

THE IDEOLOGIES OF ARTUR GLIKSON

James M. Mayo

Artur Glikson embodied a constellation of ideologies that not only represented his times but also projected his aspirations for effective planning. Combining the historic values of regionalism with his life experiences during the formation of Israel, Glikson was a pioneer intellectual and practitioner in this new nation state. His planning principles enabled him to see beyond nationalist aims by attempting to integrate ecology, economy, and culture.

The authors of this issue offer more than an intellectual critique of Artur Glikson; they provide him a tribute, an honor he richly deserves because of his noteworthy contributions to Israel's development. The authors reflect upon his aims, insights, and practices, as well as his successes and failures. But how can we compose this man's contributions in light of the ideals he embraced?

Everyone is confronted with a variety of ideologies in one's life. We accept some views and reject others. Glikson was no different, but his convictions made a difference. His blend of ideological commitments was essential to his professional success.

Beyond typical family values in his younger years, it is impossible to overlook Glikson's youthful years as a Jew in Nazi Germany. During the 1920s and the 1930s, he undoubtedly saw how the Nazi regime played a central role in revealing the inhumanity that politics can play in people's lives. Glikson's attraction to Marxism was probably a means not only to rethink societal conditions but also to counter the fascist realities he faced as a young man. In earlier times, Karl Marx and Rosa Luxemburg were obvious Jewish communist pioneers, but many German Jews supported the German Communist Party if for no reason other than to counter Nazism. During his youthful years, Glikson heard the pleas of Zionists for the formation of a Jewish state, and he left Germany before World War II, perhaps foreseeing the horrific consequences of Nazism. Glikson's immigration to Israel was no surprise.

World conditions and his entrance into Israel certainly influenced Glikson's mindset toward political ideologies. He saw the rise of repressive regimes in the Soviet Union and Communist China. Many idealists who embraced communism in the 1930s were not particularly enthusiastic Marxists after becoming aware of communist abuses in Russia and China. Glikson undoubtedly recognized the difference between Marx's salient criticisms of capitalism and the means through which communist nations implemented his theories. Glikson was too much of an idealist to do otherwise. But his immigration to Israel was a defined political step. Although not a devoted Zionist, his entrance into Israel should be construed as a commitment to Jewish nationalism. Jews did not need the pull of Zionism to want a Jewish state. After World War II, the Holocaust's effect was a sufficient reason for many Jews to want a nation-state for themselves. In retrospect, Glikson's framework of political ideologies was not unusual for educated European Jews who had lost their homelands.

Glikson's professional beliefs were complementary with his political ones. He was a Geddes regionalist committed to local communities having economic, social, and political autonomy. His stands for environmentalism are congruent with the regionalist movement. Ebenezer Howard and Patrick Geddes were regional idealists, and Howard's socialist beliefs certainly coincided with Marxism. Nonetheless, Glikson faced the same dilemmas as British and American planners who attempted to implement regionalist ideals and principles (Hall, 1996). However, unlike regionalists in European countries and the United States, Glikson had the unique opportunity to consider his regionalist ideals for planning a new nation, Israel. To implement these ideals, he used empiricism, rationalism, and functionalism. These forms of thinking were congruent with the scientific method that cutting-edge city planners from Europe and North America embraced during the time of his professional career.

The authors tell us that pragmatism was not Glikson's forte, but he was not unrealistic. In this issue, Burmil and Enis refer to Glikson as a prophet, a person "who has the vision to predict the future and to relate prospective processes and events. He fights uncompromisingly for what should be and, therefore, is not always accepted by the public." He is not a priest, "one who translates the prophet's vision into practical language and tries to apply as many of his ideas as possible into daily reality" (p. 148). Nevertheless, Glikson had sufficient insight to see that ideologies alone were insufficient to accomplish desired ends. He was always attempting to blend the ideal with the real in his plans. By promoting community activism to support planning independent of central authorities in his 1965 plan for Crete, Glikson was perhaps experimenting with the principles of advocacy planning. But Glikson was not always an advocate for everyone. Law-Yone remarks that "Glikson's proposal for the Jezreel valley also filters out all traces of Arab villages in proposing a settlement pattern" (p. 109). At the same time, his support of comprehensive planning to implement regionalist ideals put him in conflict

with incremental practices that politicians and governmental bureaucrats are accustomed to using. Political circumstances undoubtedly forced him to practice incrementalism, focusing on means without a concern for long-range ends, because the shifting winds of governmental politics gave him no choice (Friedmann, 1987). In this light, Glikson shares the plight of all planners who have the power to recommend but not to legislate.

Law-Yone's reference to Glikson developing into an organic intellectual partially describes what planning theorist John Forester (1989) has defined as a progressive planner, one who responsibly anticipates democratic possibilities and questions interests supporting such claims but distorts them. Glikson's skepticism of advanced technical means to overcome problems in the natural environment is a testament to this perspective. A progressive planner is an enlightened rationalist that attempts to find workable solutions to planning problems. Although not a pragmatist in the incremental sense, he prepared integrated plans that enabled Israeli planners to see workable possibilities addressing ecological concerns.

Although he died over two decades before the rise of the New Urbanism movement, Glikson would likely be a supporter. His ideas on integrating neighborhood design with less emphasis on the automobile are compatible with New Urbanism. As Marans notes, Glikson considered physical planning and housing design to be means, rather than ends, of social policy. These beliefs are in keeping with the New Urbanism positions. Glikson paralleled Lefebvre's beliefs that for ideas to have meaning, they must have space (Lefebvre, 1991). In this light, his architectural background fused with his desire for good planning.

Glikson died before many of his ideas could be fully implemented, but his main ideological principles were already developed. In his life, he faced Nazism, capitalism, and Islamism. He embraced, either fully or partially, Judaism, Marxism, Zionism, regionalism, environmentalism, and perhaps scientism (a devotion to empiricism). Out of professional necessity, he appreciated pragmatism and incrementalism. Law-Yone and Marans note that Glikson attempted to integrate his practice ideals with concrete institutional constraints — a process end. But as Kallus and Wilkansky separately remind us, Glikson also hoped to integrate land, economy, and culture — a substantive end. Perhaps his most profound ideological commitment on life's ideological pathway was to integrate aspects of process and substance that furthered his beliefs in humanism.

REFERENCES

- Forester J (1989) *Planning in the face of power*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Friedmann J (1987) *Planning in the public domain*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hall P (1996) *Cities for tomorrow*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Lefebvre H (1991) *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Additional information may be obtained by writing directly to Dr. Mayo at the School of Architecture and Urban Design, 317 Marvin Hall, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045, USA.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

James M. Mayo is a Professor and the Chair of the Urban Planning Program at the University of Kansas; he is also a member of the Editorial Board of *JAPR*. His published work has focused upon planning practice and the American landscape.

Manuscript revisions completed 25 August 2003.

A vertical bar on the left side of the page, consisting of a series of yellow and orange rectangular segments, with a small red diamond at the top.

COPYRIGHT INFORMATION

TITLE: The Ideologies of Artur Glikson
SOURCE: J Archit Plann Res 21 no2 Summ 2004
WN: 0420206061003

The magazine publisher is the copyright holder of this article and it is reproduced with permission. Further reproduction of this article in violation of the copyright is prohibited. To contact the publisher:
<http://taz.tamu.edu/Press/japr2.html>

Copyright 1982-2004 The H.W. Wilson Company. All rights reserved.