

MITOCW | 16. Spatial & Social Structure I: Theory

The following content is provided under a Creative Commons license. Your support will help MIT OpenCourseWare continue to offer high-quality educational resources for free. To make a donation or view additional materials from hundreds of MIT courses, visit MIT OpenCourseWare at ocw.mit.edu.

JULIAN

Anyway, I'd better abbreviate all this stuff that I want to cover today. The next three classes are going to cover cases of very complex, but very direct, relationships between social and spatial structure. There is a literature largely from the left side of the market on these issues. I don't have time to go through much of this here. You should read the required reading for this class, Kevin Lynch's piece-- chapter on social and spatial structure relationships.

BEINART:

On the left, I would assume the argument-- that space is an active agent, that it involves conflict, that it's political-- and this is an argument that is articulated very well by Henri Lefebvre in the translation of his writing into English. David Harvey's first book, *Social Justice In The City*, argues that, under capitalism, investment will never stream towards the poorer sections of the society, because capitalism has so many circuits of investment. An object of capitalist investment is always maximizing profit.

There are less attractive writings by Manuel Castells in his pre-Berkeley stage, the book, *The Urban Question*, and so on, and so on. There's David Gordon's writing about the origins of American suburbia as being the result of labor friction in the central business area, and the bosses wanting to move as far away from the workers as possible. And there are many histories of this kind. Castells' piece, *The Wild City*, which argues that suburbia is a form of advanced capitalist investment in which you have to create markets for prolific domestic goods, and suburbia is an attractive avenue for this kind of market. His writing is called *The Wild City*. He claims the American city wild in the sense that it obeys the consequences of market action in a very obvious kind of way. It's not hidden or transformed.

There's an enormous amount of writing. There's this writing and from the center and the right. In Sunday's *New York Times*, there's a piece called "Suburban Disequilibrium." I don't know if anybody looks at these things. It simply says that suburbs are an equal, something that one would presume to know.

And the reason suburbs are unequal are given, and they haven't changed-- and not much has changed. She cites examples of suburbs close together in Los Angeles, where one house sells for \$68 million. And a few miles away, there's a suburb of Mexican-American workers who can barely afford to buy their house.

In teaching this material, I found over the years that the material is very much stretched to large ideas about economic science and social policy. There's very little discussion of the meaning of place. Donald Appleyard has written about that and some others-- what place means, what space means to people, and so on. So I've decided to follow a different route in dealing with this.

I've established a notion called "bipolarity" and chosen cases where the conflict between various groups in the city is very explicit and under different conditions. So we will examine Johannesburg from its origins in 1876, I think, to today, following a path of explicit racial policy. South Africa invented or formalized racial policy to an extent that no other country and no other state in the world ever has. So we should look at Johannesburg and what this space of Johannesburg looks like as a result of the enforcement of absolute inequities between White and Black.

We should look at the colonial city. We look at Delhi and New Delhi. We look at the border between Mexico and the United States and look at the polarity between country and city in the development of Havana.

Today's class is really dealing with the mother of all social complexities, and that's Jerusalem. I want to do a case study on Jerusalem. And just for those of you who haven't read the required reading for today-- which is a long piece which I wrote after months of work, and I'm so sad that you haven't read it-- I'll go through the very-- let me just explain what I've handed out to you. After this, the map of the history of Jerusalem, a simplified history, on the next page is a drawing. It's a drawing on a napkin by the head of the planning section of MOPIC, the Palestinian organization after the Oslo Accords, which I worked with for a while.

This was the depiction of the future of Jerusalem-- as one metropolitan area with the Jewish sect on the West, and the Palestinian sect on the right, and the historic center in the middle. Below that is a letter, which is obvious, pointing out the stupidity of some of the writing on this issue. So what I'm going to do is try to take you through a history, which starts off as a history, for a long time, a history of religious consequence, and transforms much later and in recent times, certainly in this century, into a geopolitical conflict. And we end up with the status quo. Let's follow this map very briefly.

The origins of Jerusalem are, again, political. For Palestinians, it talks about the Jebusites, and the Canaanites, and the origins of the city prior to 1,000 BC, which is the date that the Davidian City, the City of David, argues its beginning. David captures Jerusalem, according to this. This is an Israeli map.

According to the Israeli history, David bought the threshing fields on the Temple Mount from the Jebusites for 15 shekels, the equivalent amount of money. And in order to unify the spread out of Jewish tribes, he built the first-- he was a lover, and a poet, and a general, and according to strict Hebrew law, was not able to build a temple. So his son, Solomon, was the author of the first temple.

I'll show you a drawing, by Corbusier of the tribal environment, which the Jews, and most people, established at the time. And the drawing shows the temple as the first physical presence in a city. Seeing that the religious city for a long time just depended on a religious infrastructure, it's clear that the first temple-- this temple exists for about 500 years, during which time the Middle East undergoes sieges and invasions.

The most significant invasion is by Nebuchadnezzar in the 6th Century. This has enormous consequences historically, and I tend to exaggerate some of them. Nebuchadnezzar came from the world's greatest city at the time, Babylon, the most advanced city of all. Instead of killing the Jews, he took them back with him as prisoners and allowed the Jews to establish themselves in Babylon in a relatively free manner. Why he did that, which was very contrary to social international behavior at the time, I don't know.

What happened was significant for the Jews. Not having a temple, not having priests, you must understand the organization of the social structure around the temple. The temple was run by priests.

There was no democracy in religion. You took what the priests gave you, and the priests were monitors of the Holy of the Holies. If you look at the plans putated for the first temple, you will see that structure.

The Jews didn't have temples. They either had to give up their religion or convert to some other pagan religion. Having been the first monoethicists of all, having-- monotheism was founded in Jerusalem. Nobody quite knows how. But the idea that many gods were dysfunctional, and that the single God, an invisible single God, was the proper course for religious faith.

So the Jews prayed in houses and in schools-- wherever they could. This type substitution was an extraordinary idea. In the history of the Church, I found a reference to saying that this was the beginning of the idea of the church free of the rule of plutocratic priests. People could indulge in a critical examination of their faith together as a group.

In fact, the conflict towards the end of the Jewish reign in Jerusalem at the time of Jesus was very much a conflict between the priests of the Second Temple and the Pharisees, who were advocating-- beginning to advocate the democratic religion in the form of the synagogue. So the synagogue emerges in primitive form in the exile of a Jewish group from the temple.

There's a second phenomenon which occurs during this period. In the Judeo-Christian Bible, there are seven chapters devoted to Ezekiel. Who was Ezekiel? What role did he play in the-- you should know these things.

You all are Christians, or Muslims, or any other form of religion. You know nothing about your own religion? Maybe you're all pagans, which would be refreshing, I suppose.

AUDIENCE: He was a Catholic?

JULIAN BEINART: Well, Ezekiel had a dream. He was a prophet. He had a dream that God and he encountered each other, and he had instructions to devise a new temple. There are six chapters in your Bible on Ezekiel's dimensions for this new temple.

Imagine dreaming of a temple when you're in exile and designing it in your mind as a text. Anyway, strange things happen. Ezekiel's temple, as I'll show you in the slides, has been redrawn and reimagined from these dimensions over time.

The Jews return, and the third significance of the stay in Babylon, the Jewish Talmud, the *Book of Laws*, has two versions, the Palestinian version-- at least the Jerusalem version and the Babylonian version. The Babylonian version is considered to be the preferred version. So the Jews in exile established a culture, which they brought back to Jerusalem having been freed, and Israel read the Bible to the people for the first time. And according to the text, they wept.

So the beginning of the idea that religion is a democratic phenomenon is my explanation for the problem of Jesus. I've a rather eccentric version of the story. What happened is we jump 500 years, and Herod goes and rebuilds the temple. He builds an enormous temple-- bigger than before.

The priests, again, are in control. They control power. They control the artifact of religion. They control property. They control everything in the city.

Along comes a Jew, a radical Jew-- has another vision of the world. Jesus doesn't threaten the Romans very much. The Romans are used to dealing with whatever in the empire, with infidels. They just lock them up or cut their heads off-- very explicit rules. [INAUDIBLE] in a rather difficult situation.

The priests are more threatened by Jesus than other Romans. The priests, therefore, connive with the Romans to execute Jesus. The notion of execution of your son occurs in the Judeo-Christian Bible before, and although it wasn't legal, the idea of passing your son on as a gift, the use of blood.

22,000 oxen were killed in the dedication of the Temple of Solomon. The whole idea of giving something to God as a gift-- if you were poor, you brought a chicken to the temple to the priest. If you were wealthy, you brought a cow, an ox. If you were very wealthy, good Lord knows, you donated your son.

The story of Abraham and Isaac is that same version of that gift giving. The supreme gift is the gift of your son. And the Jesus story is archetypally the story of God donating his son, again, for the improvement of the world. Christianity is based on many mythical stories, which emanated from the history of Jerusalem, and is the second monotheistic religion to emerge out of the city.

Muhammad is born in 570 BC. He fights his battles in Mecca and Medina, spreads the idea of Islam as the third great monotheistic religion through the Arabian Peninsula, and soon afterwards, Jerusalem is invaded by the first Arab group. Significantly, the Christians had chosen a site for the great church. Constantine's mother, Helena, from Istanbul or Constantinople, drifted down to Jerusalem, and he's supposed to have selected the site where Jesus was killed. On the basis of that information, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher was built and is still in existence today, having been destroyed seven times and rebuilt.

The Arabs arrive in Jerusalem. They're the newcomers. They asked the Christian bishop about sites for their own mosque.

The Temple Mount, which had been the site of the Jewish temple, had been raised by the Romans, and there was nothing left. For 500 years, the Temple Mount was a rubbish dump of old parts of buildings and so on. The Christians wanted nothing to do with it. In fact, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, which was usually under the Roman city, entered from The Cardo on the West, at least on the East, was closed.

And you now enter the Church of the Holy Sepulcher only from the South. On the East now, there's the best candy store in Jerusalem on The Cardo. So although the Temple Mount, which is only two-- to use their phrase-- two-arrow lengths, bow lengths, away from the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, the Islamic penetrators thought that the mythological origins of the use of the Temple Mount were sufficient for them to follow the Jewish tradition of the destroyed temple.

So they rebuilt the Temple Mount in about 100 years after Mohammad's birth and built the two buildings which are still there today-- The Dome of the Rock and the Al-Aqsa mosque. In my writing, I go through the detailed history of the idea of resilience, how under these occupations each religion plays around with the idea of permanence. The Christians in the Holy Sepulcher never really agree on the fundamentals of the Christian faith. Whilst they may agree on the fundamentals, they don't agree on its application.

So 70% of the Holy Sepulcher is still under Greek Christian. The poor African Ethiopian Christians live on the roof and are only allowed to enter the major tabernacle by a small staircase. As one of the writers writes, "They're all divided by faith," or something of this kind.

So you have a notion of the three major religions having, in the case of the Christians, an artifact which houses divided aspects of the religion. There are fires. They are people killed. There are all kinds of disjunctions between these groups, but Christianity survives.

On the Islamic front, you have the church, the Dome of the Rock, and the Al-Aqsa mosque, which survive to this day unblemished. In 1099, the Crusaders, under the pressure from the popes of Europe, attempt to restore Christianity. Instead of dismantling-- they are absolutely ruthless to the degree that they kill everybody in their sight. They kill Muslims and Jews. And in the blood of their boots, they walk to the Holy Sepulcher and pray.

There's always this kind of interesting biblical thing, which I focus on also, that the interpretation of God is always ambiguous. God is always punishing people for doing the wrong things, but he's also forgiving, if you come to terms with him-- or her, depending on what you believe. So the Crusaders behave in this apparently bifocal way. They destroy everybody whom they see in their sight violently, and at the same time, they go and sing hymns in their church. There may be parallels in contemporary violence as well. I don't know if it's a born-in instinct in humankind, that you modify your behavior in two distinct ways according to your belief system.

The Jews have lost two temples. They now are in exile. They take with them books. That's the only property they have.

There's writers-- Herschel, the American Jewish liberal theological rabbi, Mitchell [INAUDIBLE] did his PhD at MIT-- write about the idea of the Jewish book as the significant property of memory. They argue that, in fact, they are-- I think it's Herschel that talks about the Jewish religion as being a religion of the architecture of time. If you look at the layout of a text in the Mishnah, you'll see a body of writing. And on the sides are Talmudic interpretations by rabbis over time.

So the truth is never absolute in this one sense-- that it's always open to discussion. It's also that the Jews took upon themselves-- and Freud himself, who at one time thought about going to live in Jerusalem-- says that the Jews preoccupied themselves with avoiding pictorial imagery. You cannot decorate the synagogue. The text has to be absolutely pure.

Jews didn't become architects. They were never in a power position in exile for thousands of years-- well, not thousands of years. Peter Eisenman and his-- Frank Gehry are Jewish. And I suppose that we've made up for that lost time.

But the Jewish presence after 70 AD was in exile until the slow return of the Jews in the Ottoman period, which lasted from about 1500 to 1917. I hope you're following all of these detailed stories. But in a sense, it's only by looking at the detailed side of the stories that you really get a good idea of the complexity of the situation.

To say Arab-- I mean, of the 3,000 years of the history of Jerusalem, 1,200 years would be under the Israelites or the Jews, and 1,200 years under the Arabs or Islam. Whatever that means, the rest is divided amongst the Christians and the Romans.

Jerusalem was, in the first place, not a particularly important city. It was too steep. The main circulation path was to the West along the Mediterranean.

Jerusalem was the last connector between the coastal plain and the endless desert, which stretched all the way to India. The Dead Sea close to Jerusalem was the lowest point on Earth. So there was-- I'll show you a slide indicating this division, geographical division, on which Jerusalem sits.

Alexander the Great visited Jerusalem. This was an enormous victory for the Jews. Many Jews, including my son, are named Alexander because of that tradition. His first name is Peter, but his second name is Alexander. I named him after the Russian giants rather and Jewish heroes.

So Zionism, as a phenomenon, occurs in Europe as a consequence of the marginalization of Jews in Central Europe and all the way to England and France, the disposition of Jewish land. The Jews, under one of the early I think 12th century English kings, had to wear labels marking them as Jews-- the pogroms of Eastern Europe. I mean, it's a long history which precedes the Holocaust.

And Jewish reaction to persecution and punishment took the form of a biblical notion of "next year in Jerusalem." In the Jewish Passover service, there is this phrase, "next year, in Jerusalem." The Jewish Passover, unlike the Christian Easter, is not dedicated very much to a religious idea, but related to the escape under Moses from Egypt and God parting the Red Sea to allow the Jews to escape.

How true that story is, whether Freud claims that Moses was, in fact, an Egyptian who had learned about it. Well, anyway, there are too many stories. When you get all of these people having been involved in this dialogue, on this multilogue, you have many stories.

The Ottoman Empire chooses to take the wrong side in the 1418 war, and the British take over Jerusalem. They maintain Jerusalem as a mandate until 1948, when the War of Independence and the Jewish state of Israel was founded 70 years ago now. East Jerusalem belongs to Jordan, West Jerusalem, to Israel. 1967, there's another war. This time, the Jews expel Jordan from East Jerusalem, and in fact, annex the West Bank to a united Israel.

The United Nations proposes that Jerusalem be an international city. They actually have a diagram of the form of Jerusalem as an international city. Neither side, neither Arab nor Jewish politics, accept that as a resolution.

The Jews start, after the Oslo Accords, which presumably sets out that there would be an independent Palestinian state, and talks about the '67 boundary lines and zones for the future states. Israel politics, a combination of religious pressure and all kinds of other internal Israeli social issues, promote the expansion program, which now has reached 300,000 settlers living on land, which is East of the partition line set by the Oslo Accords. Many American presidents, since Harry Truman I think, have objected to Israeli settlement expansion, with no results whatsoever.

The status quo, at the end of all of my long story of 3,000 years, is a situation in which Jerusalem is claimed by Israel to be the unique capital of Israel. Although, as you will read in my letter, many of the previous Israeli presidents have looked for alternative sites to Jerusalem, at least for the capital of Israel, including Ben-Gurion's choice of coordinate in the Negev. At present, the Palestinian position is a slightly more complex position, but they would like to share Jerusalem as the capital of their state as well.

So you have a notion, which I don't think exists anywhere else in the world, where one city is the capital of two countries. You get St. Louis, Missouri and St. Louis, Kansas City. You have divisions in other parts of the world, but you have no claim for a city as being the capital of two states. In fact, the notion of two states is now under discussion.

There's a new, relatively new, movement, which argues for the existence of a single state, which would alleviate the problem of the settlements, but deny Zionist ambitions. Because demographically, the Jewish position is more vulnerable demographically. This two-state solution, which the United States and most liberal politicians support, is for there to be an independent Palestinian state. The Palestinians wish to go back to the 1967 boundary.

They'll have to be some compromise. God knows how that compromise is going to be worked out between the size of the settlement population and the emaciated, fragmented-- you can see in the last map in your handout, just in the case of the periphery of Jerusalem, how much this land has become parcelized and fragmented rather than unified. My son's book, which tackles this problem much more eloquently than I can, argues that for a Palestinian state, which is liberal and not imposing military law onto the Palestinians in the West Bank, and so on, and so on, is probably the most coherent liberal position on the subject at the moment.

The future of Jerusalem may well be never resolved. It may be the result of too much history and too much mythology. Mythology becomes history at a certain point. Let me give you an example.

Christians, at Easter today, celebrate the way of the cross. They carry the cross symbolically from the praetorium where Jesus was housed to where he was crucified. The site of the crucifixion is not absolutely clear, but most people now assume it to be somewhere around where the sepulcher is.

One of the stations of the cross, station number I don't know what-- number seven, I'm not sure exactly-- it's called the Ecce Homo station. That's where the Roman Legion commander pointed down to Jesus and said, ecce homo-- look at that man, look at this man in a derisive manner-- carrying the cross. In fact, history proves that to be absolutely nonsense, but a complete myth.

Archeologists say that the Ecce Homo Arch was only built long after Jesus' death and didn't exist at the time of Jesus. So the other confluences of reality, the Jews are near the citadel of David have the site of David's tomb, above which Christians claim the Last Supper of Jesus with his followers took place. It is now the site of the Dormitium Abbey, which is where Mary was supposedly died. [ITALIAN] Mary-- [ITALIAN] being the Italian word to sleep-- Dormitium Abbey.

So you have a vertical. As the history of this city has grown and layered upon each other, physically you have Jewish David at the bottom. Jesus is next on top, and the Ottoman Empire and Mary's memory on the top. What do you do about a place like this? You fossilize it.

In my letter, in *The New Republic*, I say that it's not only a religious city. It's an everyday city in which people go to school. People have transportation problems. The Jews have just built a light rail system.

It's a political city. It never was the capital of any of the country's Arab countries that conquered Jerusalem. I'll show you a slide of Jerusalem only being the capital of the Crusader empire and the Jewish empire. What justification that makes for arguing that Jerusalem should be the unique capital of Israel is for you to decide.

This is the most-- I mean, I can give you many detailed stories and versions of any of these events. For instance, in a religious environment of this kind, it's amazing how frequently people build on the sites of previous religious institutions. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher is built on the site of the Roman temple of Aphrodite. When the Crusaders capture Jerusalem in 1099, they go, they march, to the Dome of the Rock and the Al-Aqsa mosque. And instead of putting them down, they put a Christian flag on top of the Dome of the Rock and called the Temple of Dominus. And the Al-Aqsa mosque becomes Temple Salomonis.

Al-Aqsa mosque has its foundations in Solomon's temple stables. It is constantly-- its roof is constantly-- its lead roof is constantly having to be repaired, because its foundations are so unstable. This is the city which is built.

I write in the last part of my writing on Louis Kahn's Hurva synagogue. Well, if you haven't read it, I'm not going to tell you the story of Louis Kahn's interpretation of how you build in Jerusalem, his theory of ruins. So today, the Islam has two permanent monuments, ways, people can pray.

The Jews don't have any. They pray in the open air. The holiest presence is in the Western Wall, which is eroding in ancestry. And the Christians still have the desecrated holy place of the Sepulcher, Christ's passion-- the location of Christ's passion. And such is an abbreviated story of Jerusalem.

Now, what do you do? I worked for the Palestinian side. I worked not for the Israeli government, but for the mayor of Jerusalem over time. So my investment in this city is more than just knowing its history, which I only know partially.

The history of religion is so extensive that to understand it all-- I don't even understand who Gabriel was. The figure is in some story somewhere. I mean, the books about the Last Supper, which talk about the tradition of eating together and what that means, the book's about the killing of your first son-- remember the one of the plagues that the Egyptians or God cast on the Egyptians for the persecution of the Jews was the killing of the first son. That's why the baby Moses was hidden in the reeds.

We can go on and on, and on and on, and on. Religion is a business which produces lots of myths, and realities, and interpretations to keep itself going. OK, we should look at some of these pictures so you get a better idea of what this place looks like. The options are simple.

This is the present Israeli option for Jerusalem. If this is Palestine and this is Israel, Jerusalem has a secure border on its East side. This is a metropolitan city, as indicated in the drawing of the Palestinian planner with the central. The problem of what happens on a boundary between two countries in terms of security and customs isn't answered by one. You have to dispense with it. You can only dispense with that if you have secure relationship.

The European Union has dispensed with passports by virtue of an assumption that there is no reason to maintain fortified borders any longer between France and Belgium, for instance. But can you conceive of this being a solution in relation to two pretty hostile entities? How are you going to deal with security in a unified city-- small details?

The historic site has-- if an Iraqi wishes to visit the Dome of the Rock, he or she has to penetrate some kind of a line, or presumably there is line which has to be penetrated at all. This is a position where Palestine encircles Jerusalem in the counterpoint to this proposal. Are there any other possibilities? What do you think at the back there?

AUDIENCE: Possibility for what?

JULIAN Hmm?

BEINART:

AUDIENCE: Possibility for what?

JULIAN For the future of Jerusalem, given either one or-- given a one-state solution, there's no problem. It's the capital of
BEINART: a single state. But if it's the-- another solution is a version of number 1-- that the Ramallah, the United States, and the European Union give a billion dollars to the Palestinians to build a new capital.

AUDIENCE: It's not a question of where other people want them to put the capital. [INAUDIBLE] for Israel the same. There's two sides of Jerusalem.

JULIAN I understand.

BEINART:

AUDIENCE: There is a place to divide it. There is a divide, without there being a political division. There is a community that's divided. The problem is that it's the issue of security and whether everybody from-- what the Palestinians can control who comes right up to the edge of the Israeli side or the Jewish side. That's the problem.

JULIAN I understand. What I'm concluding is that there is no solution and that this will just perpetuate itself in history,
BEINART: causing bloodshed as blood accompanies this history of Jerusalem for 2,000, 3,000 years. That it'll just continue to be-- it is too intoxicated a site by the virtue of the three major religions in the world. Forgive me if I leave the others out.

And to use Aldo Rossi's term, "The locus is such that it is irresolvable." It's a bleak future for both Palestine and Israel. Maybe there's a solution which doesn't include Jerusalem. This is the one which I'm indicating here, where East Jerusalem is a suburb of another state, of a city in another state, but that's a far-fetched resolution.

There's the West versus the East, the countries of Palestine versus Israel, the race Arab versus Hebrew, language Hebrew versus Arabic, religion Islam and Christianity versus Judaism, Israel's relationship with the West, with Palestine's association with the Middle East and the Arab world, Israel's preoccupation with Western and industrial growth, Palestine's developing economy in agriculture and in technical industry, the Jewish background of the Holocaust and the Arab treatment of Jews in Arab countries, Palestine's heritage of colonialism, exploitation, and so on, and so on, and so on, and so on. You just travel the world of imagery. It's cheaper.

Jerusalem, like so many parts of this world, [INAUDIBLE] is exactly the same, topological structure. It's built on folded plains causing valleys, and hillsides, and different kinds of notions of development. This is a more or less contemporary imagery.

This is the old city here. This is the mosque, Al-Aqsa mosque, and that's the Dome of the Rock. This is the Western Wall. This is Jewish expansion from the 19th century onward, westward, Beit HaKarem, and all the way to the Jewish Israeli museum, the Jewish capital parliament buildings, and further westwards. Next.

Jerusalem lying on watershed between the coastal plain on the West and the endless desert on the right. Next. David's building of the city on the south. The city was always defensible on the south more easily than it was in the north. The Romans invaded from the north.

This is a set of reconstruction of Solomon's Temple over the centuries. Next. Corbusier's sketch of the Holy of the Holies under the nomadic tent. The whole idea of the temple is creating an audience of people in the community in the foreground, but no penetration of the building itself.

Jesus inherits temple. He said to exonerate-- not attacked, but assaulted the sellers of goods in the foreground of the temple. At a certain point he says, the temple will be destroyed after my death.

He says to his associates, from then onwards, you won't need a temple. My body will be your temple. Here, you have a religious substitution of the image of the body, the mass. In Catholicism, the use of the wafer to eat something refers to the actual consumption of the symbolic consumption of a body.

The wine stands for blood. These primitive and primeval relationships. Next.

God is the architect. Augustine, on the right, is seeing God, envisioning a second city up in the sky. For Jews, it was the second-- the ethereal Jerusalem is about 10 miles up. For Arabs, it's about 15 miles up. Next.

Reversionary construction of these Ezekiel's temple from the six, seven chapters. I didn't go into this, and I think we'll leave it for the moment. It was the notion of the invention of heaven. For the Jews, it seemed to me that early on the God with Yahweh, heaven was above, but dead human beings were not part of the territory that should be taken account of. Priests wore gloves when dealing with dead human beings, like animals. Next.

Here, it's temple reconstruction. The great battle, the invasion, of the Romans and the slaughter of the Jews. Next.

The only map of Jerusalem, this is in Jordan in a place called Madaba, near Aman. This is a mosaic floor in a church in Madaba showing the Roman construction of The Cardo, The East-West Cardo, and the Decumanus from the Jaffa Gate running right angles. Next.

This is the Ecce Homo Arch. We're looking at a map of Jerusalem at the time of the death of Christ. You will see the connection from the praetorium.

So here, it's praetorium at the top of the Temple Mount diagram along the way of the cross, all the way to Golgotha, to the Golgotha hill, and the putative passion of Christ. This is [INAUDIBLE], this way of the cross is a ritualistic celebration carried out each Easter in Jerusalem by thousands of pilgrims from all over the world. Next.

The temple of Aphrodite prior to the establishment of the church. The original establishment of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher has various religious components, but it connects to The Cardo on the extreme right. Next.

Here is a version of it after the Arab presence. The entrance now is on the south here, and its connection to The Cardo is truncated and stopped. These are various components of the Christian story. Next.

The Christian faiths do not trust access to the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and for centuries have endured the Nusaybah family, an Israeli Islamic family, with the keys. Here is the entrance to the south. Next.

Here's the roof. A Christian priest living on the roof of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher in semi-exile, and here is an Easter night celebration on the roof. Next.

The establishment, first establishment, of the Dome of the Rock, the circular purple building, and the Al-Aqsa mosque on the south, and the many institutions leaving this part of the holy city to be the Jewish quarter. The Basilica of Holy Zion-- slowly there's something about the Armenian quarter and the Christian quarter to develop further to the north. Next.

The Dome of the Rock, that Al-Aqsa mosque-- next. The Crusader period for a relatively short time, the [LATIN], the baptistery, the Temple Salomonis, the previous Al-Aqsa mosque, not destroyed but maintained, only Christianized in a simple way-- all the Christian institutions which grow up under the Crusader. St. James Cathedral, the Greek hopice, the Syrian monastery, the church of St. Martin, St. John the Baptist, the Hospitaliers quarter, the building of the largest hospital in the world at that time in the Muristan district, largely part of the Christianic beneficence. Next.

The retaking of the city under Arab Islamic circumstances by Saladin, rebuilding of the walls, the wall's rebuilt in 1131, 1191 to 1213, all of the schools and community places as a result of the Islamicization of this space. 1917, Jerusalem prior, at the time of the British invasion. Next.

I mentioned the example of the [INAUDIBLE], the layering of David's tomb, the Dormitian Abbey, and the [INAUDIBLE] Caiaphas, one of the agents in the death of Jesus. But the Last Supper takes place there as well. Here is the Dormitian Abbey, which has these three layers of vertical space belonging to different religions. Next.

The final subdivision of the Holy City into four sectors, the Dome of the Rock, and the Al-Aqsa mosque, penetrating into the Jewish sector with the Dung Gate. That's this gate. The Golden Gate, which is not open any longer to the Islamic section, which has the Damascus Gate on the north as its major entrance. The Church of the Holy Sepulcher, and the Christian sector, and the Armenian sector here.

The Jaffa Gate leads to-- is the prime-- if you extend these lines, the Jaffa Gate extends to the Mediterranean. The Dung Gate extends down to Egypt. The Damascus Gate extends upwards to Syria, and this closed Golden Gate potentially extends eastwards to Iraq. Next.

The contemporary city on the left, the coexistence of tall skyscrapers on the west in the Jewish city. Next. The British occupation, the McLean Plan, it's not very clear, but it's an attempt to recognize the western part, the Jewish part, and developing it according to a garden city model.

The Arab side is left gray for reasons I don't understand. Restricted building and open space-- extraordinary plan. And the United Nations' plan, which encloses a larger area than the municipality, and it encloses Bethlehem [INAUDIBLE] on the east, including Hadassah Hospital and Hebrew University on the northeast-- rejected by both sides. Next.

Jerusalem's rulers from 587-- that's Nebuchadnezzar and Babylon to 1967 AD-- showing that Jerusalem had consequence at a distance. The 1967 dividing of the city in the east and west with a boundary between the two. Next.

The boundary taken over and a map showing-- map by protagonists of the Arab cause, arguing that the Jews have always tried to locate settlements in a pattern which causes the city not to be unified. Next. Louis Kahn's-- one of the Louis Kahn's great buildings, which he never built, and his very interesting interpretation of the use of ruins in a city of-- could you just turn on those lights, please?

When you have the intersection of religion, politics, geography, and history, you cannot do anything. It's frozen. I don't know of a situation which has managed to overcome-- maybe Belgian.

I suppose in Europe at least the elimination of obstacles towards the creation of a plane of general acceptance. And the European Union is perhaps the most modern example of the breaking down of barriers. The barriers are still between Algiers and Paris. It's between the hinterland of countries, Turkey and the European Union, sending migrant labor back and forth. But this is a phenomenon which is not easily applied to Jerusalem.

In the case of Johannesburg, you will see the absence of religion. It is purely a question of race. Once you eliminate religion and you only deal with race, you find it easier to resolve, even although South Africa has struggled into the post-apartheid democracy. It took enormous resources, and time, and bloodshed. And Johannesburg is an artifact of race, and so on. So we look at these others in a slightly different light than Jerusalem.

But Jerusalem is the great metaphysical city of the world. It's the most important metaphysical presence. What that means, meaning-wise, is difficult to say. They are parts where you tread and walk softly and slowly, because you have a history of associations with that particular place. And these associations are carefully vivid.

There have been Palestinian riots around the archaeology of certain regions in the olden city. Somebody one day will try to excavate under the Holy Mount to see if the Holies of Holy is still there. Steven Spielberg's probably likely to do the movie. Although, he's done a movie which is similar. Anyway, any thoughts about all of this?

Complexity is an easy evasion. You know, wherever I go around the world hearing people talk about cities, the modern interpretation is they're too complex to have theories about them. And no city is more complex than Jerusalem. No city has been the site of three major religions. No city has been the site of 3,000 years of invasion and succession, resilience and the building up of history and myths.

You should go and visit it. That's all I can recommend. See if you can make any sense of it.

You've lived in Jerusalem, haven't you?

AUDIENCE: I never lived in Jerusalem.

JULIAN You never--

BEINART:

AUDIENCE: I've been there hundreds of times, but never [INAUDIBLE] for more than one night.

JULIAN Yeah. The first immigrant Zionists saw Jerusalem as an old-fashioned historically-bound city. And [INAUDIBLE]
BEINART: chose to make Tel Aviv the capital, or Haifa the capital facing the Mediterranean, or in the case of Ben-Gurion, the new city of [INAUDIBLE]. It's Chaim Weizmann who found Jerusalem to be archaic and medieval, and the new Jewish Zionist spirit was in favor of novelty and social equity, and some of the things which it hasn't been able to perpetuate. OK, we'll do Johannesburg on Thursday and see if there's any comparison.