment remained as it was. However, Israeli policies of creating political facts by spatial control (to which I will refer later, changed the pattern). (Benvenisti, 1982)

18. "This segregation of ethnically heterogenous cities is the spatial expression of inherent conflict conditions which characterize plural societies. The degree of Segragation serves as an indicator of the level of the conflict intensity." (Benvenisti 172, 1982)
19. Another reason for this segregation being the language, religion, different time-offs etc.

20. Parallel to these concepts, was the political-national concept of Jerusalem as a big metropolis, functionally suitable as the capital of the State of Israel, as a world-wide spiritual and cultural center, that conflicted with the local concept which regarded objective geographical conditions as a factor bound to confine Jerusalem to the limits of an average-sized town, with a distinct character. (Kroyanker 2, 1982). The conflict between the two approaches raised some issues on which there is no full agreement yet.

21. Despite its important location, the area was never developed and has remained essentially unbuilt since 1948, when during the years of the division of the city became a border area. Now 15 years after the reunification of Jerusalem, the dichotomy between the eastern and western parts of the city, is a very clear one.

PART III - NICOSIA

1. See Alastos Doros, "Cyprus in History", London Zeno, 1976

2. And in this case the walls are barbed wire barriers, that in time gave way to baricades, real walls, gun emplacements, minefields, and trenches, but nevertheless a separating element.

3. The ethnic composition of Cyprus in 1960 was: 78.5% Greeks, 18% Turks and 3.5% other ethnic groups composed of Roman Catholics, Maronites, Armenians, Protestants, Copts, Jews and Gypsies. In 1960, the Maronites and Armenians were classified as Greeks. According to the constitution of 1959 all Cypriot citizens belong to either the Greek Cypriot or the Turkish Cypriot community. The Maronites and Armenians voted by majority to belong to the Greek community. (Attalides, 1981)

4. The Greek community of the north was forced out of their houses by the Turkish army, and the Turkish community who still was living on the south part was transferred to the north.

5. On the 15th of November 1983, the Turkish-cypriots made and unilateral declaration of independence, the so called "Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus", recognized up today only by Turkey.

6. The other cities either belonged to the government administered part or are occupied in their totality by the Turks.
7. This river is running only partly in winter.

8. The first walls of the city were built by the Lusignans, but those surviving were erected by the Venetians. Those walls, with a complete circular shape, forming eleven bastions, were built with the Renaissance prototype of the ideal city.

9. Town planning has been enacted in Cyprus by the Town and Country Law of 1972, and is not yet fully operated because of the necessary adjustments following the Turkish invasion.

10. Examples of joint uprisings against the Sultan and the pashas even during the Ottoman rule.

11. The British policy of explicitly separating the two ethnic groups is apparent in the setting up of separate Greek and Turkish schools, and in the separate representation of Greeks and Turks in the Legislative Council.

12. The structure of the constitution, which the British left to the Cypriot people was such that it was not directed toward reinforcing the national state, but rather underlining the distinctive character of and differences among the respective communities. The 18% of Turkish-cypriots were offered cultural and religious autonomy and a privileged position in the constitutional system dispropriated to their numeric percentage.

Some of the divisive provisions of this constitution were the distinct political, legislative and execution representations for each community. Separate municipalities in all major towns and villages, separate and opposing educational system. Two flags, (the Turkish and Greek one) were allowed to be used accordingly by the two communities, two languages, separate national holidays. There was no room for common national symbols and common identity.

13. Even the Greek and Turkish flag and anthem were used respectively by each community and not the flag of the new state.

14. Within the Turkish enclave offices had been established for the "Turkish Cypriot Administration", and attempts at separate development on the part of the Turkish Cypriots resulted in the establishment of separate commercial, industrial and service facilities.

DIVISION

15. The major recreational areas which are important to the population of Nicosia are the coastal resorts (like Limassol, Larnaca, Paphos, Kyrenia and Famagusta), and the mountain resorts (like the Troodos and Kyrenia range), which are relatively short journeys.

16. Nicos Vassiliou, a Greek-Cypriot economist of international standing, is giving the causes for the poor performance by Turkish Cypriots in the Economic field in his article "The widening economic
17. It is necessary to emphasize that what is described as a "Turkish sector" is only partly Turkish because a great proportion of its lands and buildings are owned by Greek-cypriots and a large part of its population was composed by Greek-cypriots until they fled or were forcibly displaced in 1974.

18. Its contribution to the urban population was only 43% in 1972, or 20% out of the total population. (see tables)

19. As the 1972 town plan had to be revised before even being implemented, due to the new conditions created after the division of the city.

20. This type of movement has been estimated to about 1%-2% of the total inbound traffic. If however, the present restrictions are relaxed, it is expected that traffic would again grow appreciably in the north-south direction, via the urban area.

21. It is characteristic that the overnight stays in Nicosia in 1973 were 239,000, representing the 17.5% of the total for all island, and in 1983 209,983 representing the 9.3% of the total only.

22. Differences also exist in dealing with the traffic problem and facilitating and utilising existing facilities as well as in the level of service provided by the public transport. The greek side is more modernized and offers a higher quality of such services.

23. Paschalis Kitromilides, in his article "from co-existence to confrontation", writes: "Understanding outside influence is the most important element in understanding the evolution of ethnic conflict in Cyprus" (Kitromilides, 1976)

24. Within Cyprus, other minorities exist, retaining their religion, linguistic and other cultural distinctions without it resulting in a political problem.

25. The constitution of the Cyprus state is only followed by the greek side.

26. Greeks are using the new airport in Larnaca (30 miles south of Nicosia), and the Turks the Tumbou airport, both being military airports before and only after 1974 being used as passenger airports.

27. When I met once a young Turkish-cypriot outside Cyprus, he made this very comment to me: "I miss the Troodos mountains (the highest mountain and the only ski-resort in Cyprus, now located in the Greek sector), and you would probably be missing Kyrenia and Famagusta beaches, inaccessible to me because of the political situation."
1. The street and building regulations are the only existing planning control for the time being, until the planning law will be fully implemented.

2. See problems discussed in the results of the division on the urban form.

3. "The project is based on a limited manpower input and on the assumption that preference will be given to pragmatic approaches as opposed to data collection and lengthy academic analyses". (NMP report 1984)

4. "NMP addresses the planning problems of Nicosia as a whole, while at the same time responding to the existing situation taking into consideration the various needs and requirements confronting different parts of the town." (NMP, report 1983)

5. Based on an average annual growth of 1.5% of the today's population which is 188,00; 147,000 of them living in the south area and 41,000 of them living in the north.

6. "The proposed NMP is sufficiently flexible and capable of serving needs and requirements under existing as well as future circumstances by proposing appropriate solutions and policies so that orderly development may be achieved. For this reason the general concept of the planning process has been based on the analysis of the existing situation and trends in order to meet existing needs effectively, to improve existing deficiencies as well as to encourage the orderly development of an integrated city."

7. For this issue is essential the co-operation of both parts so that the development on both sides of the division line, can be such that even the continuous existence of the buffer zone, will not make the implementation of an integrated growth in the future impossible.

"It is therefore of paramount importance that the authorities concerned should take all necessary measures to safeguard the proposed routes, so that their full implementation will be effected at such time when circumstances will permit." (NMP report, '84)

8. The comments presented by the representative of the Turkish cypriot community for the NMP include this point as follows: "The economic situation in the northern part of the NMP area is one of the most severe constraints regarding implementation." This implying the difference in development in the two sectors.

9. Parallel to this, is the declaration of the NMP for the provision of social services and community facilities, without dealing with the fact that there is a difference in the cultural background of the two communities. This bi-polarity of population
characteristics, and the existence of two culturally, ethnically, religiously, lingistigly different communities comes no where in the plan.

10. apart from the appropriate implementation machinery and adequate financial and technical resources

11. " The co-existence was made possible because of the life styles of a single culture. But the West Jerusalem of the 20th century was made up largely of European Jews, whose culture was totally different from the Jerusalem Jew of yesteryear" (Pfaff 33, 1969)

12. For example by changing the demographic characteristics of the country with transfers of population from Turkey, that is blocking even more the implementation of the NMP.

13. Following is a Turkish -cypriot view of how this community had accepted an agreement in 1968, to permit free movement within the capital, after five years of isolation within the Turkish -cypriot enclave of Nicosia, following the events that had led to the establishment of the Green Line in Nicosia in 1963.

"When in the summer of 1968 the Greek soldiery withdrew from their encirclement of the Turkish enclaves, the Turks living in them did not rush through the newly opened gates of their 'prisons'. The wall around them had assumed psychological significance; not only did it protect them from outside danger, it enclosed them to form a cohesive living unit. Those who lived together inside developed a world of their own, one in which the reality of hope was tinged with magic and illusion. They felt safer in their familiar restraint than with freedom when it came."

14. Benvenisti refers to this different dimension of economic matters, in the cross-cultural relations of the two societies. Refering to the Arabs claims to the Israeli authorities, he writes: "under conditions of hostility and mistrust, every matter appeared to be political at first...... Slowly, both sides learned to distinguish economics from politics, mistrust was reduced and relationships were stabilized." (Benvenisti 184, 1976)

15. "Without it, Nicosia would lose its identity and become an ordinary city. It is therefore of immense importance, not only to Nicosia but also to the international community, that the Walled City is protected, enhanced and revitalized in order to assume its proper role as an integral part of the city." (NMP REPORT)

16. where Berlin inner core was seen as a whole through the location of and design of West Berlin buildings in relation to the historical city center in the East and especially in the confrontation with the architectural principles held in East Berlin.

17. Initially, CBD developed around the old traditional shopping streets in the Walled City and then expanded gradually to more convenient areas outside the walls, specially to the south. NMP, respects and emphasizes this traditional location of the CBD but considers further expansion towards north outside the walls.
18. Although two distinct areas, functioning as north and south CBD, are assigned to the city, the condition of their continuity, easily provided by the removal of the buffer zone and their centrality to Nicosia considered as a whole, safeguards an integrated growth and a "center", for the whole population of the city.
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