

Conclusions:

Can We Look Beyond Tolerance in the Age of Globalization?

TOVI FENSTER

The question raised in this section's title reflects some of the dilemmas that the papers in this volume raised. The phrasing of the question implies there may be doubts regarding the possibilities of creating a situation of 'beyond tolerance,' namely, a situation in which 'the obstacles' standing in the way of tolerance can be overcome in the age of globalization; doubts, which are reinforced when reading some of the cases that emphasize the meanings of everyday life for certain individuals and groups in the era of globalization. In order to deal with this question we must analyze, by means of conclusion, the different meanings and expressions of the notion 'beyond tolerance' as identified in the various papers. Let us deal with these different meanings in relation to the two main themes that comprise this volume.

'Tolerance and Beyond' as Expressed in Different Perspectives of Everyday Life

The different perspectives of everyday life were examined mainly in their relation to education, mass media, dual career households, homework activities, settlement planning and city management. Each of the six papers included in this part explores notions of exclusion, tolerance and beyond in relation to the specific context of everyday life.

In her paper, Janice Monk emphasizes the dilemmas she experiences regarding teaching the 'Other.' It is not only the question of what research can contribute to understanding what it means to be the 'other,' she argues, but also how, as academics, the ways in which we teach contribute to students' responses to the 'other.' In this context, to go beyond tolerance means to prompt empathy and bring students towards a commitment to working for social change that can lead to equitable co-existence across differences. To reach this goal, the teaching of students must incorporate a collection of strategies and approaches that bring knowledge, emotion, and action together in order to engage students' emotions and experiences. Here, 'beyond tolerance' is indeed targeted so that the 'other' is not only tolerated, but even more so, the 'other' is valorized and respected.

Without a doubt, the education system is one of the fundamental structures in which such norms are formulated from early childhood and affect men's and women's perceptions and attitudes when they become adults.

The multiple meanings of tolerance are emphasized in Mandeep Grewal's paper in which she reviews the expressions of tolerance of middle class immigrant Indian women in mass media in the US. Here tolerance touches norms of behavior in private and public domains. Its meaning for middle class Indian women, argues Grewal, is a 'complex web' of behavioral expectations, needs and desires. In this respect, Grewal asserts that American mass media is actually used to change individual behavior and attitudes especially in relation to employment, parenting and self-help, so that Indian women better understand their host environment and perhaps, through this, become more tolerant towards American society. At the same time, ethnic mass media is used to retain 'traditional' societal behavior and attitudes, especially in relation to sexuality, religion and importance of family so that cultural norms of the Indian immigrants may be conveyed to the children and tolerated by future generations. Mass media, here, serves as a mirror of identity choices and as a tool to practice tolerance in a way that, perhaps, represents the dual identity discourse and the needs that immigrants usually face, their civil and ethnic identity (Fenster, 1996).

'Beyond tolerance' is a situation that cannot be achieved in the new globalized economy for partners in dual career households with children. This is the rather sad conclusion in Irene Hardill's paper. 'Beyond tolerance,' in her paper, meant, in principle, equality in the workplace and the home for both partners. This unequal sharing of the tasks of social and economic reproduction becomes yet additional proof of the role of patriarchy in dual career households.

The notion of 'tolerance and beyond' is implicit in Mireia Baylina's paper. She discusses forms of exclusion and the formation of exclusionary spaces in homework systems from which the readers can, perhaps, draw the meanings of beyond tolerance. She shows how homework, as an 'invisible activity,' can become a form of social and spatial exclusion and enhance patriarchal norms and trends which are reinforced by global processes. Thus, flexible work can lead to the exclusion of women and ethnic minorities from the labor market and thus disempower them. A beyond tolerance approach, or inclusion as she phrases it, could be the regulation and acknowledgement of homework so that working conditions would be improved and the meanings associated with this form of work would be enhanced.

Haim Yacobi's paper takes the discussion on social exclusion and tolerance into a different field of analysis – that of settlement planning. In challenging the intricate relationships between power relations, spatial exclusion and the role of the planner in the planning process of the *Jahelin* Bedouin

community, Yacobi coins the terminologies: 'tolerant planning' and 'tolerant professionalism.' Both of these terminologies acknowledge and unmask the external and internal power relations as inherent components of the planning process. By doing so, the basic obstacles that are presented in official policies, legal systems or cultural norms, are challenged and criticized.

'Spaces of tolerance' is another new terminology, which connects space, gendered power relations and tolerance in Tovi Fenster's paper. By discussing everyday practices of gendered social and spatial exclusions in Jerusalem and London, reviewing notions of comfort, belonging and commitment, Fenster connects between issues of exclusion, tolerance and urban planning and city management. Beyond tolerance and the design of spaces of tolerance relate mainly to coping with fear in public spaces as a reflection of patriarchal power relations. Urban planning and management can create spaces of tolerance if it adopts safe city policies, as elaborated in the paper, and policies that ensure that those public spaces are for all.

Tolerance Towards People of Diversity and Beyond?

The papers in this section illustrate diversity as a major component in the construction of norms of exclusion, 'tolerance and beyond.' Each of the papers highlights a significant form of difference, which has become the focus of analysis in the case studies. Thus, we deal here mainly with the homeless, the elderly and immigrants while particular attention is placed on the gender differences in each of these groups.

The meanings of 'tolerance and beyond' in Fran Klodawsky's paper present a rather different angle. She claims that public polls conducted among residents of Toronto and Ottawa that show that more people think that homelessness should receive greater attention from local government – reflect a lesser degree of tolerance towards homelessness. This point of view raises a basic question of whether we can employ the notion of tolerance towards what is perceived as a negative phenomenon, for example people with no homes. Namely, if Canadian citizens think that homelessness is bad and should, therefore, be addressed by the local government, does this mean that they are intolerant? Or, perhaps, it means that they are more tolerant to notions of inclusion and equality in society. As in Hardill's paper, the notion of 'tolerance and beyond' is perceived in a rather opposite way to what appears in the introduction and in the literature.

Joos Droogleever Fortuijn examines the position of elderly women in Dutch society and their relevance to terms such as exclusion, coexistence, tolerance and beyond. She argues that for the relatively young, prosperous, healthy, active elderly, the term 'beyond tolerance' is most appropriate as this

group is not only tolerated, but also valued for its contribution to the richness of society at large. However, concepts such as exclusion also describe the situation of other groups of elderly – the very old, poor, inactive, single or in poor health, most of whom are women. For them, circumstances such as the commercialization of care, a decrease in the amount of informal care and the withdrawal of government policies in support of such groups, result in a growing level of exclusion. This is a clear example of how current trends of globalization, which are reflected in the above mentioned circumstances, have a direct, negative effect on elderly women.

The paper that ends this volume is Tijen Ugur's paper in which she examines exclusions and tolerance with regard to notions of diaspora and citizenship in the case of Kurdish women from Turkey living in Britain. She does not refer directly to notions of 'tolerance and beyond,' but more to the forms of exclusion that Turkish women experience. These experiences are a result of their complicated and multi-layered construction of formal belonging, that is, of the definition of citizenship and other informal notions of belonging to more than one community. By way of suggesting future policies, she actually defines what 'beyond tolerance' is for Turkish women in the diaspora. Among others, she mentions the need to recognize the diversity of experiences of members of a diasporic community, equal access to information for the immigrants, preferably in their own language, and participation in decision-making structures and in the workforce of local boroughs where Kurdish people are concentrated.

Reading these rich and diversified experiences and definitions of 'beyond tolerance' generates some concluding insights: First, the multi-layered nature of 'beyond tolerance' and its multiple meanings in different cultural contexts. In this respect, 'tolerance' and more so, 'beyond tolerance' are as ambiguous as other notions such as 'human rights,' 'cultural rights,' 'ethnic rights,' etc. and more often than not, their definitions are culturally and power-relation constructed. Moreover, as in the human rights discourse, in the 'beyond tolerance' discourse as well, we can face the same dilemma that I posed in the introduction in regard to gendered tolerance, that tolerating a community as a whole sometimes means intolerance for the women in this community. This is expressed in the planning process for the *Jahelin* Bedouin as well as in the way the Jerusalem municipality manages some of its public spaces. This intricacy, between tolerance for all but intolerance for some, is what makes gendered 'beyond tolerance' a complicated notion. Second, and perhaps a follow-up of the first point, is the dominance of patriarchal power relations in determining what 'beyond tolerance' is. This dominance is expressed in almost every case presented in this volume, no matter if it deals with Bedouin women in the Palestinian Authority, or professional women in dual career households in the UK. It seems that no matter what the

level of involvement of women in global processes may be, most of them experience certain levels of exclusion and face obstacles in their everyday lives both at home and in public. Third, is the wide range of relevance of 'beyond tolerance' to almost all expressions of private-public divides in the globalized world. From the very intimate and individual levels of men and women in dual career households, to the Indian women immigrants in the US and their interaction with 'global' mass media, or women home workers and their contacts with global restructurings, or expressions of private/public dimensions in settlement planning and in city management, or with regard to the different definitions of citizenship and as related to the changing policies towards the elderly. It seems that in each case the 'removal' of the obstacles in a 'beyond tolerance' situation depends on the political definition of such private/public divides. And finally, adopting a 'beyond tolerance' attitude, which removes the obstacle, and deals with 'problem situations' and inadequate use of tolerance (Dascal, 2000), turns it into an action which we, as professionals, researchers and academics, can promote either in the ways we teach the 'other' or in the ways we plan for and with the 'other' or, in general, in the ways we critique such obstacles. Hopefully, this volume is one step forward in this direction.

References

- 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.
- Fenster, T. (1996) Ethnicity and Citizen Identity in Planning and Development for Minority Groups. *Political Geography* 15 (5): 405–418.