

Introduction: Why Beyond Tolerance?

TOVI FENSTER
University of Tel Aviv, Israel

Beyond Tolerance: Globalization and Gendered Exclusions highlights one of the current discourses around globalized urban spaces – that of social, economic and cultural exclusions. As we see in the papers presented in this volume, most forms of exclusion are gendered. They may vary in their explicit or implicit expressions, they may differ in their fields of activity, but they exist in most cities around the world. Homelessness is one such example and is among the topics discussed in this volume, as it has become one of the more common expressions of globalization processes. Additional papers discuss other types of exclusion: in dual career households, in homeworkers' households, in geographical education, settlement planning, city management and in policies towards the elderly. Forms of exclusion may be official in relation to definitions of citizenship, or unofficial as in implicit messages produced by the mass media, especially towards the 'other.'

The papers in this volume were first presented at a workshop organized at the Tel Aviv University in 2000, as part of The Gender and Geography Commission of the International Geographical Union activities. As is often the case, the content of both the workshop and this volume are drawn from our own experiences of gendered exclusion both in the academic world and in our daily practices in globalized cities. In such spaces, the implicit or explicit rules of inclusion and exclusion contribute to the structuring of society and space in a way that may be oppressive to some and appealing to others. To name a few more examples, big shopping malls in many cities all over the world, which are 'privatized' in the sense that the 'others' are excluded from entry; or public parks and other public areas, which became controlled areas excluding those who threaten the normative cultural rules. These public/private spaces are actually intended to serve the needs of certain groups in society, while, in fact, they exclude others (youth, poor, lower classes, black, immigrants, etc.) and introduce a lesser or greater degree of surveillance.

At times, a sense of exclusion can move us to place issues of exclusion at the forefront of both the academic and practical world. The major contribution of this volume is to highlight such issues of gendered exclusion in global cities and examine the intersections between culture, gender and identity and analyze how power relations and gendered subordination are still actually dominant factors in shaping and re-shaping the lives of both women and men. It was felt in the workshop, and hopefully in this volume, that by highlighting experiences of gendered exclusion in these times we can articulate, explore and perhaps even provide a better understanding of such processes and identify the meaning of 'Beyond Tolerance.'

The title of this introductory part asks: "Why Beyond Tolerance?" This probably reflects one of the major challenges of this volume, whether or not the experiences in the various papers indeed lead to conclusive comments regarding the exact meaning of 'beyond tolerance' and how to accomplish such a situation. This is the ultimate and final message that will hopefully emerge from the different and varied experiences that will be presented in this volume and discussed at length in the conclusions. In this introductory chapter, I wish to clarify the basic keywords that this volume focuses on: exclusion, gendered exclusion, tolerance and coexistence, and I would like to suggest an opening definition as to what 'beyond tolerance' is.

Social and Spatial Exclusion in Globalized Urban Spaces

"The human landscape can be read as a landscape of exclusion" (Sibley, 1995: ix). In this first sentence of his book, *Geographies of Exclusion*, David Sibley, in fact, introduces a somewhat casual nature of exclusion which is expressed in a variety of ways, for example, the lack of access to resources, particularly housing, employment and social services, or exclusion as part of an ideology, such as the Apartheid in South Africa and in many other cities in the world, or even daily expressions of exclusion which can be manifested by each of us especially if we happen to be white, adult, male, middle class, physically and mentally healthy, and heterosexual. Those identities, argues Sibley, may contribute to the oppression of the 'Other.' To understand this, it is important to go beyond the basic consideration of exclusion and re-examine the assumptions about exclusion and inclusion, which are both implicit and explicit in the design of places and spaces. It is also necessary to analyze individual and communities' motivations in creating forms of exclusion through cultural norms and values, habits, superstitions, etc.

What is perhaps most important in understanding social and spatial exclusion is to identify such forms as they are experienced and articulated by individuals and groups. This is, perhaps, the major contribution of this volume – to bring forth such different experiences as they are identified, felt and viewed by individuals and communities in different aspects of life and in different parts of the world. The papers included in the volume explore forms of exclusion at home, at work, in the city and in different areas, for example, in planning and development, in city management, in policies towards immigrants and concerning violence, aging and knowledge.

Different Forms of Gendered Exclusions

Gendered exclusions occur when men and women are exposed to experiences of social and particularly spatial exclusion as a result of their gendered roles and status in society. Here, gender identity becomes the focus of analysis; although forms of gendered exclusion are very much affected by other identities such as culture, ethnicity, age, class and the like.

One of the most popular contexts of analyzing exclusion is the often-arbitrary divide between private and public spaces as areas, where cultural norms meet spatial gendered exclusions (Fenster, 1999a, b). Much has been written in the literature about the different definitions and perspectives of these two notions, their cultural orientation (Charlesworth, 1995; Fenster, 1999b), their associations (at least the public space) with the political sphere (Cook, 1995; Yuval-Davis, 1997), their roots in western liberal thought and different forms of patriarchy (Pateman, 1988, 1989) and their feminist perspective. The latter, in fact, criticizes these divisions and argues that it is actually a falsity and is invoked largely to justify female subordination and exclusion and to separate the abuse of human rights at home from the public (Bunch, 1995, Hyndman, 2003). The arbitrary nature of private/public divides becomes even stronger in global economies as services, spaces and activities such as health, childcare and elderly care that used to be ‘public’ in industrialized welfare states are now privatized (Eisenstein, 1996).

It seems that the most pertinent concept of gendered exclusion, at least in this volume, is still the cultural context. It is actually because of cultural norms that women usually find themselves excluded from the ‘private’ as well as the ‘public.’ As we read in *Irene Hardill’s* paper, even in dual-career households living in globalized urban spaces, such as England, there are forms of gendered exclusions within the household even though both partners are employed in globalized economic activities. In other cases, female exclusion is reflected in the

'public,' meaning that women are not able to use public spaces for work, shopping, studying or socializing.

Another common form of gendered exclusion that exists in many cultures is that of exclusion from different sources of knowledge. Elsewhere (Fenster, 2002) I argue that gendered exclusion from knowledge is usually spatial, concerning the lack of women's access to sources of knowledge such as reading and writing, studying, working in professional jobs, having access to sacred books or using mass media. Spain (1993) studied gendered spaces in non-industrial societies that remove women from different sources of knowledge. For example, in the Mongolian Ger, sacred books are kept in the male part of the traditional tent because they contain religious and historical knowledge, which is forbidden to women. Knowledge, in many societies, is thought to be a male attribute which women are not allowed to attain. Being excluded from access to knowledge means, in many cases, exclusion from power and control, which can be viewed as a patriarchal construct because the production of knowledge is usually a male domain. Women, argues Rose (1997), are usually the objects of knowledge, not the makers of it and this also dictates the access to power. Hence, one way to express power in space, and exclude women is by manipulating meanings of spaces as forbidden or permitted, thus preventing women's access to resources of knowledge existing in 'public' such as: access to education, mass media, public life activities, cultural and political events and many more. As we read in the papers in this volume, these forms of exclusion are not limited to third world countries only; in fact, they represent the lives of many women in global cities such as Detroit, London, Toronto, Amsterdam and Jerusalem. It is precisely these and other forms of exclusions presented in the volume, that we try to overcome, to reach a sense of coexistence, a tolerance and beyond.

Coexistence and Tolerance

How do we bridge these gendered exclusions and reach coexistence in the era of globalization? I connect between coexistence and tolerance as I consider tolerance a basic premise of coexistence. Let us first understand the meaning and use of tolerance before defining 'beyond tolerance' and how it is related to coexistence.

Michael Walzer in his volume, *On Toleration*, makes the connection between tolerance and coexistence in his definition of toleration: "a peaceful coexistence of groups of people with different histories, cultures, and identities, which is what toleration makes possible" (Walzer, 1997: 2). Coexistence, argues Walzer, is a 'good thing'. It is taken to promote an open mind and patience, ultimately enabling the emergence of the truth (Goldberg, 2003). Tolerance can

adopt different political forms with numerous implications on everyday moral life, for men and women, with no one, universal character beyond the minimalist claim for what is defined as basic human rights. However, to argue that different groups and/or individuals should be allowed to coexist in peace is not to argue that every actual or imaginable difference should be tolerated. Which differences should be tolerated then? Walzer mentions the kinds of differences, some of which this volume focuses on, namely, cultural, religious, way of life, sexual preference, and gender differences. What does it mean to tolerate groups and individuals of these sorts? There are several possibilities to describe tolerance or toleration; first, simply as the acceptance of difference for the sake of peace; second, as a passive indifference to difference "it takes all kinds to make the world;" third, as acknowledgment of the right to be different; fourth, as openness to others, curiosity perhaps even respect and willingness to listen and learn; and fifth, as an enthusiastic endorsement of difference. It is viewed as a necessary condition of human flourishing, one that offers women and men the *choice* that makes their autonomy meaningful. I suggest that this last possibility of tolerance, as one of choice, acts as a feature common to most of the experiences presented in this volume.

In addition, Walzer proposes five regimes of toleration, in other words, what exactly do we do when we tolerate? First, is the multinational empire regime; it is the oldest and can be associated with Persia, Egypt and Rome where various groups are constituted as autonomous or semi-autonomous communities that are political or legal as well as cultural or religious in character, and that rule themselves across a considerable range of their activities. This model is sometimes accused of being one of 'divide and rule.' While this is probably true, it is historically known as the most successful way of incorporating difference and facilitating peaceful coexistence, but with a heavy social and political pay off. The second regime of toleration is that of International Society; it is not a domestic regime and, therefore, it is an anomaly. It is a kind of a utopian suggestion where anything goes; nothing is forbidden, absolute toleration.

The third model is of consociations. In this model the different groups are not tolerated by a single power; they have to tolerate one another and work out among themselves the terms of their coexistence. In this category, examples such as Belgium, Switzerland, Cyprus, Lebanon and perhaps Bosnia are relevant. According to the Nation states model, the dominant group determines the character of public life, the state calendar and holidays. It is not a neutrally political apparatus, rather an engine for national reproduction. The states these nations create can tolerate minorities, but this toleration rarely extends to the full autonomy of its minorities. Thus, tolerance in nation-states is commonly focused not on groups, but on their individual members. As citizens, they have the same

rights and obligations as everyone else and are expected to engage positively with the political culture of the majority. The last model of coexistence and toleration is that of Immigrant Societies. This is when members of the different groups have left their homeland and come individually or in families. The state, in this case, perceives immigrants as individuals rather than groups and therefore, the objectives of toleration are individual choices and performances. Men and women are encouraged to tolerate one another as individuals, to understand difference in each case, as a personalized version of group culture, which means also that the members of each group must be tolerant towards each other as well.

What these models lack is the gendered perspectives of tolerance. Elsewhere (Fenster, 1999b) I discussed the dilemma of whether it is ethical to tolerate cultural values even if these values abuse women's human rights. There, I elaborated upon this dilemma regarding the short-term negative effects of modernist planning on Bedouin women. Here, we can pose a similar dilemma; whether we can be tolerant to other cultures even if they consist of norms that abuse and oppress women. Unfortunately, all five models suggested by Waltzer do not provide satisfactory options for this dilemma. In the multinational empire model, gender issues were taken as inherently internal affairs. A similar toleration can be expected in the consociation model. Theoretically, the nation-state and the immigrant society models would not tolerate customs that abuse women's human rights such as the *suttee* in India (widows burning after husband's death) or female circumcision among minorities. Reality, however, sometimes lags behind and we know of cases of women being murdered on the basis of family honor, or female circumcision operations, which are held in prestigious hospitals in London, France and other European countries. This dilemma is one of the focal points this volume deals with in the context of defining 'beyond tolerance,' not so much in terms of political models, but more in everyday practices and urban life.

A Suggested Definition of Beyond Tolerance

In his opening lecture at the workshop in Tel Aviv University the then Dean of Humanities, Professor Marcelo Dascal, related to the term 'beyond' as: 'a metaphor that designates an 'obstacle' that somehow stands in the way of movement' (Dascal, 2000: 4). In the phrase: 'beyond tolerance' the obstacle, he says, is 'an inadequate concept of tolerance, the initial position, the present 'problem situation', the target, a desired solution to the problem and the movement progress' (Ibid: 4). The process, whereby the obstacle is to be overcome, is critique. Critique of situations of exclusion, coexistence, tolerance and beyond is what this volume constitutes. This critique concerns mainly global processes, which produce a variety of forms of social and spatial exclusions,

displacements and resettlements as only a few of the results of governments' policies, institutional frameworks, and cultural values, which exist in many parts of the world. 'Beyond Tolerance' also relates to the way difference is taken: "Difference is not just to be tolerated, but valorized, given value by the dominant culture. Difference addresses the powerful, asserting specific needs, claims, and rights. Difference speaks to us with a *collective voice*, in the voice of specific 'social groups.' It is beyond liberalism" (Sandercock, 1998: 124-125). 'Beyond tolerance' then, means a critique which conceptualizes the notion of tolerance beyond its policy-oriented association and disentangles its everyday life meanings as related to various groups that suffer from social, political and spatial obstacles: homeless, the elderly, immigrants, minorities, or any other groupings which are part of urban life everywhere. Beyond tolerance means that even traditionalists will have to learn toleration of their own – different versions of their own culture and religion of their own women and children. Tolerance, here, means both within the community itself as well as from outside parties towards the community. And, finally, tolerance is not only to accept difference, but to valorize and appreciate it as well.

The volume's papers are divided into two main themes. The first focuses on: *'Tolerance and beyond as expressed in different perspectives of everyday life.'* This part begins with *Janice Monk's* account on Teaching the 'Other,' in which she questions not only what research can contribute to understanding what it means to be 'other', but also how, as academics, the ways in which we teach contribute to students' responses to the 'Other.' Especially as geographers, she argues, we want our students to understand their own identity in relation to places that more often than not are culturally heterogeneous. It then continues with *Mandeep Grewal's* paper on expressions of tolerance of middle-class, immigrant Indian women in mass media in the US. In this paper, she asks how American and ethnic media determine, if at all, the criterion via which immigrant women are tolerated. She focuses on the extent to which mass media assists both patterns of adjustment: Privatization of tradition and culture and public mainstreaming of non-threatening symbols of cultural representations. In the third paper, *Irene Hardill* explores the degree to which dual career households in the UK, which juggle between work and home, are egalitarian in the way decisions and compromises are made in relation to the career development and career prioritization of each of the partners. Another perspective of the home-work discourse is presented in *Mireia Baylina's* paper where she examines the nature and function of women's industrial homework in rural Spain in the context of current global processes of restructuring in rural areas. She focuses in particular on how homework, as an 'invisible activity,' can become a form of social and spatial exclusion which is reinforced by global processes. Another perspective of

social and spatial exclusion is presented in *Haim Yacobi's* paper where he challenges the intricate relationships between power relations, spatial exclusion and the role of the planner in the planning process of housing environments. In his paper, he concentrates on a particular project for the *Jahelin* Bedouin community in the occupied Palestinian authority of East Jerusalem. This section ends with *Tovi Fenster's* paper that deals with everyday practices of gendered social and spatial exclusions in Jerusalem and London, analyzing women's and men's narratives regarding notions of comfort, belonging and commitment in the city. She then connects the issues of exclusion and urban planning and city management.

The second theme in this volume is: *Tolerance towards People of Diversity and Beyond*, on which three papers are presented, all questioning the notion of tolerance towards people who are considered marginal, for example, the homeless in Toronto and Ottawa in Canada. In her paper, *Fran Klodawsky* explores the changes that have occurred in public polls in which Toronto residents thought that homelessness should receive greater attention from the local government. She examines what tolerance might imply about Canadians' concerns with homelessness. Another perspective on people of diversity is presented in *Joos Droogleever Fortuijn's* paper in which she examines the position of elderly women in Dutch society. In her paper she asks: to what extent can the position of elderly women in the Netherlands be clarified in terms of social and spatial exclusion, coexistence and tolerance? The last paper in this volume is *Tijen Uguris's* paper where she examines exclusion and tolerance with regard to notions of Diaspora and citizenship in the case of Kurdish women from Turkey living in Britain.

These rich experiences and case studies hopefully help to deepen our understanding of the different expressions of gendered exclusion in the era of globalization, their complexities, similarities and differences in many parts of the world and, perhaps, lead us in the concluding part to a better understanding of the expressions of tolerance and beyond.

References

- Bunch, C. (1995) Transforming Human Rights from a Feminist Perspective. In J. Peters and A. Wolper (eds.) *Women's Rights, Human Rights*, New York: Routledge.
- Charlesworth, H. (1995) What are "Women's International Human Rights"? In R. Cook (ed.) *Human Rights of Women*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Cook, R. (1995) Women's International human rights: the way. In: R. Cook (ed.) *Human Rights of Women*, Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Dascal, M. (2000) *Beyond Tolerance?* Paper presented at the workshop on: "Beyond Tolerance: Social and Spatial Coexistence – Lessons of Gendered Exclusions." Tel Aviv University, May 28–June 1, 2000.

Introduction

- Eisenstein, Z. (1996) *Women's Publics and the Search for New Democracies*. Paper presented at the conference: Women, Citizenship and Difference, London, July 1996.
- Fenster, T. (1999a) Space for Gender: cultural roles of the forbidden and the permitted. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 17: 227-246.
- (1999b) Culture, human rights and planning (as control) for minority women in Israel. In T. Fenster (ed.) *Gender, Planning and Human Rights*. London: Routledge.
- (2002) Planning as Control – Cultural and Gendered Manipulation and Mis-Use of Knowledge. *Hagar – International Social Science Review* 1: 67-84.
- Goldberg, D. (2003) The Power of Tolerance. In T. Martin (ed.) *Philosophy and Multiculturalism*, College Station: Penn State University Press.
- Hyndman, J. (2003) Beyond Either/Or: A Feminist Analysis of September 11th. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 2 (1): 1-13.
- Pateman, C. (1988) *The Sexual Contract*. Cambridge: Polity.
- (1989) *The Disorder of Women*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Rose, G. (1997) Situating Knowledge: Positionality, Reflexivities and Other Tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 21(3): 305-320.
- Sandercock, L. (1998) *Towards Cosmopolis*. London: Wiley
- Spain, D. (1993) *Gendered Spaces*, Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Sibley, D. (1995) *Geographies of Exclusion*, London: Routledge.
- Walzer, M. (1997) *On Toleration*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1997) *Gender & Nation*, London: Sage Publications.