

# THE SCHEME FOR SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF 5-MILLION POPULATION IN ISRAEL

ELIEZER BRUTZKUS

## A. *The Background*

**A**T THE EVE of the Jewish colonization of the country in the second half of the nineteenth century, the settlement patterns of Palestine were similar to many other Mediterranean countries and regions. A typical "anomaly" characterizing many of these regions was apparent here too. Plains and valleys excelling in fertility of soil had only a very thin population, while hill regions with less favorable conditions for agriculture showed much higher densities of settlement. Lack of security under Ottoman rule and spread of malaria in plains and valleys covered by swamps were the main causes of this anomaly.

The low standard of life of the Arab rural population did not allow for growth of urban service centers of any significance.

The existing towns, most on historical sites known from ancient times, were of very modest dimensions. Jewish population kept alive by "*halukka*" donations from abroad concentrated in four holy cities—all of them in interior of the country and remote from the sea shore.

The beginning of the Jewish colonization in the eighties of the nineteenth century relied upon land purchases effected in coastal zone concentrated mainly in this belt which was at that period still only thinly populated. Its economic foundations relied upon intensive agriculture of wine, almonds, and in later years upon orange groves. Substantial increase in the amount of sea traffic and commerce contributed equally to restore the coastal zone, very densely populated in ancient times, to its role of the central spine of the settlement pattern of the country.

Gradual concentration of additional population, mostly Jewish—both urban and rural within the central coastal zone continued uninterrupted during the whole period of the British mandate. The urban growth was centered during this period almost exclusively on the metropolitan areas of Tel-Aviv and Haifa.

The rural colonization was always an object of major concern and under a more or less systematic guidance by the Zionist organization. Urban settlement was on the contrary an outlet of entirely spontaneous and unguided trends. These spontaneous trends resulted in a spatial settlement pattern characteristic of countries whose population was shaped by absorption of immigrants like Australia or Argentina. A "polarized" settlement pattern emerges in this case in which almost all nonagricultural population becomes concentrated within few big seaport cities.

Marketing of agricultural produce and supplying services to rural population is effected in this case by "direct" links between the basic rural cell (in case of Jewish Palestine—the *moshav*<sup>1</sup> or *kibbutz*) and the big city without leaving any functions to the intermediary links of an urban hierarchy—small and medium size urban centers.

Small and medium size urban centers were practically nonexistent within the Jewish sector of the country excepting some bigger orange belt private colonies which showed already under British mandate distinct signs of an advanced urbanization.

Almost all industrial administrative and service functions were concentrated within the three bigger cities of the country. At the date of establishment of the State of Israel, 68 per cent of the Jewish population of the country were concentrated within the three metropolitan areas of Tel-Aviv, Jerusalem, and Haifa—40.5 per cent within the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area alone.

With the foundation of the state a radical change occurred in the direction of the urban development. Urban development formed quantitatively already under British mandate the major part of the Jewish development could obviously not remain further an unguided and unplanned sector. A definite policy for urbanization was adopted which embraced the whole of the urban development of the country.

This new policy was a result of two factors. One—a new ideological concept which came from the professional physical planners; the other—the pressing necessity to find an adequate solution to settlement problems of the newborn state.

The most outstanding and distinguished expert of the Zionist movement in the field of economy and colonization, Dr. Arthur Ruppin, used to stress until the thirties that one-third of the Jewish population in Palestine should be "rural" and gain its livelihood mainly from agriculture. He considered the agricultural layer as the main and primary cornerstone of the whole structure of Jewish economy and settlement of the country. The professed "conventional wisdom" of the labor movement, strongly influenced by the *kibbutzim* and *moshavim* was distinctly "ruralistic," and so was, at least nominally, that of the Zionist movement and of the public opinion of the country. This ruralistic attitude was even more far-going than the relatively moderate approach of Dr. Ruppin.

In spite of this conventional semiofficial attitude, a number of outstanding economists of the country arrived already in the thirties to different conclusions. Following a more thorough analysis of existing trends both within the country proper and abroad, they claimed that even in the case that all political obstacles for Jewish colonization would be removed the percentage of the agriculturists within the total of the Jewish population can never surpass the mark of 20 per cent.

Taking this conclusion as a starting point, a new approach was developed among physical planners already at the end of the thirties. Decentralization of

<sup>1</sup> Cooperative smallholder settlement.

urban settlement was for the first time put forward as a policy target. This meant creation of a new pattern of small and medium size urban centers maintaining intensive relations with their rural surroundings within small and "well balanced" regions.

Such approach developed on a background of a "regionalist" ideology predominant at that time in professional writings on spatial planning and settlement geography in Europe.

The lessons gained during the period of the world crisis 1929-32 were equally in favor of such an attitude.

The experience of that period showed that "mixed" regions with a strong mutual interpenetration of industry and agriculture, urban and rural settlement were more resistant to crisis and mass unemployment than big cities or purely agricultural districts.

In the eyes of the adherents of this new approach a "regional" town, well integrated within the rural surroundings, conformed well to the basic aspiration of Zionism to make Jewish settlement in the country as deep "rooted" as possible. A regional town appeared as an organic overstructure upon the basic layer of agricultural settlements. The implementation of such ideas required a transformation of the existing "polarized" settlement pattern into one based on hierarchical principle containing urban centers of different grades as intermediary links. Theoretical concepts of Lösch and Christaller concerning the inherent laws of urban settlement patterns provided later a quasi-scientific support to the new approach.

The second origin of the new line of policy was rooted in the realities which emerged immediately following the establishment of the new state. In defiance to the traditional ruralistic "conventional wisdom" it became gradually obvious that agricultural colonization may absorb only a modest fraction of the total additional population. Therefore the urgent necessity to proceed with rapid Jewish settlement of the thinly populated districts like Galilee, southern coastal zone, the Negev and the Jerusalem corridor led to a conclusion that basic rural colonization should be paralleled by urban settlement. The mass immigration pouring into the country required an immediate answer to the basic question—to which towns and districts should these flows of immigrants be channelled?

Since the establishment of the state the settlement spread was accompanied by a continuous overall planning which had a substantial influence upon the settlement process. Schemes for desirable spatial distribution of population for periods of fifteen to twenty years ahead were prepared from time to time by the Department for Physical Planning placed in the Prime Minister's Office (later within the Ministry of Interior). In the early sixties, the government decided to accord a high preference to the problem of "dispersal of population." There was even a special ministerial committee for this purpose.

The planning policy was strongly influenced by changes in conventional concepts and outlook. These changes were partly rooted in local experience in Israel and partly were projections of "fashionable" concepts prevailing at that

time among physical planners and urban development strategists abroad. As far as such fashionable concepts were absorbed by the politicians responsible for implementation of the policy, they were often taken over in a too oversimplified and exaggerated way.

There were often put forward radical "prescriptions" as remedies capable to heal all ills and to guide the development of the settlement pattern in an entirely new direction. In reality "freedom of choice" after the new basic settlement pattern was initiated and shaped in the first years of the state was relatively limited.

The scheme for a desirable spatial distribution of a population of 5 millions presented in this article was from the start very conscious of these limitations and went in its whole a "middle line" between various one-sided and sometimes mutually contradictory recommended directions.

#### B. *Elaboration of the Scheme*

The scheme for a desirable spatial distribution of a 5-million population is the result of a common work of the Division for National Planning at the Ministry of Interior and of the Economic Planning Authority within the Ministry of Finance.<sup>2</sup> It was prepared under guidance of an inter-ministerial steering committee on which seven ministries were represented<sup>3</sup> The scheme tried to find a creative response to diversity of problems and constraints involved in shaping of an optimum settlement pattern for Israel for two decades ahead.

The scheme has been prepared in conformity to the provisions of the Planning and Building Law 1965 and following the directives of the National Planning Council constituted under above law. Since the end of 1972, it is under consideration of the National Planning Council.

It is for the first time that a scheme of this kind which sets definite demographic targets for each district, subdistrict, urban or semiurban settlement for a period of twenty years ahead has a chance to become a statutory and legally binding document, provided a recommendation of the National Planning Council is granted and the endorsement of the cabinet is obtained. In such case it will have a different and superior standing to all previous schemes of similar kind which were prepared and revised at several dates since 1949 and had only an indicative and advisory character.

<sup>2</sup> *The Scheme for Spatial Distribution of a 5-million Population in Israel*, Vols. A and B (Jerusalem, 1972) (Hebrew).

On behalf of the Division for National Planning at the Ministry of Interior participated in preparation of the scheme E. Brutzkus, Ch. Arion, and Sh. Hasson and on behalf of the Economic Planning Authority—R. Silberberg.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to representatives of the Division for National Planning and Economic Planning Authority who were responsible for the preparation of the scheme, members on the Steering Committee were Dr. Ahiram (Ministry of Immigrant Absorption), J. Slaiper (Ministry of Housing), A. Shaliv (Ministry of Commerce and Industry), Dr. Pohoryles (Ministry of Agriculture), and Col. Z. Ofer (Ministry of Defence). The author of the present article served as the chairman of the Steering Committee and Ch. Arion as its secretary.

Elaboration of the scheme was based upon a considerable extent of surveys, research work, and projections embracing demography, economics, urban planning, and existing land reserves.

In close cooperation with the Ministry for Immigrant Absorption and the Immigration Department of the Jewish Agency, estimates of expected amount of immigration and its composition for the next twenty years were established. The same concerning the expected increase of the present population of the country, specified for Jews and minorities, for Israel in its whole and separately for its different districts and subdistricts. The possible extent and directions of the anticipated interior migration flows were equally evaluated.

The scheme is linked to the plans of economic development established by the Economic Planning Authority. Since the time-range of the scheme is approximately twenty years there arose a necessity to establish working hypotheses concerning economic development for the period which was beyond the reach of economic plans established for a much more limited time-range.

Particular attention was devoted to the future development of the employment basis in various economic sectors like agriculture, industry, construction, transportation, and services for the country in its whole and separately for different districts.

Another primary consideration for elaboration of the scheme was to evaluate the capacity of the government to promote population growth in specific districts and towns and to influence the direction of interior migration by means like channelling of immigrants to specific areas, state financed housing, granting of special advantages to remote districts and guidance of investments in industry and hostelry.

Additional research work substantial to defining of local demographic targets extended equally to: (a) analysis of demographic growth of each urban and semiurban settlement in the past and its components like natural increase, absorption of immigrants and the balance of interior migration, and (b) extent of land reserves available for urban extension in different settlements.

### *C. The Demographic Basis of the Scheme*

The scheme is linked to a definite population number—5 millions. This number includes the total population living within the area to which Israeli law applies (including Eastern Jerusalem) and Jewish residents within the presently occupied areas. Following some basic assumptions upon which the scheme relies, 5-million population mark will be reached in 1992. Obviously the discrepancies between these basic assumptions and the reality and especially concerning the number of immigrants may cause that 5 millions' mark to be reached few years earlier or few years later than in 1992. In accordance with the mentioned basic assumptions, the 5 millions' population will be composed of 4,180,000 Jews and 820,000 minorities.

At the intermediary stage of a 4 millions' population to be reached presumably in 1981, this number will be composed of 3,380,000 Jews and 620,000 minorities.

The total population increase of the country will be from 3,094,000 on December 31, 1971 to 5 millions in 1992 or by 62 per cent. Within this total increase, the increase of the Jewish population will be from 2,635,000 to 4,180,000 or by 58 per cent and of the minorities from 458,500 to 820,000 or by 79 per cent. Percental share of the minorities within the total population will thus increase from 15 per cent in 1971 to 16.4 per cent in 1992.

Realization of these projections is dependent upon their components—the natural increase of the existing population and the amount of the net immigration to Israel. Demographic projections for Jewish population take into account certain drop in natural increase from 1.7 per cent in 1970 to 1.4 per cent in 1992. The decline in natural increase will be even more spectacular for the non-Jewish population—from 3.9 per cent in 1972 to 2.6 per cent in 1992.

Such a forecast relies upon following premises: The present rate of natural increase for non-Jewish population approaches maxima which were only for short periods reached anywhere else. During the period of the scheme, rapid urbanization of the non-Jewish sector of population is expected which will be accompanied by a rise of standard of living, better education for girls and increased participation of Arab women in gainful occupations outside the home. All these factors are usually contributing to the decline of the birth rate. These changes are still in their initial stages and therefore their impact is not yet recognizable in the present rates of natural increase. There is, however, a high probability that such a decline will occur some years later.

Immigration forecasts for the period 1970–92 prepared in collaboration with the Immigration Department of the Jewish Agency and the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption suppose for the whole of the period of the scheme a total gross of 940,000 immigrants, or an average immigration of 43,000 per year. This total of 940,000 includes 300,000 immigrants from Eastern Europe, practically almost all of them coming from Soviet Union. Should the immigration be stronger than assumed above, the 5-million population mark may be reached before 1992.

The spatial distribution of population is shaped to a wide extent by interior migration too. Interior migration of the recent years had very marked preferences which resulted in a distinct positive migration balance of the Tel-Aviv district. There was a very slight positive surplus in the migration balance of southern, central, and Haifa districts and an extremely negative balance for the northern district. The migration balance of Jerusalem district was negative before the Six-Day War and slightly positive after this war.

Since guiding immigrants to peripheral districts meets increased difficulties a strong reduction of the negative migration balance of the northern district was considered as one of the most important, however difficult and problematic targets of the scheme.

#### D. *The Economic Background*

The economic premises of the scheme rely upon plans and forecasts of the Economic Planning Authority prepared for time periods of five to ten years,

further upon more specified plans of the Ministry of Agriculture and those for industrial development in 1971–80 by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry.

The time range of the scheme for population distribution is longer than that of economic plans drawn for four, five, and only partly for ten year periods. Therefore they provide the 5 millions' scheme only with essential milestones showing the road for future development.

The expected development in various branches of economy appears per existing economic plans as follows:

Possibilities of agriculture to absorb additional manpower appear to be very limited. At the same time the value of agricultural production may still increase very considerably.

Within the industrial sector, the growth will go on in extent of production, volumes of exports, and eventually in employment too. The upper ceiling of the relative share of industry in total employment will be reached probably around 1980—many years before the termination of the period to which the scheme extends. From this point further the increase of employment within the tertiary sector will become more conspicuous as it happened in most other affluent countries.

Facing the trend of increased automation and mechanization reducing the manpower needs of industry strengthened by emerging lack of manpower resources for industry in Israel—both among veteran population and immigrants, any increase in share of industrial employment within the total labor force appears doubtful.<sup>4</sup>

Among the different branches of industry no substantial growth is expected for food industry and textiles while considerable increase is anticipated in branches like chemicals and pharmaceuticals, printing, plastics, electronics, tools and machinery construction with a strong emphasis on science-based branches of industry.

Development of industry upon above lines depends heavily upon existence of technical and managerial manpower and research institutions—all concentrated primarily in central parts of the country. This relationship does not make a more balanced and dispersed distribution of population easier to achieve.

Within the spheres of the tertiary sector an increased importance will accrue to “exportable services” or such contributing in other ways to receipts in foreign currency, among them tourism, sea and air traffic, institutions serving the Jewish diaspora or developing countries, exports of “know-how,” medical and educational services for foreigners, etc. The receipts in foreign currency from pensioners deriving their income from abroad and settling permanently in Israel would form in the future equally important item contributing to the balance of

<sup>4</sup> A minority vote of Dr. Ahiram (Ministry of Immigrant Absorption) and of the author suggested to assume for the final year of the scheme the present share of industry within the total labor force (26 per cent) without any increase at all and to admit instead a correspondent increase of the share of the tertiary sector. The majority of the Steering Committee fixed the percentage of industrial employment at 30 per cent.

TABLE I

	5 Millions' Scheme	Employed in 1969
Agriculture	5.5	10.5
Industry, including handicrafts and mining	30.0*	26.2
Construction & public works	7.5	8.2
Technical services	1.5	1.9
Transportation	7.5	7.7
Commerce & banking	14.0	12.9
Services (public & personal)	34.0*	32.6
	100.0	100.0
Labor force within total population	37.0	33.7

\* Minority vote of Dr. Ahiram (Ministry of Immigrant Absorption) and E. Brutzkus assumes 26 per cent employment in industry and 38 per cent in services.

payments of Israel.

The anticipated percental breakdown of the labor force per economic branches at the end of the period of the scheme (as accepted by the majority of the Steering Committee) is given in Table I showing equally the correspondent breakdown of the labor force for 1969.

#### E. *The Rural and Agricultural Sectors*

Population employed in agriculture has numerically not more the same standing and importance as it possessed during the mandatory period or in the first decade after the creation of the state. The drop in the share of agriculture within the total labor force of Israel is parallel to similar trends occurring round the world.

The percentage of employed in agriculture within the area of the state as before 1967 was assessed by the Steering Committee of the scheme (relying upon macroeconomic forecasts) at 5.5 per cent of the total labor force (4.6 per cent for Jewish and 10.1 per cent for non-Jewish population). Notwithstanding this overall reduction of the relative weight of the agricultural population it remains still a dominant factor for some regions, especially those in the northern and southern districts.

There is no direct correlation between "agricultural" and "rural" population. Rural settlements include nonagriculturists employed in services in the industrial enterprises of the *kibbutzim* and residents whose employment places are in near or more remote urban centers. The scheme takes for granted that during the period of the scheme a certain liberalization of the present strict rules governing the *moshavim* will happen to allow more residents to live in *moshav* without being necessarily in possession of an agricultural holding. The "rural" population as defined under the scheme includes equally rural service centers, small private colonies, minor urban settlements, and scattered housing outside the urban and



semiurban "centers." It includes further the majority of small and medium size minorities' villages, health and touristic resorts, and institutions located outside the urban areas.

Residents who are not agriculturists within *kibbutz* and *moshav* settlements were estimated to be 25 to 80 and even up to 90 per cent in surplus of the basic agricultural population. Higher marks in regions possessing abundant opportunities for additional employment like in districts near to Tel-Aviv or Jerusalem.

The total of Jewish "rural" population included within the scheme amounts to 320,000 (7.3 per cent of the total Jewish population), thereof 241,000 in *kibbutzim* and *moshavim*, 32,000 in private agricultural settlements, 13,000 in rural service centers and 34,000 within scattered settlements of a semiurban character, health resorts, institutions, etc.

Population increase within *kibbutzim* and *moshavim* during the period of the scheme<sup>5</sup> is assessed to be 13.3 per cent compared with 60.5 per cent average increase in Jewish population for the same period. This increase will, however, reach 29 per cent for the Jewish rural population in its whole including small and scattered settlements of urban and semiurban character.

The rural population of the minority sector (largest settlements excepted) will reach in accordance to the scheme 266,000 accounting for 32.5 per cent of the total population of minorities at the end of the period of the scheme.

#### F. General Aims

In its general outlook the scheme is well aware of the relatively narrow limits for possibilities to achieve radical changes within the existing settlement pattern of the country. It continues, however, in the same direction as the previous schemes—to achieve a more balanced distribution of population over the whole territory of the country and to relieve the overconcentration of population in the central coastal zone and within the metropolitan area of Tel-Aviv in particular.

This direction was fixed already in the directives issued by the National Planning Council at the start of the preparation of the scheme. A deeper insight into problems involved leads to conclusion that there exists still a necessity to continue this line of policy and so mainly for the following reasons:

(a) General goals of a national settlement policy to arrive at a reasonable balance between Jewish and non-Jewish population in the northern district.

(b) Response to challenges emerging from the growing population density in the central coastal zone. Among these—lack of adequate land reserve for enterprises or institutions which require large plots of land, lack of sufficient recreation areas, increasing traffic difficulties and bottlenecks, pollution nuisance steadily worsening in the most densely populated districts. To relieve and counteract such challenges means to extend urban development to new and less "overloaded" regions.

<sup>5</sup> Computed for a period starting with December 31, 1970.

(c) Insufficient stability—demographic, economic, and social within the new towns and rural districts, particularly in those remote from the central coastal zone. Their lack of consolidation does not permit to leave them unassisted and commands to continue to guide additional human and economic resources to them to achieve a reasonable consolidation and some additional growth within them.

This necessity to continue a policy aiming to consolidate the achievements obtained in the past and to relieve the pressures already existing and capable to worsen in the central coastal zone is confronted with numerous difficulties and impediments. They derive partly from the very fact that such line of policy runs in opposite direction to strong spontaneous trends, and this unrelated to the question whether these trends are in the long run positive or negative. The framework within which such policy must be now implemented became more rigid and less favorable compared with conditions which were prevalent during the first two decades of the State of Israel.

Conditions which have meanwhile undergone profound changes and become less favorable to the policy of decentralization are the growing weight of the natural increase versus increase by immigration within the total growth of the population. Immigrants may be more easily guided to new towns and remote districts than veteran population. Composition and provenience of immigrants have changed and they have now a much stronger predilection for metropolitan areas. Additional agricultural colonization stopped and there is no demand for additional manpower in rural districts. The growing tertiary sector is distinctly linked to central districts and metropolitan areas. All these trends do not make the implementation of a policy for dispersal of population easier.

It is evident that difficulties on the way of a policy aiming to strengthen the peripheral districts may be overcome by increased input of government resources and investment in these districts. But such one-sided allocation of resources for one purpose only may be in contradiction with other important targets of government policy.

The scheme pursues the aim of strengthening of peripheral districts without trying to arrive at radical change within the existing balance between various districts. The emphasis is less upon higher numerical targets and more upon the consistency in its implementation without unduly exaggerating the amount of resources allocated for this purpose.

Responsibles for the elaboration of the scheme were well aware of the advantages linked to "concentrated" effort within few strong and carefully selected "growth poles." In this way better and more impressive results may be achieved, but this does not mean that the needs of small urban centers should be neglected or disregarded. Not only is their liquidation unthinkable for reason of existing stock of buildings and infrastructures, but their further existence and certain growth is an essential prerequisite for any future consolidation of rural districts.

Therefore proposed distribution of human "resources," as suggested in the scheme, including guiding of new immigrants to different districts of the country

is well balanced. Increase of population in rural districts foreseen within the scheme is substantially under the national average. Small urban centers shall have a larger share in the total increase of population—close to national average. The scheme assumes that the growth within the metropolitan areas of Tel-Aviv and Haifa may be kept equally below the national average. From all those areas and settlements where the growth will be beneath the average accrue “surpluses” which may be guided to few strong and promising “growth poles” like Beer-Sheva, Ashdod, and Nazareth where the increase will be far above the national average.

We may sum up that the targets of the scheme are well balanced without any too distinct alignment with any one of the numerous one-sided concepts put forward in the recent years, apparently appealing but to a certain extent contradictory each to the other.

#### *G. Proposed Spatial Distribution of Population*

The scheme presents a model of spatial distribution of population within the boundaries of Israel as before June 1967 with east Jerusalem added. It contains further the expected Jewish population within areas beyond this boundary line. The total number of Jewish residents beyond this boundary is taken as 1.5 per cent (63,000) of the total Jewish population of the country and this without breakdown of this number between possible regions of settlement. Population number for minorities includes only minorities residing within the boundaries before 1967 and east Jerusalem.

For the central coastal zone the scheme suggests that the bulk of additional urban development outside of the metropolitan area of Tel-Aviv and Haifa shall be concentrated within few stronger urban centers like Rehovot, Ramla, Lydda, Kefar-Saba, and Hadera and especially within those possessing within their municipal boundaries considerable land reserves on sand dunes like Natanya, Rishon-Lezion, Ashdod, and Ashkelon.

Turning to the metropolitan area of Tel-Aviv the scheme emphasizes a development axis in southern direction starting with Holon and Bat-Yam and passing through the extensions of Rishon-Lezion on sand dunes to Yavneh and Ashdod. Development along this axis is preferable to an urban sprawl upon agricultural belt in eastern or northern direction from Tel-Aviv.

Regarding the minorities' sector the scheme assumes some migration to the towns of the coastal zone—especially to the metropolitan area of Haifa. The scheme recognizes the necessity to promote urban regional centers within the districts populated by minorities—among them Tarshiha, Sakhnin, Kefar-Yassif, and others. It is suggested to give preference to a concentration of industrial and service activities within these regional centers.

The tables summing up the changes which shall occur within the spatial distribution of population in accordance with the targets of the scheme are presented in Table II. They show the breakdown per administrative district.

Expected evolution of population within the three main metropolitan districts is shown in Table III.

As Table III shows the scheme suggests an additional drop in the share of the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area, retaining, its present share for Haifa metropolitan area and an increase in the share of Jerusalem within the total population. The aggregate weight of the three metropolitan districts will slightly decline in accordance to the scheme.

The intended changes within the spatial distribution of population should be achieved partly by guiding of immigrants to definite towns and districts and

TABLE II  
POPULATION OF ISRAEL ON DECEMBER 31, 1973 AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
THE TARGETS OF THE SCHEME PER ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICT

(In thousands)

District	December 31, 1973		5 Millions' Scheme		Index of Growth
	Number	%	Number	%	
Northern	511.7	15.3	800.0	16.0	157
Haifa	509.5	15.3	770.0	15.4	152
Central	617.9	18.5	870.0	17.4	141
Tel-Aviv	946.8	28.4	1,215.0	24.3	129
Jerusalem	362.7	10.9	642.0	12.8	177
Southern	385.7	11.6	640.0	12.8	166
Occupied territories*			(63.0)	1.3	
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,334.3</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>5,000.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>150</b>

\* Jewish settlers within occupied territories are included within the number of residents of the adjacent district.

TABLE III  
EVOLUTION OF THE THREE MAIN METROPOLITAN AREAS AND OF THEIR RESPECTIVE  
WEIGHT WITHIN THE TOTAL POPULATION

(In thousands)

	Census 1961	December 31, 1965	December 31, 1970	4 Millions (1981)	5 Millions (1992)
Greater Tel-Aviv*	634.1	716.9	822.2	954	1,090
% within the total population	29.6	27.6	25.7	23.8	21.8
Greater Haifa†	218.6	252.7	290.3	355	445
% within the total population	10.1	9.8	9.0	8.9	9.1
Jerusalem	166.3	191.7	314.1‡	450	560
% within the total population	7.7	7.4	9.7	11.2	11.2
Three metropolitan areas together	1,019.0	1,161.3	1,426.6	1,759.0	2,105.0
Thereof Jews	1,003.0	1,140.0	1,324.3	1,607.0	1,895.0
% within total population	47.4	44.8	44.4	43.9	42.1
% within Jewish population	51.9	49.5	48.2	47.5	45.3

\* Includes Tel-Aviv-Jaffa, Givatayim, Ramat-Gan, Bnei-Beraq, Holon, and Bat-Yam.

† Includes Haifa, Neshet, Kiryat Motzkin, Kiryat-Bialik, and Kiryat-Yam.

‡ The increase in population number is due mainly to addition of East Jerusalem in 1967.

TABLE IV  
BREAKDOWN OF PLANNED GUIDING OF IMMIGRANTS TO DIFFERENT  
DISTRICTS FOR THE ENTIRE PERIOD OF THE SCHEME

	(%)
Northern	13.8
Haifa	16.4
Central	14.7
Tel-Aviv	22.6
Jerusalem	14.8
Southern	15.6
Occupied territories	2.1
Total	100.0

TABLE V

District	(In thousands)	
	Jews	Minorities
Northern	-80	-40
Haifa	-5	28
Central	35	1
Tel-Aviv	-12	9
Jerusalem	25	0
Southern	0	2
Occupied territories	37	—
Total	0	0

partly by influencing the direction of interior migration flows, particularly by reducing the negative migration balance of the northern district.

The model of proposed distribution of immigrants among the different districts adopted within the scheme upon acceptance by the majority of the Steering Committee<sup>6</sup> is shown in Table IV.

It is admitted, however, that the cumulative amount of negative migration for the Jewish population of the northern district will for the entire period of the scheme reach 80,000. For the minorities of the northern district the out-migration will reach an amount of 40,000 directed to central coastal zone and especially to Haifa metropolitan area.

Assumptions of the scheme concerning the cumulative net surpluses and deficits of interdistrict migration for the entire period of the scheme are shown in Table V.

A scheme for desirable spatial distribution of population shall possess an inherent flexibility.

During the course of preparation of the scheme numerous alternatives were considered relating to the demographic balance between districts and subdistricts

<sup>6</sup> Representative of the Ministry for Immigrant Absorption in a separate *votum* proposed to reduce the share of Haifa district to 13 per cent, of the central district to 12 per cent, and of the Tel-Aviv district to 18 per cent and to increase instead the share of the Jerusalem district from 14.8 per cent to 25 per cent.

and to the population targets of single urban settlements. It is however not desirable that a scheme which has to guide in a very definitive way local planning and factual urban development would be presented in its ultimate stage in alternatives. It is preferable to present one alternative only—that which has been chosen as an optimum one.

The necessary flexibility is integrated within the scheme in another way. For each urban settlement are defined two additional and higher demographic marks beyond the basic “balanced” target. The total of the single “balanced” population marks yields the total population of 5 millions. These higher marks are fixed for the purpose of preparation of master plans which shall be more elastic and have to provide for population numbers exceeding the optimum ones conceived by the government’s policy and reflected in “balanced” numerical targets. One of the basic tasks of the scheme is to provide guidance to local master plans drafted usually for a period of twenty years ahead.

For guidance of more short-range developments a scheme for an intermediary stage of 4 millions’ population, presumably reached in 1981, was prepared in addition to the more far-reaching scheme for 5 millions.

#### H. *Regional Changes in Economic and Employment Basis*

Structural changes within Israel economy will not appear uniformly in various districts and regions of the country.

In northern and southern districts and to a lesser extent within central district the agriculture will still preserve its basic role for employment and economy. The share of industrial employment will however increase considerably. Industrial growth will be particularly impressive in the southern district.

Basic chemical industry is expected to take root in the eastern Negev outside of the urban areas. Extensive industrial areas are already demarcated here for enterprises considered as “noxious” for urban environment or such in need of large plots of land. Central district will absorb industrial enterprises anxious to extend and needing relatively larger plots, but not prepared for various reasons to move far away from the Tel-Aviv metropolitan area.

Within the interior zones of the metropolitan district of Tel-Aviv coinciding with the Tel-Aviv administrative district will remain only such enterprises which need a very reduced floor area and therefore their demands for land are very modest. This applies to enterprises linked directly to customers and commercial activities and being more workshops and “services” than large-scale industries.

The extension of industrial activities in the north and in the south will be due mostly to creation of new enterprises, while the growth of industrial employment in central districts will be achieved primarily by extension of already existing enterprises.

Additional industrial employment will be created in the most districts mainly in branches like construction of machinery, electrical equipment, electronics, and vehicles; in the northern district, however, in clothing industry too.

In the field of tourism the scheme recommends to reduce the present excessive concentration of hostelry in Tel-Aviv. The commanding position of Tel-Aviv

TABLE  
DISTRIBUTION OF PLACES OF EMPLOYMENT

Economic Branch	Country in Its Whole		Northern		Haifa	
	1969	1992	1969	1992	1969	1992
Agriculture	10.5	5.5	28.3	14.3	6.3	3.8
Industry	26.1	30.0	22.6	30.2	26.2	32.0
Construction	8.1	7.5	9.4	8.1	9.5	7.7
Technical services	1.9	1.5	1.1	0.8	2.5	1.7
Commerce & banking	12.9	14.0	7.4	10.8	14.7	13.1
Transportation	7.7	7.5	4.2	5.6	10.8	10.5
Public & private services	32.4	34.0	26.7	30.2	29.7	31.2
Unknown	0.4	—	0.3	—	0.3	—
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

in hostelry and tourism does not contribute to development of peripheral districts and the numerous deficiencies of Tel-Aviv as a tourist center have negative repercussions upon the development of Israel tourism in its whole. The scheme proposes to create in addition to Jerusalem as the main attraction center for tourism in Israel a number of other recognized touristic poles well equipped with services and hostelry, among them some in the northern and southern districts.

The expected evolution of the employment basis of various districts of the country is shown in Table VI.

The Steering Committee of the scheme was of opinion that means to achieve the targets of the scheme should be essentially positive means of encouragement, financial assistance and of increased allocation of resources to the regions to which a preference is accorded. Nevertheless the use of restrictive measures cannot be entirely discarded. Such restrictive measures should conduce to an attenuation of an excessive rhythm of growth in Tel-Aviv metropolitan area and central coastal zone. These measures may include reduction in extent of industrial zones and of allocation of agricultural land for urban development and preventing excessive government and public investment going to this region.

Shaping of the future settlement pattern of Israel is confronted with a number of challenges and difficult problems. Such are the modes in which a spatially balanced absorption of immigrants may be realized, strengthening of a basic Jewish settlement in a number of areas inside and outside of 1967 boundaries, stabilization of rural districts and of new towns since some of them did not yet reach economic and social consolidation. Further problems arise with the necessity to find an adequate solution for employment needs and urban development in minority sector characterized by a strong natural increase. Spatial organization of the coastal zone is equally confronted with challenges emerging from steadily growing density of population, increasing traffic difficulties and pollution and deterioration of environment under the necessity to care at the same time for

VI  
PER ECONOMIC BRANCHES AND DISTRICTS

(%)

Central		Tel-Aviv		Jerusalem		Southern	
1969	1992	1969	1992	1969	1992	1969	1992
18.0	8.0	1.3	0.4	3.3	1.7	10.3	8.4
28.5	35.1	30.4	30.2	17.6	17.1	32.2	35.5
6.2	6.5	7.5	6.8	8.0	8.7	9.1	8.0
1.2	1.4	2.4	2.0	1.9	1.0	2.1	1.7
8.9	11.0	18.7	19.4	12.6	15.0	7.8	11.3
6.2	6.0	7.7	7.7	6.7	7.0	8.2	6.1
30.8	32.0	31.6	33.5	49.9	49.5	30.3	29.0
0.2	—	0.4	—	—	—	—	—
100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

protection of agriculture and landscape values.

All this leads to a basic conclusion that further development of the settlement pattern of Israel cannot be left over to a free play of economic forces and spontaneous trends and will remain always a domain of a planned government policy guided by long-range consideration.