Planning as Control - Cultural and Gendered Manipulation and Mis-use of Knowledge

TOVI FENSTER
Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv

ABSTRACT: *This article discusses the different meanings of knowledge as expressions of gendered power relations in spatial planning. In Israel, planning procedures are very centralist giving very little attention to citizen participation in these procedures. The planning process is professional, on the whole, with the planner's 'professional' knowledge as the main generator. This situation creates three channels of what is referred to in the article as mis-use of knowledge. The professional mis-use of knowledge relates to the professional level of language used in plans and other documents, excluding 'ordinary' citizens from understanding and becoming involved in the process. The gendered mis-use of knowledge relates to the knowledge of the gendered spatial power relations which are significantly relevant to the planning process. The symbolic mis-use of knowledge relates to the ignorance of planners towards the symbolic meanings of spaces, usually on a gendered basis, which leads to inappropriate plans that do not meet the needs of men and women in certain societies and cultures.*

Introduction

This article is about the use of spatial planning as a tool of control over cultural minorities in Israel. While such control affects every aspect of the everyday life of cultural minorities, I argue that it affects the daily life of women more than that of men. This is because cultural codes of women's honor are usually concerned with spatial restrictions which planning - as control - tends to ignore. This issue is expressed in the two case studies presented here. For both Bedouin Muslim women and Ethiopian Jewish women, modernist planning schemes based on the idea of homogeneity have made their lives more complicated than in their previous traditional lifestyles. In this article, I will examine how princi-

ples of spatial planning become expressions of control by analyzing how manipulating 'knowledge' aids and abets the establishment of such control.

It is because of historical reasons (see, among others: Lustick, 1980) that control of space and territory became the main expression of the relationship between the Arab minorities and the state apparatus in Israel. As the following case studies illustrate, this is true also for groups within Jewish society itself; situations of control exist among Muslim Bedouin and immigrant Ethiopian Jews as well.

Planning as Control by means of Manipulating 'Knowledge' – the creation of the 'Mis-use of Knowledge'

In this section I intend to use the notion of knowledge as positioned and situated and show how by approaching knowledge as universal and neutral, as modernist planning does, it has the potential to become a tool of control. Following this argument, I analyze the formation of three different types of Mis-use of knowledge: Mis-use of professional knowledge, of symbolic knowledge and of gendered knowledge. First, however, let us define the term 'Mis-use of knowledge'. Mis-use of knowledge can be expressed in two ways: From the planners' aspect, the term emphasizes the tendency planners have to ignore existing sources of knowledge, symbolic and gendered knowledge in particular, which are extremely essential in formulating efficient and adequate plans, particularly for non-western societies. From the users' aspect, the Mis-use of knowledge is manifested in the lack of access the 'have nots', the 'others' and the powerless have to existing sources of knowledge, generally technical-professional sources of knowledge. These sources are usually kept in the hands of those in power, i.e. authorities, dominant groups in communities (men over women, dominant ethnic groups over other groups). This situation of 'Mis-use of knowledge' differs from 'normal' manipulation of knowledge in that it highlights not only the actual technical-professional Mis-use of knowledge, but also the lack of access to sources of knowledge. Before discussing each type of Mis-use of knowledge, I would like to present a brief discussion of planning as control.

Several researchers have discussed the connection between planning, control, social structures and the role of planners in maintaining or changing social structures. Harvey (1989) analyzes these connections arguing that by the mid–1970s, it became clear that the planning inspirations of the 1960s had faded and that the main task was how to define new horizons for planning into the 1980s. Why? The 1960s were characterized with civil strife which was contained by repression, co-optation and integration. The role of the planner within the

framework of class struggle comprised only part of the total complex of state power seeking to maintain 'balance' by defining policies that would facilitate social control and serve to re-establish social harmony through co-optation and integration. This role is slowly changing, particularly in globalized economies in which economic forces and powers dominating and affecting society and space are undergoing processes of change as well. The result is, in many aspects of life the state's central role is no longer so dominant, leaving a great deal of the planning duties in the hands of the private sector. In such a situation, the power relations within planning schemes also evolve, making more room for 'bottom up' initiations to emerge and allowing local forces and local knowledge to become a part of the planning process.

Forester (1989) emphasizes the relationships between planners and those in power arguing that if planners ignore those in power, they assure their own powerlessness and, of course, the lack of power of their plans. Yiftachel (1995b) discusses the conversion of planning from a progressive tool of reform to an instrument of control and repression, when one ethnic group becomes dominant and uses the state's apparatus (including planning) to maintain and strengthen its domination. Yiftachel analyzes planning as control in three principal domains: territorial, procedural and socioeconomic and shows how all three are used to control the Arab-Palestinians in Israel. Fainstein's contribution (1996) to the discussion of planning as control is in her highlighting of the feminist perspective, emphasizing the male dominance in urban planning which neglects the interests of women, especially in economic development and land use planning.

What are the expressions of control used in planning? The ways and means by which planning procedures define and allocate land uses, that is, the restriction of the use of land according to what has been decided upon by those in power. This is mainly expressed in the articulation of zoning principles, which are formulated to protect the interests of the 'public'. While some view the 50s as the 'golden age' of planning, a positive and central agent of progressive transformation, others highlight how during this period state power behind planning increased which, in turn, sometimes caused inequality and the deepening of intergroup inequalities (Yiftachel, 2000). Hence, one must recognize the fine line, where planning moves away from reform and becomes a means of control, and where the difference between 'reasonable exigencies of social order' and sinister expressions of repression, exploitation and oppression occur within planning schemes (Yiftachel, 2000). Following this distinction, it is also important to note that planning as control usually has a stronger impact on the powerless members of a community (such as women and ethnic minorities) than on the elite who, in comparison, are more represented by those in power.

However, as mentioned earlier, global changes and the changing role of the state in planning and development leave more room for voices of resistance that are beginning to be heard, both via NGOs and other forms of organizations, or via 'grassroots' protest and resistance groups emerging from those communities which would be negatively affected by planning and development. This changing situation of globalization and the weakening of the role of the state highlight the importance of such a discussion of the Mis-use of knowledge in planning that follows.

Space is fundamental in any form of communal life and in any exercise of power (Foucault, 1980). Foucault defines power as the economic functionality of production and of class domination. For him, power is essentially repression. Huxley (1994) takes this point and argues that planning, in its control of space, can be seen as part of what she calls 'the normalization generated through the exercise of power'.

Following this line of thought, in another paper (1999b) I defined 'planning', in a rather Foucaultian spirit, as the arrangement of space according to principles and goals determined by those in power. Some would argue that plans control the 'free will' of all citizens or community members. However, if those plans are spatial translations of the goals of a particular group (men, ethnic, class, race and cultural majority), they obviously serve its interests which, in many cases, contradict the principles or goals of other groups.

Huxley (1994) finds similarities between planning regulations, such as zoning and Foucault's views on imprisonment and social control in Enlightenment logic, a discourse that also generates the notion of the 'Other'. She analyzes the notion of planning and power placing a particular emphasis on ideas of zoning as a tool of control. Zoning, she argues, is used to posit homogenous areas that exclude the Other: "...it is a part of the state's involvement in the creation and control of citizens/subjects and the discipline of bodies" (p.8). But zoning is only one of the means the state used to exclude the Other. Policies of economic oppression, land confiscation and political control are other means employed to exclude communities. It is part of the state's involvement in the creation of means of control of citizens (Huxley, 1994).

How should states treat the 'Other'? Derrida (Caputo, 1997) argues that a state in which there would be only *unum* (unity) is a terrible catastrophe. A state without plurality, he argues, would be, first, a totalitarian state, "...a state must be attentive as much as possible to plurality, to the plurality of people, of languages, cultures, ethnic groups, persons and so on. This is the condition for a state" (p.15). In such a Derridarian state, planning serves a different role and its procedure would be different from that of modernist planning. It seems that

in order to understand how such pluralism in planning can be realized, the notions of knowledge/power must be brought into the discussion.

Planning creates and reflects power relations in two ways; by controlling material resources in the environment, such as land, water, oil, minerals, etc. and by controlling metaphorical or symbolic resources such as knowledge. Giddens (1981) makes a similar distinction between two types of resources that are controlled by the state authoritative resources and material resources. Lack of authoritative resources, he argues, involves primarily the retention and control of information or knowledge.

I move now to discuss the control of symbolic resources, namely, knowledge. The first question to ask is which 'knowledge'? The 'everyday knowledge' of common people (Innes, 1989 in: Healey, 1992) or 'politician knowledge', the knowledge of the 'elite' (Mazza, 1986 in: Healey, 1992) Obviously, there are many ways of defining knowledge. I argue here that knowledge, in principle, is situated, that is, 'partial': "all knowledge is produced in specific circumstances and that those circumstances shape it in some way' (Rose, 1997: 305). This means that the type of knowledge created depends on who its makers are. Thus, knowledge is neither universal nor neutral; it is reflexive and positioned. This new feminist, post-Marxist and postcolonial notion of knowledge has only recently begun to infiltrate the field of planning. Healey (1992) mentions that the systematized, rationally grounded knowledge is now understood to be only one among several forms of knowledge. Healey herself acknowledges that any form of knowledge is infused with ideological and political practices that protect the powerful and confuse the powerless. Planning, argues Healey, must find ways to challenge what Forester refers to as 'misinformation' and I call: 'Mis-use of knowledge'. Here three forms of Mis-use are discussed: a misuse of professional knowledge, of symbolic knowledge and of gendered knowledge.

The Mis-use of Professional Knowledge

'Knowledge', in the professional sense, means the knowledge of the profession of planning. Planners and mapmakers were, from the early days, part of the elite. The knowledge of mapmaking, like the knowledge of plan making, was one of the specialized intellectual weapons through which power could be gained, administered and legitimized throughout history. This knowledge was concentrated in, relatively, only very few hands, and maps were associated with the religious and political elite. These circumstances prevailed in several historical periods (eras): early Egypt, medieval Europe, Greece and Rome and in the Mediterranean world during the late Middle Ages (Harley, 1988). The dominant group, in our case politicians and planners, decide upon principles of, for example, zoning because they possess either the power or the professional

knowledge - positioned and situated - and this knowledge provides them with the power which, in turn, produces knowledge, again situated and positioned (Foucault, 1980). This interpretation of the notion of knowledge reflects Foucault's thinking regarding the relationships between discourse, power, control and the manipulation of knowledge and, ultimately, of society (Moore, 1996). Foucault views texts and maps as a means of concealment and deliberate control and as instruments of power/knowledge. Planning maps and texts, such as documentation and guidelines, are illustrations of how knowledge or Mis-use of knowledge becomes control, as those maps and texts consist of complicated language, known only to professional planners, and the hidden agendas underlying their creation form a 'knowledge' shared only by an exclusive group of people, and not by those who are or might be affected. Similarly, Forester (1989) calls to avoid what he terms 'misinformation' in planning. He emphasizes the importance of having 'information' in the planning process and categorizes several kinds of information according to the planning tradition adopted (see also: Sandercock, 1998).

The Mis-use of Symbolic Knowledge

Symbolic knowledge is actually the opposite of professional knowledge. It is not the 'knowledge' which is intended to serve those in power. On the contrary, it is the knowledge, which is based on the concept of understanding and listening to the Other, the marginal, the have–not. It is local knowledge, which looks at how people perceive, use and relate to space. It is symbolic because it derives out of people's culture, norms, habits, fears, emotions; components that create the 'symbolic' viewing of a 'physical' space. It is not a visible type of knowledge, rather something that requires listening and a deeper understanding. This symbolism of space affects the way people use space and it influences their environmental needs. This type of knowledge becomes relevant when a planning intervention is going to be made, in order to make sure that the intervention meets the community's needs. Symbolic or local knowledge provides the social and the cultural mapping of the physical space, it is required as basic for rearrangement of space. This type of knowledge:

> "emphasizes listening and interpreting, developing skills that are sensitive to and able to pick upon everyday ways of knowing. It suggests an entirely different practice in which we respect class, gender and ethnic differences in ways of knowing, and actively try to learn and practice those ways in order to foster a more inclusive and democratic planning" (Sandercock (1998:121).

Mis-use of symbolic knowledge occurs when it is being ignored by planners and decision makers; this usually happens because it is not considered relevant to the professional, knowledge - base planning process. Plans based on Mis-use of symbolic knowledge become irrelevant, inadequate and inappropriate for communities, especially those of non-western cultural backgrounds. Mis-use of symbolic knowledge can also occur when there is 'a colonization of the Other' (Sibley, 1998) that is, an appropriation of the minority's knowledge which is not denigrated but it does become a part of 'the currency of academic discourse' (p. 98). Since this 'private', 'indigenous' knowledge, argues Sibley, is now publicized, it can be Mis-used by those intending to control the 'Other'. Here we return to the knowledge/power relation, but from a different perspective. Sibley argues that for this knowledge to be helpful to the 'Other', the 'Other' has to have some control over it, otherwise it increases oppression and discrimination.

The Mis-use of Gendered Knowledge

The third use of 'knowledge' is in the context of gender relations. Spain (1993) elaborates on this idea. Gendered spaces in non-industrial societies, she argues, remove women from knowledge. For example, in the Mongolian Ger, books are kept in the male part of the traditional tent. Because books contain religious and historical knowledge, Mongolian women, historically, have been forbidden to read them or even have spatial access to look at them, because of the fear that women destroy social order. Knowledge, says Moore (1996), like language, is thought to be a male attribute. Access to knowledge, like the control of language, is a prerequisite for full adult male status. Women do not possess social (male) knowledge and are, therefore, excluded from the exercise of power. Here, cultural codes dictate the gendered access to knowledge, that is, cultural norms dictate whether women have or do not have access to sources of knowledge. In most cultures the lack of access to sources of knowledge is spatial. It serves to perpetuate women's subordination and the men's control over them. As Rose (1996) argues, women are usually the objects of knowledge, not its makers. One way of exercising power and control over women is by manipulating meanings of spaces (forbidden, private) in ways which prevent women's access to resources of knowledge which exist in 'forbidden spaces' or the public sphere, such as gaining access to education on its different levels (from literacy to professional training), being exposed to and being able to read newspapers, seeing movies and watching television, participating in public social activities such as cultural and political events and many more. In many ways this is similar to the manner in which states manipulate knowledge in planning and control of space due to the fear that minorities will destroy their social or-

der. In analyzing the two case studies, I will illustrate how the Mis-use of gendered knowledge increases control over women in the planning process. I will now move on to discuss the Mis-use of knowledge within the framework of each of the case studies. These two cases emphasize how, by enforcing the rational comprehensive-modernist planning approach, many principles of justice, equality and human rights are abused (see: Fenster, 1997, 1998, 1999a,b). I will illustrate how the three aspects of Mis-use of knowledge in planning increase control over women.

The Mis-use of Knowledge as Means of Control Over Women of Cultural Minorities in Israel

Women and Planning in Israel

The state of Israel was established in 1948 as a Jewish state, a home for the Jewish people from the Diaspora, some of whom were holocaust survivors. The arrival of Jewish communities from countries of different cultural backgrounds created a very heterogeneous society, with different and sometimes contradictory sets of norms and values for each community (especially regarding norms of the woman's role in the family, women's modesty, equality within the family unit and so on).

By definition, the state categorizes all of its non-Jewish citizens (some 20%) as minorities.[1] Being a Jewish state where spaces are strongly classified and have strong emotional symbols means that one of the important priorities of planning is control (Yiftachel, 1995b). This means that cultural minorities in Israel face constant political, social and cultural discrimination on the basis of their minority position.

In comparison with Western countries, Israel has a very high population density: the total population density per sq. km. in 1998 was 272.8. Over ninety percent of its residents live in urban areas, about 70% of these live in apartments. Seventy-three percent of the population live in owner-occupied dwellings (Statistical Yearbook, 2000). Israel has a young population the average age of which is 26.7. Culturally, it is a family-oriented society. All ethnic groups in Israel, both Jewish and non-Jewish, place a great emphasis on family, as is evidenced by the high fertility rate. Another statistic which reflects its family-centered nature is the low percentage of unmarried Israelis (just 4.3% of men and 5.6% of women in the age group of 40-44 among the Jewish population, the figures decrease for non-Jews) and the low divorce rate of 1.6 per

1 This 20 percent is composed of Muslim (76%), Christian (15%), Druze and other (9%).

thousand in the Jewish population and 0.8 per thousand among Muslims. Twenty-five percent of households are headed by women (Statistical Yearbook, 2000).

Women constitute 50.4% of the population in Israel. Most women in Israel face considerable control, first, as part of a socially, economically and politically misrepresented and disadvantaged group. In addition, some also face control and subordination as a result of their own cultural norms and values. For Jewish women, this subordination is mainly expressed in the Jewish family laws of marriage and divorce, which discriminate between men and women. Jewish, religious women are also affected by norms of modesty that restrict their movement in public spaces. The subordination of Arab-Palestinian women is more explicit; first, as members of the discriminated Arab-Palestinian community and second, as members of their own culture, which by norms of honor and modesty restricts their everyday life. The case of Bedouin women herewith illustrates this point.

Israel has a high percentage of women in the work force, but this applies mostly to the Jewish population. In general, 51.4% of total employees in 1999 were women. Among Jewish women the proportion is 52.5%, among Arab women 15% and among Bedouin women only 5%. These differences are a result of varying work opportunities; opportunities are much broader for Jewish women due to policies of economic discrimination, but also because of different cultural norms, which allow Jewish women to work outside the home to a greater extent than Muslim and Arab Christian cultural norms allow their women.

Both the Jewish and Islamic religions are similar in their patriarchal perceptions of women's 'fragile' nature, which is used to dictate strong control over their modesty and honor. The result is that according to both religions women can not be equal, family laws subordinate them and their place is considered the private sphere of domesticity. Muslim women in Israel sometimes face stronger restrictions because of the Shari'a family laws, which aim to maintain women's honor and modesty by strict laws of marriage and divorce. Moreover, since Muslim sexuality is actually territorial (Mernissi, 1987), rules of modesty that restrict women's movement in 'public' and allocate space to each sex are very concise and well maintained or guarded, especially among the Bedouin. Muslim women's 'burden of representation' in Israel and many Muslim countries is sometimes fatal. Women have been murdered by their male relatives because of behavior that allegedly brought 'shame' upon their family and community. Each murder repeatedly provokes public discussions as to the official state policy and the role of the police in preventing such crimes (Rabinowitz, 1995). The murder of women is, however, not exclusive to the Arab-Palestinian popu-

lation. In 1997, husbands or partners murdered some tens of Jewish and Arab–Palestinian women, and the police and the justice system have not succeeded in reducing this violence.

These issues highlight the importance of cultural values as points of reference in spatial planning. Cultural values refer not only to religious laws and norms, but also to the centrality of family life in Israel, the high reproduction rate the high proportion of Jewish women in the work force (52.5%) as opposed to the low rate of Arab (15%) and Bedouin women (5%). For women to live in a family oriented society with, on one hand, being expected to fulfill the traditional women's roles and on the other, being part of a modernized society with increasing work and career opportunities, is a highly problematic situation; perhaps more than in any other capitalist society.

The planning system in Israel is highly centralized and homogenized. It fails to examine and incorporate aspects of social, cultural, economic and gender diversity. In Israel, plans are still made for the 'average person' who is: 'male, Jewish, healthy, 35 years old, married with 2 children, secular and middle class'. This probably represents not more than 5% of the entire population (Churchman et al, 1996). In light of the above, the Israeli Women's Network (IWN) (Churchman et al, 1996) published a shadow report for the 1996 Habitat International Conference in Istanbul. The report sets out some of the principles of women's roles and needs that must be considered in urban planning. Some of the principles discussed include: the geographic location of settlements, the type of locality and the size of population, the frequency of public transportation services, zoning policies, building density in the city and the types of residential structures as indicators affecting women's everyday life. The report states that decisions regarding these variables should take into consideration the needs of individual groups, including ethnic, religious and socio-economic groups. As the report states, however, 'there is somewhat a leap in moving from social needs to spatial planning variables - a gap from factors in the physical environment usually addressed by physical planners to the social needs that these physical factors must meet'. This gap between the social and the physical unfortunately characterizes spatial planning in Israel. The planning system lacks 'knowledge' of social and cultural needs in planning (see: Fenster, 1996, 1997, 1999a,b). The IWN report's recommendation sees the notion of knowledge in planning as follows:

> ...To avoid erroneous assumptions about the degree to which planning variables meet the needs and interests of a particular group, the group's own perception of its needs should be taken into consideration. The planner must obtain information about how various social-physical environments might lower

> the level of distress and improve the quality of life of the members of various population groups. Furthermore, the total impact of intervention by the planner upon decision variables in various areas must be examined. This examination must encompass the possibility of improvement in certain areas and deterioration in others, in the wake of particular policies. (p. 25)

In its existing institutionalized structure, the Israeli planning system does not allow other ways of 'knowledge' to be incorporated in its rational–comprehensive planning procedures, especially not the 'knowledge' of cultural and national minorities, as shown in the following examples. This Mis-use of knowledge is, in fact, part of its controlled nature.

The Mis-use of Professional Knowledge as a Means of Control

The Mis-use of professional knowledge is, perhaps, the most explicit means of control used over both Bedouin and Ethiopian groups through creating planning schemes and regulations according to principles dictated by those in power. For the 100,000 Muslim Arab Bedouin living in the Negev Desert in the south of Israel, planning as control is mainly expressed in the landownership dispute between the Bedouin and the state. The state, not recognizing the Bedouin land claims, wishes to see them concentrated in a small number of towns, each large in population, so that several tribes would live in one town. This is the opposite of what they were accustomed to in their traditional lifestyle, which was to live in a village-like habitation, on lands they claim they own. Half of the Bedouin now live in seven such towns, which the state claims, provide the Bedouin with services and infrastructure. The rest of the Bedouin population lives in some 108 traditional, tribal, clan-based villages that are considered illegal by the state and are, therefore, not provided with basic services and infrastructure. Planning as control is expressed in the spatial differences between the modernist Bedouin town and the traditional Bedouin village. For one, the two differ in their residential density. For the Bedouin, population density is a factor which has effects on the cultural norms of privacy and women's honor. Residential density may be very high within a Bedouin village, as it consists of members of the same affiliation group (tribe, sub-tribe, clan, etc.) which means that there is no threat of breaking the cultural laws of women's modesty. However, there must be a considerable distance between these villages in order to decrease the chances of unwanted meetings between women and men of different tribes. In contrast to these needs, the state formulates its planning principles for Bedouin settlements on its prerequisite to concentrate them in order to control as much of their lands as possible. This means that Bedouin from different tribes live very close to each other, a situation which breaks codes of privacy and honor

and has a tremendous effect on Bedouin women's everyday life in that women are, thus, more restricted in their freedom to move in what is termed 'public space'.

For the 65,000 Ethiopian Jews living in Israel, planning as control means that they cannot choose to live where they wish to, but must live in certain towns or cities. Only in these towns and cities do they get a housing mortgage from the government. Planning as control also means no real option to choose whether to live in urban or rural environments. This is very similar to the situation of the Bedouin who are forced to move to urban areas.

Modernist planning, in both cases, is based on professional knowledge. It is very centralist in its process; it is homogenizing in nature. It assumes knowledge to be neutral and universal. Planners, thus, do not need 'to know a lot' about these two cultural minorities, they just use the universal principles of their 'professional' knowledge. The result is disastrous for the communities, often causing an increase in cases of poverty, domestic violence and drug use. Mis-use of professional knowledge means that none of these groups were involved in the planning process or in its outcome and thus one can conclude that the planners ignored the Bedouin sources of knowledge about their own cultural construction of space. In each case, the planning approach was decided upon according to principles determined by those in power and according to the 'state's needs', with no attention paid to the needs of the community members themselves. Clearly, indicators such as: the type of locality, the size of population and the geographical location of the towns which were designated in the IWN report were not part of the planning process, there was no mention of women's needs as well; and as a result, indeed their everyday life was worsened. Moreover, professional meetings, plans and documentation were prepared without any involvement of the community members themselves or their representatives. And the end result - the plans - also remained unfamiliar to the community members, because they are compiled of professional documents, formulated in a professional language and are only accessible to professional planners or politicians. The Mis-use of professional knowledge here means that planning professionalism was exclusive. It was a manipulation of material knowledge because this professional knowledge was not shared at any point with the community members; it was even not thought to be necessary. This Mis-use of professional knowledge 'helped maintain' the 'gap' between the social and the physical factors mentioned in the IWN report.

It is only in the last few years that this situation of lack of access to 'professional knowledge' has slowly started to change, as young male Bedouin begin to take initiative and get involved in some of the official planning procedures. This is accomplished mainly by means of expressing their objection, for exam-

ple, to the official Regional Outline Plan (regarding recognition of some of their 'illegal' villages). Another 'bottom up' initiative is the establishment of the 'Regional Council for the Unrecognized Villages in the Negev'. This is a very interesting composition of an 'illegal' body, which has decided to adopt the state bureaucratic formulation and create its own planning body. Most of these are initiatives involving men, however, leaving women outside the domain of knowledge and power in decision-making processes.

The Mis-use of Symbolic Knowledge as a Means of Control

Symbolic knowledge refers to the knowledge of aspects of Bedouin and Ethiopian culture that have relevance to planning. Some examples of these are the cultural notions of tribal segregation and of women's modesty in the Bedouin case and communal lifestyle in the Ethiopian case. [2]

For symbolic knowledge to be taken into consideration in the planning process, a different planning approach must be adopted. It must be more progressive, pluralistic and participatory, with totally different end-goals. The goals of such a planning approach are not designed to satisfy the needs of the state or the public, but to satisfy the needs of the community members. This means, first and foremost, to identify their needs. This approach recognizes knowledge as situated, thus necessitating the involvement of community members in the planning process. Community members should also be responsible for the incorporation of symbolic knowledge in the planning process. The danger of misusing symbolic knowledge seems, however, to be high. Symbolic knowledge is also not free of the power relations 'game' between the planner and the community or between the community members themselves. It obviously raises a very crucial point of the positioning of this knowledge by the planner and by the powerful people within the community. From my own experience, in practice, I admit that this is a very complicated area in the planning process because, as already mentioned, knowledge is always situated, even when it comes from the community members themselves, especially if there are conflicts existing between them. However, symbolic knowledge, as complicated as it is, is a useful tool in understanding communities' cultural construction of space, which shapes people's movement, especially that of women. Symbolic knowledge is

2 For elaborated analysis on the cultural norms of the two societies see also:
For the Bedouin cultural norms see: Abu Lughod (1986,1993), Mernissi (1975,1991), Lewando - Hundt (1984). For the Ethiopian cultural norms see: Anteby (1999), Ashkenazi & Weingrod (1987), Corinaldi (1988), Doleve-Gandelman (1990), Pankhurst (1992), Salamon (1993), Westheimer & Kaplan (1992)

also a useful tool in getting acquainted with gendered knowledge and the allocation of gendered spaces.

The Mis-use of 'Gendered Knowledge' as Means of Control

The Mis-use of gendered knowledge means not taking into account the gendered cultural construction of space. For Bedouin culture, gendered spaces are what are termed 'forbidden' and 'permitted' spaces. The conceptualizations of forbidden and permitted can be associated, to a great extent, with the Western conceptualization of 'private' and 'public' dichotomies. In discussions with Bedouin women (see for elaboration: Fenster, 1999a), they refer to their home and neighborhood as 'their private place' in which they are free to move, as opposed to other areas of their town (park, town center) that are, in fact, inaccessible to them. Gendered mis-knowledge relates precisely to the fact that modernist planning does not consider such cultural constrictions of space. Because of this, the 'new' Bedouin towns created a situation of increased control over Bedouin women by producing high residential density, increasing the likelihood of undesirable encounters for Bedouin women and thereby enhancing deeply engrained cultural codes concerning women's modesty. As a result, the boundaries of forbidden and permitted spaces have become stricter in the new towns; larger areas are now designated as forbidden to Bedouin women, though they may be adjacent to permitted areas. By dictating these spaces, women's access to sources of knowledge and power such as banks, libraries, shops, newspapers agencies, health clinics and so on, is restricted. All that signifies the 'public' is, actually, forbidden to Bedouin women. Even walking to the public park with their children is forbidden (see: Fenster, 1999a). For Bedouin women, knowledge is everywhere outside their homes and neighborhoods and by preventing them from walking in these spaces, knowledge is prevented as well. Thus, the notion of town planning and its benefits, e.g. large-scale services, education, cultural activities and recreation areas, are literally not available to Bedouin women in the towns planned for them because of gendered Mis-use of knowledge from the side of the planners.

For Ethiopian women, gendered spaces concern cultural customs of women's menstruation which, in Ethiopia, dictated a separation between 'pure' and 'impure' spaces. In traditional Ethiopian communities, both Christian and Jewish, women's menstrual blood is considered impure, as are menstruating and postpartum women. 'Pure' and 'impure' spaces are differentiated in relation to menstruation and childbirth. This precludes menstruating and postpartum women from attending Church in the case of Christians and from the family home in the case of Jewish women (Pankhurst, 1992). This practice removed menstruating and post-partum women from their daily routines and during this

time female relatives would bring food to the menstruation hut on special plates (for elaboration see: Fenster, 1998). The environments into which Ethiopian immigrants to Israel moved, had no possibilities to offer for spaces comparable with the menstruation huts, although the planners were certainly aware of traditional customs. This has caused tension among family members, with the women, in particular, expressing feelings of guilt and shame. For them, a lack of respect for their gendered spaces is Mis-use of knowledge from the side of the planners. Their needs [3] (at least of some of them) of such separate spaces during their menstruation and after childbirth, are viewed as part of their intimate female network, a place where 'knowledge', the female knowledge is passed on (knowledge regarding daily routine, gossip, storytelling, cooking, embroidery etc.). Staying in the menstruation hut with other women creates a group, which provides both emotional and spiritual support and enables them to remain closely 'in touch' with their bodies (Doleve-Gandelman, 1990). In the housing schemes in Israel, such spaces were not allocated and by that a very significant source of support, power and knowledge disappeared.

Conclusions

In this paper, I have attempted to critically analyze modernist planning by looking at how the manipulation of knowledge in planning and its Mis-use become a means of control over cultural minorities and especially over women. The contribution of this paper to the existing discourse around modernist planning is in introducing and using the notion 'Mis-use of knowledge'. This notion and how it is divided into three, 'professional', 'symbolic' and 'gendered', makes the critique of modernist planning clearer in that it demonstrates how the Mis-use of knowledge in the planning process leads to situations of control.

As analyzed in the paper, for both the Bedouin and the Ethiopian communities, in general and women, in particular, the results of Mis-use of knowledge are disastrous in that they can increase levels of poverty, and, in some cases, cause an increasing in the level of domestic violence. Sometimes the difficulty in coping with the changes even leads to drug use. In both cases the Mis-use of gendered knowledge raises a very interesting and complicated dilemma as to whether and how to take into consideration local, cultural knowledge that, in fact, abuses women's rights (this dilemma is elaborated in: Fenster, 1999b).

3 In another paper (Fenster, 1997) I discussed the dilemma of whether cultural norms that actually abuse women's human rights should be taken into consideration in planning. It is actually the dilemma about cultural particularism versus universalism, which is being focused on here. Thus, when saying 'women's needs' this point should be taken into account.

Here it is appropriate to mention that, in general, gendered Mis-use of knowledge led to greater restrictions on Bedouin women's freedom of movement in the planned towns, and to loss of sources of support, power and knowledge as they existed in the menstruation huts in Ethiopia and which disappeared in Israel.

'Mis-use of knowledge' actually highlights the significance of power relations in dictating which knowledge and whose knowledge is going to be part of the planning process. Such an understanding clarifies the complexities of planning as power relations. There are hopes that such an analysis of the planning processes for cultural minorities will help re-examine some of the basic and common myths around modernist planning and its knowledge base.

References

Abu Lughod L. (1986) *Veiled Sentiments,* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press,.

Abu Lughod L. (1993) *Writing Women's World,* Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Anteby, L. (1999) There's blood in the house: negotiating female rituals of purity among Ethiopian Jews in Israel *In*: Wasserfull, R. (ed.) *Women and Water: Menstruation in Jewish Life and Law,* Hanover: Brandeis University Press, pp. 166-186.

Askenazi, M. and Weingrod, A. (Eds.) (1987) *Ethiopian Jews and Israel*, Brunswick, NJ: New Transaction Books.

Caputo, J.D. (1997) (ed.) *Deconstruction in a Nutshell - a Conversation with Jacque Derrida,* New York: Fordham University Press.

Central Bureau of Statistics of Israel, (2000) *Statistical Yearbook.*

Churchman, A., Alterman, R., Atzmon,Y., Davidovitch-Merton, R. and Fenster, T. (1996) *Shadow Report for Habitat International - Istanbul,* Jerusalem: Israel Women's Network.

Corinaldi, M. (1988) *Ethiopian Jewry: identity and tradition,* Jerusalem: Rubin Press.

Doleve-Gandelman, T. (1990) Ethiopia as a lost imaginary: the role of Ethiopian Jewish women in producing the ethnic identity of their immigrant group in Israel, *In* F. MacCannell (ed.) *The Other Perspective in Gender and Culture, New York:* Columbia University Press, pp. 242-257.

Fainstein, S. (1996) Planning in a Different Voice *In* Fainstein, S. and Fainstein, S. (eds.) *Readings in Planning Theory,* Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 456-460.

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

---------- (1997) Relativism vs. Universalism in Planning for Minority Women in Israel, *Israel Social Science Research* 12 (2): 75-96.

---------- (1998) Ethnicity, Citizenship, Planning and Gender: the case of Ethiopian immigrant women in Israel, *Gender, Place and Culture* 5(2): 177-189.

---------- (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* Fenster, T. (ed.) *Gender Planning and Human Rights,* London: Routledge.

Forester, J. (1989) *Planning in the Face of Power,* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge,* Gordon, C. (ed.) New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Giddens, A. (1981) *The Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism: power, Property and the State,* London: Macmillan.

Harley, J. (1988) Maps, knowledge, and power *In* Cosgrove, D. and Daniels, S. (eds.) *The Iconography of Landscape,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harvey, D. (1989) *The Conditions of Postmodernity.* London: Blackwell.

Healey, P. (1992) A Planner's Day- Knowledge and Action in Communicative Practice *Journal of American Planning Association* 58(1): 9 - 20.

Huxley, M. (1994) Planning as a Framework of Power: Utilitarian Reform, Enlightenment Logic and the Control of Urban Spaces *In* Ferber, S., Healy, C., McAuliffe, C. *Beasts of Suburbia,* Melbourne University Press: Melbourne, pp. 148-169.

Lewando-Hundt G. (1984) The exercise of power by Bedouin women in the Negev, *In* Marx, E., Shmueli, A. (eds.) *The Changing Bedouin,* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, pp. 83-123.

Lustick, I. (1980) *Arabs in a Jewish State,* Austin, Texas: Austin University of Texas Press:.

Mernissi, F. (1987) *Beyond the Veil,* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Mernissi, F. (1991) *Women and Islam: A Historical and Theoretical Inquiry,* Oxford: Blackwell.

Moore, H. (1996) *Space, Text, and Gender,* New York: Guilford Press.

Pankhurst, H. (1992) *Gender, Development and Identity,* London: Zed Books.

Rabinowitz, D. (1995) Widening the Path to Rescue the Mulatto Women: an Israeli Forum, *Theory and Critique* 7: 5-19.

Rose, G. (1996) Geography as a Science of Observation: The Landscape, the Gaze and Masculinity *In* Agnew, J., Livingstone, D. and Rogers, A. *Human Geography,* Oxford: Blackwell.

---------- (1997) Situating Knowledge: Positionality, Reflexivities and Other Tactics, *Progress in Human Geography* 21(3): 305-320.

Salamon, H. (1993) 'Beta Israel' and their Christian neighbors in Ethiopia: an analysis of central perceptions at different levels of cultural articulation, unpublished PhD dissertation, Jerusalem, Hebrew University (in Hebrew)

Sandercock, L. (1998) *Towards Cosmopolis,* London: Wiley.

Sibley, D. (1998) Problematizing Exclusion: Reflections on Space, Difference and Knowledge. *International Planning Studies* 3 (1): 93-100.

Spain, D. (1993) *Gendered Spaces,* Chapell Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press.

Westheimer, R. and Kaplan S. (1992) *Surviving Salvation,* New York: New York University Press.

---------- (1995b) Planning as Control: Policy and Resistance in a Deeply Divided Society, *Progress in Planning* 44(2) Ch. 2.

---------- (2000) 'Ethnocracy' and its Discontents: Minorities, Protests, and the Israeli Polity, *Critical Inquiry* 26(4): 725-756.