

The Attempts to Implement Municipal Reform in the Tel Aviv Metropolis in the 1960s and 1970s

Eran Eldar

Abstract

This article deals with the relationship between the central government of Israel and the municipality of Tel Aviv and its surrounding cities (the Dan Bloc). It focuses on the aspirations in the early 1960s to establish an umbrella municipality, a large body responsible for the overall management of the city cluster. This effort was a part of the international discourse on urban development that had been inspired by municipal reform in several western countries. By the 1960s and 1970s the Dan Bloc had reached the point where it needed overall management. This entailed changing the cities' legal status and creating an umbrella municipality or, under the existing law, the cooperative management of the different cities for the common good. To date, an umbrella municipality has yet to be established. The article explores why the launching of this arrangement failed and how the Israeli government and one or more of the cities in the bloc thwarted the effort.

Keywords: Tel Aviv, Government of Israel, umbrella municipality, urban reform, Dan Bloc

Introduction

Local government reforms periodically exceed the public agenda in Israel and the world. In Israel, compared with other places in the Western world, municipal reform has never been undertaken, although Gush Dan (the Dan Bloc), Tel Aviv metropolitan area, located along the country's Mediterranean coastline, is an urban continuum that includes a large city and satellite cities, conditions that usually result in the establishment of some common framework.

This article deals with relations between the city of Tel Aviv-Jaffa, the cities of the surrounding Gush Dan and the Israeli government. The article focuses on the ambition created as early as the 1960s — as part of the international discourse on metropolitan areas and municipal reforms implemented around the world — to establish an umbrella municipality, a body of legal standing to be responsible for the overall management of these cities.

The establishment of an umbrella municipality is a reform of local government, principally administrative, which is called for in the face of demographic, economic and political changes. The stated goals for such reform may be many, including increasing economic efficiency in providing

municipal services and establishing physical infrastructure, influencing local physical and economic development patterns, strengthening local democracy, increasing citizen involvement in managing local affairs, and good governance. Local government reform often has political goals — visible or hidden.

International experience shows that the chances of the success of an umbrella municipality — not significantly affecting the local autonomy of its member municipalities, but focusing on economic development and land use planning — are better than any other arrangement. So why did the Tel Aviv municipality's effort to establish an umbrella municipality in Gush Dan fail? To answer this question, I will review and analyse the negotiations on this matter between the mayors of Gush Dan and at the same time between them and the Israeli government, based on documents, protocols and discussions conducted in urban and inter-urban settings. As I will present, the effort fails for two main reasons: disagreement between the mayors and opposition from the central government.

The article has four parts: the first part deals with the metropolitan area and reviews its typical problems and proposed solutions; The second section presents the urban reforms from around the Western world, which ultimately influenced the Israeli aspiration to establish an umbrella municipality; The third section presents a historical overview of the Dan bloc from its inception until the 1960s, including the municipal solutions taken during those years. And the fourth part, the heart of the study, describes and analyses the failed attempt of the 1960s and 1970s to establish an umbrella municipality in Israel as well.

The metropolis

Particularly from the beginning of the twentieth century, internal migration processes and changes in population composition and employment in the central city and suburbs were accompanied by a relative stagnation of existing administrative frameworks and a lack of coordination between processes and the pace of municipal legislation. Over the years, it is increasingly recognised that the right way to deal with the problems has necessitated a reform of the administrative structure of the metropolitan area in the direction of over-sharing and coordination among the cities that make it up.

Municipal reform, aimed at addressing the metropolitan problem, usually involves three main areas that are interrelated: changes in government structure, including the division of powers between central government and local government; Changes in the map of local authorities, reflected in a change in the size of the authorities, the area and the population; And changes

in the revenue and expenditure structure of local authorities.¹

The usual arrangements for the solution can be classified into three groups: decentralised sharing, which includes, among other things, the municipal unions; Centralised sharing, which includes an umbrella municipality arrangement; And transferring powers to the central government.

Decentralised sharing: Collaboration by subject — Municipal union (also known as Conurbation). Within this framework, for each cooperation issue, a separate organisation is set up that is shared with the cities in question. These include, for example, 'the Ashkelon Environmental Association', 'The Haifa - Sewer Area Association' or 'Association of Cities of the Gush Dan Area for Sanitation'.

Centralized sharing: Another arrangement for collaboration is the establishment of a roof body to handle all the joint activities. As part of this, a new organisation is set up jointly with the cities in question, and it consolidates powers in all the actions and issues agreed to be collaborative. This body is at the municipal level, and it takes the place of municipalities in dealing with issues that are transferred to it. For the central government, this body is at the municipal level. Another alternative to centralised sharing is an umbrella municipality, a body that is common to all municipalities in which its powers, in the areas transferred to it, are identical to municipal authorities. The central government can also transfer its powers to the umbrella municipality. In this case, the umbrella municipality would become an intermediate level of government under the central government, but above the municipalities.

Central government: A third arrangement for cooperation is the transfer of joint activities to the central government framework. This arrangement is generally unacceptable, but is sometimes triggered for specific activities. This is done when the metropolitan framework is still too small to deal with a particular issue or when the cities are unable to reach agreement on an issue where cooperation is essential.²

Expansion and unification: Reforms in Western cities in the 1960s and 1970s

From the mid-nineteenth century, the built-up area in major cities in Western countries expanded rapidly due to mass flow from the village to the city, natural increase and continuous improvement in urban transport. This process was also accompanied by a parallel expansion of urban jurisdictions. In the United States, the process was simple, as most of the residents of small, peripheral cities, supported their annexation to major cities thanks to the city's superior services, including water supply and a modern sewer system. Thus, some of the suburban areas were annexed even before they reached the level of development that allowed them to be organised as an independent entity.

In the United Kingdom, for example, until the 1920s, rapid expansion of municipalities was allowed at the expense of rural local authorities.

A major motive for pressures to formulate metropolitan frameworks was the need to develop modern urban infrastructures, which only large municipalities were able to promote. A prominent example of the comprehensive reforms undertaken in the late nineteenth century, though different in its motives and character, was the establishment of New York City in 1898 as a municipal union of the New York City with the municipalities around it, including the Brooklyn Municipality. In the early decades of the twentieth century, the rapid expansion of the jurisdiction of cities in the United States and Britain ended.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the typical model of the municipal-divided metropolis developed: a core city, surrounded by many 'suburban' local authorities that block its expansion. This split was seen as unequal and ineffective,³ prompting proposals for metropolitan reforms, with the preferred solution usually being the establishment of an all-inclusive umbrella municipality, which would assume a variety of functions and powers from the local authorities that comprise it and perhaps even from the central government.

Those who were in favour of an umbrella municipality claimed four main reasons: (A) coordinated overall planning is required for the entire metropolitan area, including the countryside; (B) the concentration of services of local government in large units has an advantage in size; (C) such a reform will create an equitable situation in which large municipal units increase equality in the distribution of taxes and the level of services; (D) Most importantly, there was an expectation that umbrella municipality would rid central government of local infrastructure decision-making and, in particular, increase local government autonomy and accountability.

In the area of metropolitan reforms, Canada was one of the leading states, and the first strong metropolitan umbrella municipality was established in Toronto in 1953 (The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto).⁴ This umbrella municipality was considered successful: it was given powers in the areas of roads, sewerage and water supply, was involved in the overall planning of the suburban process, and financing of infrastructure investments in the new suburbs was made possible through the core city tax base. Toronto was the inspiration for a wave of metropolitan reforms in Canada, and between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s, extensive reforms were implemented in local government in the state. Other countries were also influenced by the Canadian model, and in the United Kingdom it was decided in 1972 to implement a comprehensive reform of the local government, a reform that took effect in 1974. Among other things, six metropolitan umbrella municipalities (Metropolitan Counties) have been established, alongside the umbrella municipality of London, which was established about a decade earlier.⁵ Moreover, during these years, the establishment of metropolitan

municipalities was identified as one of the important elements in formulating welfare state mechanisms, and comprehensive reforms of the local government system have also been implemented in Western European countries such as West Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark and Sweden.

In the United States — although significant changes were made to local government during this period, and the greater part was expressed in the merger of central cities with the surrounding towns — the change was often met with major obstacles, and the changes were relatively limited. Indianapolis is one of the only metropolitan areas in the United States that was able to establish a framework of metropolitan rule during this time. The reform was implemented in 1969 through Indiana state legislation, which was supported by Republican support and Democratic opposition. As part of the reform, an umbrella municipality called UniGov (Unified government) was established and included the city of Indianapolis and most of the Marion governorate. The umbrella municipality mayor and council members were selected by all the residents of the sub-district. The successes attributed to the umbrella municipality were mainly in the area of promoting economic development, strengthening the mayor's status and executing important urban projects.⁶

With this, metropolitan municipalities, especially those established in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, Canada, also revealed some problems: difficulty in delineating the boundaries of the umbrella municipality; The formation of an expensive and cumbersome mechanism; Lack of direct responsibility towards the public and hence disconnection from it; And increasing friction with the central government due to the difficulties of the umbrella municipality to finance the provision of services to the growing metropolitan population.⁷

Conurbation (municipal union) as a legal framework: The beginning of metropolitan development in Israel

The beginning of metropolitan development in Gush Dan can be seen as early as the 1920s, during the third period of immigration (Third *Aliyah*). In Tel Aviv, land prices and housing prices rose, forcing parts of the public who could not meet the housing market requirements to organise in groups and associations and search for land for building houses outside the city. These associations eventually formed the first suburbs: So, in the first phase, 'Eir Ganim' (City Garden), 'Migrash Ganim', 'Nahalat Ganim' and 'Kfar Ganim' founded the neighborhoods that later joined and established Ramat Gan; The Beit Vagan (A house and a garden) Association of the Mizrachi movement settled south of Jaffa and founded Bat Yam; And the Borochoy neighborhood was the core of Givatayim. A group of religious Tel Aviv Jews established Bnei Brak as an agricultural colony; And on the road to Petah Tikva, the Nahalat Yitzhak neighbourhood was established. All of these

neighbourhoods, established in the 1920s, were characterised by their economic dependence on Tel Aviv. In the following decades, too, neighbourhoods were established based on such dependencies, for example, the neighbourhoods east of Jaffa — the ‘Shchonat Ha’am’ (people’s neighbourhood) established in the 1930s or ‘Agrobank’ established in the late 1940s — neighbourhoods that were the beginning of Holon. The 1948 spatial change created a new reality,⁸ for at once the Jewish population gained military and political control over a large geographical area in the Land of Israel, which until then was under British Mandate rule. At once, settlement options that were not previously available were opened now: extensive areas were moved to Jewish sovereignty, and restrictions on the establishment of Jewish settlements in them were removed. Moreover, Jewish settlement operations throughout the new sovereign space could now be done through state measures of sympathetic legislation and helpful allocation of economic resources.

Also in the Tel Aviv area, land that had previously been Arab settlements was vacated after the war. Evacuations of these communities, such as Abu Kabir or Salame, previously seen as obstacles to the city’s territorial expansion, allowed the city to develop east and south, a development that led to a physical connection with Ramat Gan, Givatayim and Bnei Brak in the east, and Holon and Bat Yam in the south. During this period, Tel Aviv’s spatial development and design were largely the result of struggles between several factors: the local leadership’s aspiration to develop the city and the needs of immigration with the establishment of the state and the emergency period on one hand, and the plans initiated by the government to disperse the state’s population to the periphery on the other hand.

Tel Aviv’s unplanned growth following the 1948 war required re-planning. In the early 1950s, Aharon Horwitz, an urban planning expert, began to formulate a master plan for Tel Aviv together with a team of planners, and in July 1953, they submitted an interim report to the mayor. The main purpose of the plan was to redefine Tel Aviv’s centrality in the State of Israel, but Horowitz nevertheless argued that the city’s growth should be limited to its natural growth, and that there was a need to direct the tens of thousands of immigrants to other areas of the country. This plan, which has never been granted statutory status and has therefore not been implemented, had no reference to the metropolitan area, but only to the inner planning of the city in the new areas that were now available to it. In those days, the Tel Aviv municipality was not interested in anything but the territories for the city’s development without any reference to the metropolis. The cities around Tel Aviv have absorbed tens of thousands of new immigrants and have been in many troubles, and in some the municipality control was in the hands of the labour movement, the rival of the General Zionist Party, which ruled Tel Aviv.

In the 1950s, and especially in the 1960s, urbanisation intensified, not only in Tel Aviv, but throughout the central area of the coastal plain. This was reflected in the rapid and vigorous urbanisation of the former agricultural settlements, which had extensive agricultural land. In the process, these areas served as the main potential for construction in the cities of Petah Tikva, Rishon LeZion and Herzliya and in the localities adjacent to them. Already in the early 1950s, the classic conurbation (or Metropolitan) structure was created, with Tel Aviv serving as the core of the conurbation, and its adjacent communities the first ring to surround it.

Recognition of the existence of metropolitan areas appeared in public hearings in Israel only in the early 1960s, long after the identification of this special settlement phenomenon in the settlement systems in Europe and North America. The initiative to define areas as metropolitan areas stemmed from the Central Bureau of Statistics, which, prior to the 1961 Census, created new geographical definitions for Israel's settlement system. It was the first census in Israeli history conducted according to the most updated official rules, and its results were published and served as the basis for geographic, demographic, social and economic analyses in the State of Israel from the beginning of its second decade of existence. In all the many geographical definitions that were prepared for this census, the innovation of the large urban bloc that was forming around the city of Tel Aviv and known to the public as the 'Gush Dan' was prominent.⁹

The geographic unit of the Central Bureau of Statistics, established in 1959, was commissioned to define the urban bloc and examined a series of definitions for urban concentrations around the world. The unit debated between two definitions: the British one of Conurbation; And the American of the Metropolitan Area (Standard Metropolitan Statistical). In the end, it was decided to use the British definition, mainly because of the continuity of the urban area built around Tel Aviv. In the United States, on the other hand, the 'metropolitan area' was defined based on functional connections between urban cluster cities, measured primarily by commuting flows.¹⁰ Such data were not available at all at that time in Israel.

The delineation of the Conurbation of Gush Dan in 1961 was the result of the implementation of the British definition. This conurbation includes the core of the conurbation — the city of Tel Aviv-Jaffa; The inner ring — the cities of Ramat Gan, Givatayim and Bnei Brak in the east, and Holon and Bat Yam in the south; And the middle ring — all the localities whose built-up area creates a continuum with the inner ring, namely Ramat Hasharon to the north, and Givat Shmuel, Kiryat Ono, Or Yehuda, Ramat Pinkas and Ramat Eyal to the east. In 1961, therefore, the Tel Aviv conurbation was demarcated, and towards the 1972 census, its boundaries were expanded and the Middle Ring was expanded — including Herzliya and Ra'anana to the north, and Petah Tikva to the east. This year, the population of the conurbation was more

than 800,000, so from 1948 to 1972, the conurbation population grew almost three times.¹¹

The Tel Aviv metropolis,¹² like other metropolitan areas in the world, has been characterised by expansion in the physical space and accelerated growth in marginalised areas, as demographic growth diminishes in the metropolitan core. In the 1960s and 1970s, the increase in the area reflected the increase in connections between the core of the metropolis (Tel Aviv) and the communities (The cities surrounding) in many areas of life, especially in the fields of economics and culture. Like other metropolitan cities around the world, Tel Aviv has also been characterised by economic and cultural supremacy as a centre of power that offers relatively high salary comparing to the periphery, diversity of functions, great physical security, all kinds of jobs and extensive social infrastructure. It should be noted that the centrality of Tel Aviv as a metropolitan core in terms of employment, trade, entertainment and services has increased in parallel with its weight loss in the total population of the conurbation.

To date, Gush Dan does not have legal status, but several conurbations of several local authorities have been established for various purposes under the Conurbations ('Iggod Arim', in Hebrew) Act, 1955. Two prominent conurbations are the Dan Sewer Urban Association, established in June 1956, which maintains the sewer lines that pass along the Dan bloc and drains the sewerage to the Shafdan site (Rishon LeZion Wastewater Treatment Institute) between Rishon LeZion and Palmachim. The second one is the Dan Region Urban Sanitation and Garbage Disposal Association, which for years was responsible for the Hiria waste site until its closure in 1998. The Tel Aviv metropolis therefore grew and developed, and in the 1960s, among other things under the influence of urbanisation processes in the Western world and the reforms reviewed above, the first attempts were made to establish an umbrella municipality. These attempts are the heart of this study and will be reviewed in detail below.

From conurbation to umbrella municipality: The attempt to change that did not succeed in the 1960s

In the 1960s, the demographic crisis began in Tel Aviv. Already at the beginning of the decade it was clear to Mayor Mordechai Namir (from Mapai) that the rate of population growth in Tel Aviv had slowed, but soon this slowing down changed into a negative growth, a trend that would last more than two decades, until 1988. Many residents left the city and moved to nearby cities in the metropolis — Ramat Gan, Bat Yam, Holon, Bnei Brak and Givatayim — in order to improve their living conditions. Due to these accelerated suburban processes, the population of satellite cities grew at a larger rate than the core city. Thus, the rate of the Tel Aviv population in the conurbation population dropped from 77% in 1952, to 61% in 1961 and 49% in 1969.¹³ As part of this trend, the phenomenon of commuting, daily

workers' movement into Tel Aviv in the mornings and back to the 'sleeping cities' in the evening, grew, so that the number of residents who worked or entered Tel Aviv for commercial and service purposes but did not pay direct taxes to the Tel Aviv municipality increased. Although the dependence of satellite cities on the big city had increased, the demographic crisis in Tel Aviv was seen as a metropolitan crisis, which primarily concerned the location and the status of the big city in the region. Therefore, the need for administrative reform was raised to enable it to maintain its dominant position in the metropolis, and one of the options that came to the fore was the establishment of an umbrella municipality for the entire metropolitan area.

Even the new master plan for the city, the 'Hashimshony Plan', had been shaped in the context of this new state of affairs. The need for a new master plan stemmed from the obsolescence of the Horwitz Plan, which reflected the state of the city in the early 1950s, although it did not receive statutory validity. The new master plan was written by the architect Zion Hashimshony, an architect from the planning department in the Ministry of Housing, who for decades objected that Tel Aviv would serve as a metropolitan centre of the country, but in the late 1960s he was also required to deal with urban transformations.¹⁴ While the population of Tel Aviv remained relatively stable, the population of the localities around it grew, and the proportion of employed persons in Tel Aviv living outside the city almost doubled. This trend greatly increased the traffic of vehicles entering the city every day, and thus the program devoted a major place to the transport issue. The mayor of Tel Aviv thought this plan should include not only the city of Tel Aviv, but the entire metropolis. The idea of establishing an umbrella municipality was first raised at the Tel Aviv City Council meeting on 23 March 1964, and from then on it would be discussed in various forums. At that meeting, Mayor Namir explained that he supported the idea: 'Anyone who goes by car from Tel Aviv to Ramat Gan and Givatayim or south to Holon and Bat Yam can also see at a glance that these cities are actually one big city. Nevertheless, municipal government is divided in this large urban area between a number of independent and completely separate municipalities.'¹⁵

Namir explained that before the establishment of the state, non-Jewish settlements, most of them hostile, different from Tel Aviv in their way of living and retarded in their development, separated Tel Aviv from other Jewish settlements, and that the British Mandate government was also not interested in connecting Jewish settlements in this area into a unified bloc. Namir explained that with the founding and development of these communities, each formed its own special character, but the 'revolutionary transformations' that have taken place since the establishment of the state have largely blurred the differences and what used to be a 'Moshava' or 'neighbourhood' or 'Kerya' no longer exists. The non-Jewish partitions between the localities have also disappeared, and Namir claimed that this is the moment for changing the organisation and management of the area. 'The

time has come to establish an umbrella municipality for the big organic metropolis, known as “Greater Tel Aviv”, but it can and should be given another name as well,’ Namir said.¹⁶ He mentioned as an example the Great London Council, which unites several sub-municipalities, and argued that, if the neighbouring cities of Tel Aviv showed interest in a process like this, the experience of Canadian cities run by umbrella municipalities should also be taken into account. Namir did not seek to abolish the autonomy of the cities of the Dan bloc. He argued that the autonomous status should be preserved especially when it comes to a range of municipal functions and services that a local municipal body should take care of. Namir stated that a partial union (conurbation) is not enough, and a permanent organisation with broad powers is required, which will be responsible for the full range of functions, services and matters shared with local authorities in the area. Namir added that the umbrella organisation of municipalities could also serve as a powerful tool for mutual assistance in professional knowledge, material ability and technical and managerial experience.

Namir outlined, in general, the powers that he believed should be granted to the future umbrella municipality. He explained that the umbrella municipality should be granted powers in the area of overall planning and development, traffic and interurban roads, to enable it to outline equal principles in taxation, high school education and higher education, regional sewerage, water supply, fire extinguishing, hospitalisation and emergency preparedness. He also stated that in order to prevent unilateral takeover concerns, the umbrella municipality council and its committees should be composed of representatives of municipalities in a way that ‘maintains the existing public power relations in the localities’.¹⁷ Namir, who thought that the process is necessary for Tel Aviv for the preservation of its status, understood that it might be a lengthy and complicated process and also knew that other municipalities, fearing for their status if the reform were implemented, would object: ‘I’m not deluding myself, no umbrella municipality will be set up overnight, but it is time for practical treatment of the program for the purpose of establishing a unified body for the benefit of a population of more than 700,000, expecting more efficient planning, improved construction and better services.’¹⁸ He also noted, and here referred to the Government of Israel, that an umbrella municipality should be initiated by the local authorities, and would not be ‘forced from above by force of interests and aspirations’ which are not always in favour of local affairs.¹⁹

But such a process, of course, cannot be done without government intervention and supervision, and indeed on 12 May 1964, the Interior Minister set up a committee chaired by the Attorney General, Dr Ze’ev Falk, and as other members Dov Rosen, Director of the Department of Local Authorities and Local Councils; Attorney Yitzhak Yechiel; and Attorney Zvi Zilbiger, Attorney General of the Tel Aviv Municipality.²⁰ The committee’s role was to examine legal ways and administrative options to establish a body

for overall municipal cooperation in Gush Dan. The Commission considered ways of inter-urban cooperation, and examples from other countries were also examined.

The committee's recommendations, submitted to the Deputy Minister of the Interior on 13 April 1965, stated that the situation in the Gush Dan region requires cooperation between the municipalities, and that there is almost no natural boundary between them, and they become a joint urban area, whose population is approaching one million. The committee also stated that it would be desirable to have coordination between the authorities in various areas of municipal action today, but negated a large municipality in Gush Dan, a large body that might be cut off from the resident, according to the committee, with cumbersome mechanisms and bureaucracy, that might be a state within a state and interfere with population dispersal. In fact, the government committee was afraid of competition between a large and strong local authority with a firm legal status and the Israeli government. As a solution, the committee recommended allowing the establishment of a comprehensive urban association for Gush Dan (conurbation), which will serve as a framework for joint action according to the will of the partner authorities from time to time. The recommendations were never implemented, but its principles were the basis for further discussions on the umbrella municipality. Namir, the mayor of Tel Aviv, was not satisfied with the idea of forming a comprehensive city union, as he feared such an arrangement would weaken Tel Aviv's status. He stuck to the idea of the umbrella municipality and even wanted to present how the principle is applied elsewhere in the world, like in Toronto, Canada. A special report prepared by Michael Lapidot, the head of the mayor's office, on 24 July 1966 sought to illustrate the effectiveness of the umbrella municipality mechanism in Toronto, Winnipeg and London.

The mayors of the local authorities around Tel Aviv also had a firm opinion on the matter. Each municipality had its own position on the matter, and this created controversy. On 20 October 1966, a meeting was held at the office of the Minister of the Interior in Tel Aviv, attended by Solomon-Israel Ben Meir, Deputy Minister; Moshe Silverstone, General Manager of the Office; the mayors of Holon, Bat Yam, Givatayim, and Bnei Brak; and the Deputy Mayor of Tel Aviv. Deputy Minister Ben Meir explained to those in attendance that the matter of the reform is crucial because the financial situation in the authorities requires drastic changes, and cooperation in this area might solve the economic problem in Gush Dan. He explained that the rule is that no one municipality gives up its sovereignty, it is about cooperation and agreement between all of them. Silverstone said that, in principle, municipal cooperation had already been agreed, and that the Tel Aviv municipality would prefer a 'far-reaching' arrangement for an umbrella municipality, but the municipalities had not yet announced their positions on the drafted proposal, although they had long been asked for.

The opinions of the heads of authorities began to become clear at a subsequent meeting on 17 November, when the mayors analysed the situation, each according to the needs of his city. Ya'akov Kreisman, the mayor of Givatayim, claimed that although cooperation between the municipalities is required, the municipality of Givatayim would join such a union only on the condition that it was clear what the future expenses for his municipality would be. He explained that the municipality of Givatayim would not be able to carry a large financial burden: 'The residents of Givatayim enjoy Tel Aviv's coast, but since the municipality of Givatayim has not participated in expenses, it does not see a financial option to participate in a beach that is not within its boundaries.'²¹ Silverstone agreed with this statement, saying that the Union's goal would indeed be to streamline and improve the current reality and not to put more financial burden on the municipalities. Givatayim also saw an unnecessary financial burden for joining a water union, as it had eight water wells in its area that provided what was needed for the city. However, the mayor of Givatayim has expressed support for cooperation in specific areas such as firefighting, civil defence or traffic. The mayor stated, 'I am not willing to participate in a master plan for Tel Aviv.'²²

Bat Yam needed a convenient transportation arrangement and freeways to connect it with Tel Aviv and the other cities. Bat Yam also saw a real need for cooperation in the fields of sanitation, cemeteries and higher education. However, the city sought to maintain the situation as it is on the water issue, as the city, to its satisfaction, maintained a closed water plant that met its needs. Mayor Rothschild proposed in principle to accept the report of the Falk Committee from 13 April 1965.

On 10 June 1968, Moshe Silverstone, Director-General of the Interior Ministry, wrote to Mordechai Namir, noting that in recent years a general opinion had been expressed as to the need for cooperation in municipal affairs between the municipalities of the Dan bloc.²³ He noted that the main differences of opinion revolved around what issues and roles would be within the new political structure in the region. He mentioned that some mayors were in favour of a broader framework and some for a narrower one. But one issue was common to all opinions: they all agreed that there is a vital and urgent need for cooperation between the Gush Dan authorities in integrated planning of the entire area. Silverstone wanted to know what the current position of the Tel Aviv Municipality is and what the other local authorities are thinking about the issue.

On 13 November 1968, Namir wrote to Silverstone that 'We have always supported the proposal to establish an umbrella municipality in Gush Dan, with actions and powers in matters that are common to all the cities of the region, and with close coordination and cooperation.'²⁴ Namir reminded Silverstone of the Falk Committee, in which the idea was to 'go more modestly at this stage' and establish city unions on issues: garbage disposal,

fire extinguishing, transportation, slaughterhouse, water supply and civil defence. Namir noted that he believed the original proposal for the establishment of an umbrella municipality should be reconsidered, which he believed would ensure a more thorough solution to the complex of problems created by the existing split between the municipalities in Gush Dan. Namir also noted that in such a situation, it would be essential to maintain the rights to full autonomy of the cities. But that did not end the attempts at municipal change.

Yehoshua Rabinowitz: Umbrella municipality with sub-cities in the face of government opposition.

In other areas of Israel, the idea of an umbrella municipality also came up in the late 1960s and early 1970s. In July 1969, Haifa Mayor Moshe Fliman proposed to establish an umbrella municipality for Haifa and all local authorities around it. As part of a press tour in Haifa, the mayor noted that the establishment of an umbrella municipality would benefit a population of about half a million people.²⁵ In Haifa, the proposal dropped from the agenda in the early 1970s after the opposition of the heads of localities around the city became clear. Moshe Goshen, Mayor of Kiryat Motzkin, argued in 1971 that 'in practical terms, in terms of democracy and the good of the citizen, a smaller municipal framework is desirable, which allows the local authority's immediate contact with the citizen.'²⁶ In Jerusalem, in 1970, Mayor Teddy Kollek opposed the establishment of an umbrella municipality that would unite all neighbourhoods and quarters, Jewish and Arab, even though he had come up with the idea several years earlier. In late November 1972, Gershon Tetz, the mayor of Nahariya, proposed to establish an umbrella municipality for five urban communities in the Western Galilee. At a meeting of local authorities in the Western Galilee held at Kibbutz Gesher-Ziv, Mayor Tetz said that the five cities: Nahariya, Acre (Akko), Karmiel, Maalot and Shlomi shared problems that would be easy to solve in a roof municipality.²⁷ The mayor claimed that the Jewish population in the Western Galilee reaches only 40 percent, explaining that urban development of the area is needed. In this case too, because of the objections of some of the localities around Nahariya, the matter dropped from the agenda.

Calls for the establishment of general metropolitan administrative and planning bodies to be implemented as part of an overall metropolitan development policy in the Tel Aviv area continued to be heard also in the 1970s. Yehoshua Rabinowitz, who replaced Mordechai Namir as mayor in 1969, also, like his predecessor, supported the idea of establishing an umbrella municipality: 'The solution in my opinion is an umbrella municipality with sub-cities,' he wrote on the matter. He also noted: 'The principal areas of operation of an umbrella municipality will be the ecology, namely: regional sewage, air and sea pollution, garbage disposal, regional parks as well as vocational and higher education, metropolitan transportation,

elderly care, planning. All other areas are under the jurisdiction of the sub-cities that enjoy full autonomy, as is acceptable throughout the world.’²⁸

Rabinowitz explained that in his opinion the umbrella municipality should include the cities of Tel Aviv, Ramat Gan, Holon, Bat Yam, Bnei Brak and Givatayim, and that according to ‘all the studies’ it turns out to be one city. He explained that Tel Aviv must also be divided into three sub-cities: Jaffa, Tel Aviv and Tel Qassila across the Yarkon River.²⁹ Rabinowitz was aware of the concerns of the other mayors. On the other hand, he sought to warn of any other arrangement that would weaken Tel Aviv’s premier status, claiming that places in the world that reached the level of urban development such as Tel Aviv had adopted very comprehensive organising methods. He objected to a conurbation as a solution.

Rabinowitz saw in Tel Aviv a metropolitan city that provides services to the surrounding cities. For example, he argued that trading in Tel Aviv does not serve Tel Aviv alone. He noted that Tel Aviv’s main business centre is the ‘beating economic core of the entire country’ and that Tel Aviv’s role as a centre of public, administrative, governmental, legal and other institutions is extremely important. He saw in Tel Aviv a cultural centre which includes the main theatres, museums and galleries, and also in the field of education he saw in Tel Aviv a centre that also serves the surrounding cities. In this context, he explained that approximately 30 percent of the city’s high-school students are not residents of the city at all, and of all the Tel Aviv University students, only 38 percent are residents of Tel Aviv, and the rest come from the five surrounding cities and from the entire country. He claimed that the five cities around Tel Aviv are actually ‘sleeping towns’, and Tel Aviv provides them with general services in the areas of professional and higher education, hospitalisation, sanitation, transport and water. He also noted that there are about 65,000 vehicles in Tel Aviv, but every day there are about 160,000-165,000 vehicles moving in the streets of the city, most of them coming from the surrounding cities.

Moreover, in the early 1970s, many services still needed to be organised within a metropolitan area, including a comprehensive planning authority that would regulate land use and work to efficiently utilise the metropolitan limited land resource; Overall transport authority; An overall fiscal authority that will regulate municipal income tax; Joint authority on environmental issues and prevention of ecological hazards and more.³⁰

Attorney Zvi Avi-Guy, Tel Aviv’s secretary-general, also saw the establishment of an umbrella municipality as a necessary tool for strengthening local government. His arguments reminded everyone of the decline of the status of the local government in general and of Tel Aviv in particular, whose autonomy was greatly diminished with the establishment of the state as it went from being an independent city-state to a city in the state. Avi-Guy explained that the increasing influence of the government on local government was detrimental to the independence of local government, and

that independence was essential for the local authorities. He also claimed that the increasing dependence of the local authorities with the help of the government deepens and expands as long as the cities of the Dan Bloc are split between them, and that

[a]n umbrella municipality may inhibit this process of erosion. It may counterbalance government ministries in practical decisions of common interests to the cities of Gush Dan. As a result, many problems can be solved in a more relevant and purposeful way. It might reflect the needs of the region and represent them more faithfully than the central government.³¹

Precisely from this, one might conclude, the government feared, and therefore opposed the umbrella municipality reform. Avi-Guy noted that eventually the umbrella municipality reform will be fulfilled even if the 'delay battles' could delay its construction. Either way, the central government will have an important and significant role to play in local government matters, but 'by nature, its degree of involvement in day-to-day decisions will be reduced'.³²

Avi-Guy explained that the concern that an umbrella municipality in Gush Dan might reduce the power and influence of the government is the underlying factor behind the 'unfavourable' approach to the idea of central government circles, which assume that such an umbrella municipality may replace its decisive position in many areas of activity, and, therefore, they impose difficulties and obstacles in the way of its establishment. The Interior Ministry was aware of the urban problems in Gush Dan, but insisted that one big municipal body would do more harm than good. On 23 February 1971, Dov Rosen, Director of the Department of Municipalities and Local Councils of the Interior Ministry, wrote to the mayor of Tel Aviv, Rabinowitz, that there is no dispute that the contiguous urban area of Gush Dan is a single planning, economic and social unit and that the municipal boundaries that divide the local authorities are artificial. He explained that the origin of these boundaries is in the pre-state period and that the amendments in the state period are primarily intended to meet the needs of the hour.³³

Rosen explained that the existing situation in which each municipality sees only its needs in its jurisdiction is a phenomenon that results in duplicity, inefficiency, waste and sometimes friction. However, he noted that the idea of cancelling the existing municipalities in Gush Dan and merging them into one municipal body is impractical. He reminded the mayor of the committee appointed by the interior minister about seven years earlier (the Falk Committee of 1964). The role of the committee was to examine the legal and administrative ways of establishing a body for municipal cooperation in the Gush Dan area. He pointed an accusatory finger at the Tel Aviv Municipality, claiming that because of Tel Aviv's hesitancy in the matter, it reached a dead end.³⁴ In the same letter, Rosen explained to the mayor that in order to promote the matter, it is desirable that the city council and its management formulate a formal position about the Falk report and notify the Interior

Ministry. Rosen stated that after the Tel Aviv municipality would form an opinion on the matter, the ministry would initiate a renewed discussion with the participation of the six mayors in order to strive for the establishment of a comprehensive union in accordance with the committee's recommendations and on the basis of a mutual agreement.

Each side became entrenched in its position. On 18 April 1971, Avi Guy, Tel Aviv City Secretary, wrote to Dov Rosen, Director of the Department of Municipalities and Local Councils of the Interior Ministry, as mentioned above, that Mayor Rabinovich does not think that a city union (conurbation) will be able to answer the problems facing the cities of Gush Dan. According to Avi-Guy, the only path the mayor sees as a solution, both from the practical and the conceptual point of view, is to establish an umbrella municipality that will concentrate the role of the local government.³⁵

Rosen added another argument against the idea of establishing an umbrella municipality — the opposition of several municipalities themselves. On 23 April 1971, in a letter to Avi-Guy, Rosen made it clear that an umbrella municipality in Gush Dan could not be established without the consent of the neighbouring municipalities, and that the mayors of Ramat Gan, Holon, Bat Yam and Bnei Brak were publicly opposed to this proposal of the mayor of Tel Aviv. He explained to the secretary of the city that the distinct advantage of the interior ministry's proposal to establish an inclusive city union in a legal and flexible framework, to which new content can be added at any time, was that it does not require new legislation. The idea of establishing an umbrella municipality, however, requires new legislation and this might take many years. Moreover, taking in account the opposition of the neighbouring mayors to join an umbrella municipality, it is doubtful whether the Knesset's approval of new and appropriate legislation would ever be possible.

The municipality of Givatayim — headed by Yaacov Kreisman from the Ma'arach political party — was very interested in the idea of the umbrella municipality, and it even froze development plans in its area until the idea and implementation were decided. This is likely to be done through party-ideological identification with Tel Aviv and its leadership. The municipality of Ramat Gan has actually supported the arrangement under existing law.

On 27 May 1971, Israel Peled, Mayor of Ramat Gan, wrote to Dr Yosef Burg, Minister of the Interior, that the need for regional planning for a transport plan for Gush Dan is an urgent necessity and there is no disagreement on this issue. He noted that the disagreement is over the organisational framework, since there are those in favour of a solution in the form of an umbrella municipality and there are those in a city union.³⁶ The Mayor of Ramat Gan noted that he is a supporter of a city union plan and that he believes there is no legal and practical way to establish an umbrella municipality, because most of the Gush Dan municipalities oppose this solution, and because the existing law does not recognise this framework and the passing of appropriate legislation may take many years. In contrast, the

1955 municipal unions Act allows immediate action. Peled, whose political path began with the General Zionist Party, apparently feared the takeover of the left-wing parties over both Ramat Gan and the entire metropolitan area and therefore opposed far-reaching reform.

In a speech given by Holon Mayor Pinchas Eilon in the late 1960s at the Beit Brenner Club at a national-municipal conference, he enumerated the problems of local government in Israel in the absence of an orderly constitution. Among other things, he claimed that 'we say that local government is a prime cell of democracy and in fact it preceded central government in the world because the states arose from local government. And we say that local government should be independent'.³⁷ Eilon argued that because of the local government's dependence on the government, 'our hands are almost completely bound'.³⁸ In the complex situation of the cities of the Dan region, he blamed the government. In a newspaper interview about the umbrella municipality, he argued that the six cities relationship of Gush Dan 'is really anarchy'.³⁹ He explained that this was reflected in the planning of a separate outline for each municipality: 'Each municipality plans the area regardless of the neighbouring cities. One city is planting a public garden while the neighbouring city is setting up an industrial area just in front of it'.⁴⁰ He explained that road planning also has no uniformity and that many roads have no continuation. However, he argued that 'full merger is out of the question and not healthy'.⁴¹ Eilon — a member of the Labor Party — argued that as part of an umbrella municipality, full autonomy should be maintained for the municipalities and warned against the takeover of Tel Aviv. He saw the umbrella municipality as an unwanted addition to the existing bureaucratic apparatus: 'In terms of efficiency, I am sure there are no savings,' he said, explaining that even in various parts of the world where an umbrella municipality was established, no savings were proven.⁴² In this regard, Eliyahu Spizer, the deputy mayor of Tel Aviv, who anticipated the difficulties, also claimed: 'It seems to me that overt or covert opposition by ministers and government ministries is expected for every step of expanding the powers of an umbrella municipality. Without this, there is no point in a municipal umbrella institution.'⁴³

On 26 November 1971, a meeting in the office of the Minister of the Interior in Tel Aviv took place in the presence of Yosef Burg, Minister of the Interior; Haim Kubersky, Director General of the Interior Ministry; Dov Rosen, Director of the Department of Municipalities and Local Councils of the Interior Ministry; other officials from this office; and the mayors of Tel Aviv, Holon, Ramat Gan, Bat Yam, Givatayim and Bnei Brak. The expanded forum once again discussed cooperation in Gush Dan, and the controversy between the mayors was clear. Rabinowitz, the mayor of Tel Aviv, continued to adhere to the establishment of an umbrella municipality. Kreisman, the mayor of Givatayim, explained that he is in favour of an umbrella municipality and not for other forms of association, but he has some

reservations. A few days later, in a letter to Rabinowitz, Kreisman argued that 'we cannot be part of the issue as long as we didn't clear the basis for equal representation in the umbrella municipality and its various committees, for each municipality'.⁴⁴ Eilon, the mayor of Holon, argued that cooperation was necessary. He supported the declaration of cooperation and suggested an expert committee be established immediately; Rothschild, the mayor of Bat Yam, complained that even though in 1964 the Falk Committee warned that there must be cooperation, nothing has been done since. Rothschild, who apparently feared giving Tel Aviv a premiere status, proposed a return to the 1964 proposal, namely, to form several unions that would actually form a single union, and that it should be a voluntary city association for certain issues, not an umbrella municipality. Peled, the mayor of Ramat Gan, said he was opposed to centralisation and merger, but he was in favour of coordination and sharing. Peled would later claim that the idea of the umbrella municipality did not materialise because there was no real desire for such an act. 'There is fear, and everyone is guarding their territory,' he claimed.⁴⁵ Israel Gottlieb, the mayor of Bnei Brak, claimed that the city represented a religious character and that he had no doubt that the city council would oppose an umbrella municipality. He explained that he was in favour of a city union as proposed in 1964, that is, sharing on issues that are necessary, except for education or a slaughterhouse in which Bnei Brak, due to its special nature, cannot participate.

Kuberski, the Director General of the Interior Ministry, concluded the discussion, saying that everyone agreed that municipal cooperation should be reached, but there were disagreements about the framework. He suggested that the Minister of the Interior appoint a committee of experts whose role is to offer a defined solution framework, ways of execution and execution stages. The committee would be guided by a steering committee attended by the mayors, and it would be asked to finish its work within six months of its appointment. The participants in the meeting accepted his proposal.

On 8 February 1972, Kubersky sent a letter to the mayors informing them of the composition of the expert committee that the Minister of the Interior intended to appoint for the examination of the umbrella municipality, chaired by Prof. Haim Ben-Shahar of Tel Aviv University, who was the head of the research team of the Israeli Institute of Urban Research. Five months later, in June 1972, the Commission submitted a proposal formulated by the Israeli Institute for Urban Research. The proposal stated that the reorganisation of the municipal structure could take on a variety of forms and a wide range of possibilities, from one municipality to partial coordination arrangements in defined areas such as sewage, water, fire extinguishing or transportation.

On 31 August 1972, members of the Steering Committee were invited to a joint discussion with the heads of the Israeli Institute of Urban Research in the Interior Minister's Office in Tel Aviv to determine the test framework, schedule and budget plan on the matter. Prof. Ben-Shahar briefly presented

to the attendees the program offered by the Institute. The steering committee, which included representatives of the Interior Ministry, headed by Kubersky, the general manager of the ministry and the six mayors, examined the advantages and disadvantages of the municipal structure of the Gush Dan metropolitan area and was asked to determine the preferred alternative. It had to formulate its organisational structure, areas of operation and powers of the Central Authority and the surrounding authorities, and the structure of the taxation system; point out the appropriate legal and legislative framework for the preferred organisational structure; and outline the ways of action of the chosen alternative — all from maintaining the uniqueness of the cities as independent cities with full powers in the fields of society, culture and lifestyle. The steering committee received from the expert team a detailed report, including the recommendation for the establishment of an umbrella municipality in Gush Dan to include the cities of Tel Aviv, Ramat Gan, Holon, Bat Yam, Bnei Brak and Givatayim. According to the recommendation, the umbrella municipality would handle a limited number of activities that would be assigned to it by law.⁴⁶ In all other areas of activity, the establishment of the umbrella municipality would not be detrimental to the particularity and independence of its member municipalities, and the full autonomy of each municipality would be preserved. The composers of the report had no doubt that a strong umbrella municipality was the right solution, and the only deterrent to an even more far-reaching implementation of the idea was the recognition of the political obstacles involved.⁴⁷ According to the recommendation, the council of the umbrella municipality and the head will be appointed by the municipalities themselves, and not be elected directly. The mayor of the umbrella municipality would be, at least in the first phase, from Tel Aviv. The umbrella municipality could collect taxes and take advantage of all the financing options available to the local government, as well as impose payment quotas on the municipalities contained therein.

On 1 June 1973, the Concluding Report of the Steering Committee on Municipal Reform to the Gush Dan Cities was published. All members of the committee felt that municipal cooperation in Gush Dan should be stepped up, and the opinions were divided only on the framework:⁴⁸ The mayors of Tel Aviv, Holon and Givatayim supported the recommendation of the expert committee regarding the establishment of an umbrella municipality in the Gush Dan area with all sorts of reservations, which have already been raised in the past. The mayors of Bat Yam and Bnei Brak continued to oppose an umbrella municipality and called for increased cooperation in existing city unions and the addition of city unions — in the form of existing city unions law. The Mayor of Ramat Gan emphasised mainly the degree of authority of the new proposed body and demanded full autonomy for municipalities in the existing format.⁴⁹ Members of the Steering Committee reiterated their views on the crucial importance of the physical planning issue and their desire to reach cooperation between cities on this issue even before the metropolitan

body was established. The recommendations of the Ben-Shahar Committee, which were to be submitted to the Knesset for legislation and to bring the desired change, were not implemented, and in October 1973 the Yom Kippur War broke out and the issue of municipal reform dropped from the agenda.

Conclusions

The demographic crisis of Tel Aviv in the early 1960s — the negative migration of the city's residents into the suburbs and the transformation of Tel Aviv into a commercial and service centre — was seen as a metropolitan crisis, primarily affecting Tel Aviv's location and status in the surrounding area. At the same time, Gush Dan, which included the core city and the satellite cities, developed and needed increased cooperation between all municipalities. On this background, there was a need to decide whether to change the legal status of the municipal authorities and to establish an umbrella municipality, or to continue to act under the existing law and to cooperate and manage the common municipal affairs within city unions (conurbations). The Tel Aviv Municipality — under the influence of reforms, most of which were successful in those years in metropolitan areas in Europe and North America, especially in England and Canada — supported the establishment of an umbrella municipality and saw it as a necessary need, for two main reasons: to allow Tel Aviv to preserve, and perhaps even strengthen, its dominant position in the metropolitan area, and to improve the local authorities' activities and services in all areas.

The attempt to establish the umbrella municipality, initiated by the Tel Aviv municipality, was made in two steps. The first was in 1964, when a government committee was formed, headed by the Attorney General of the interior ministry, Dr Ze'ev Falk, with the aim of examining the ways and legal and administrative options for establishing a body for municipal cooperation in the Gush Dan area. The committee negated an umbrella municipality because it believed such a large body would be cut off from the residents and run a cumbersome and bureaucratic mechanism, and recommended a smaller change: In the first stage, a city-union for various issues, and then a large and comprehensive city union. Mordechai Namir, the mayor of Tel Aviv, supported an umbrella municipality; and some of the heads of local authorities around Tel Aviv disagreed. But everyone agreed that overall metropolitan planning is needed. The second attempt was made in the 1970s, when the interior ministry appointed an expert committee headed by Prof. Haim Ben-Shahar to examine possible municipal solutions, and a steering committee that included the mayors and an interior ministry representative. The Ben-Shahar Committee, based on the report of the Israeli Institute for Urban Research, recommended to the steering committee to establish an umbrella municipality in Gush Dan to include the cities of Tel Aviv, Ramat Gan, Holon, Bat Yam, Bnei Brak and Givatayim. Later it became clear, in the steering committee's concluding report, that although all committee members

required the need to increase municipal cooperation in Gush Dan, they still disagreed with the cooperation framework. In the end, despite the economic and organisational logic that underpinned the proposal to establish an umbrella municipality, the idea did not succeed for two main reasons. One was the disapproval of the mayors of the satellite cities to merge with other municipalities, partly because of concerns about a decline in their status. The second reason: the central government's fear that an umbrella municipality would take away its ruling status in many areas of municipal activity. From the early days of the state, in the absence of a formal municipal constitution, the local authorities were totally dependent on the central government policy and the political interests of those who headed it, and municipal change could have changed this situation. As the Ben-Shahar report pointed out, the establishment of an umbrella municipality would increase the political autonomy of the local government, and the bargaining position of the local population towards the government and other institutions could be improved by being represented by a large, coordinated body.

These disputes prevented the development and progress of urbanisation processes, quite unlike core cities in other metropolitan areas of the world, where municipal reforms were implemented and changes were made. However, despite the failure of the reform, the many areas of action that still required the development of cooperation frameworks between the local authorities in the Tel Aviv metropolitan area remained unchanged, and the metropolitan authorities remained with only one way to deal with the regional problems: frameworks for cooperation within urban unions.

Why didn't the idea of an umbrella municipality come up again? The change of the political map in the metropolitan cities after the 1973 elections, especially with the election of Shlomo Lahat from the Likud party as mayor of Tel Aviv, led to a loss of interest in the 'Ma'arach' government in the reform, as it feared giving a new focus of power to cities dominated by the rival party. The severe economic situation that the State of Israel experienced after the Yom Kippur War also removed the issue of local government reform from the public agenda, thus closing the window of opportunity for the establishment of an umbrella municipality in the Tel Aviv urban metropolis.⁵⁰

In parallel with the disappearance of the umbrella municipality concept from the agenda in Israel, the world's metropolitan municipalities, especially those established in Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg, Canada, revealed some problems that also plagued the mayors of the Dan Region: difficulty in delineating the boundaries of the umbrella municipality's authority; the formation of an expensive and cumbersome mechanism; a lack of direct responsibility towards the public and hence disconnection from it; and distrust on its part and increasing friction with the central government. Therefore, from the mid-1970s, the trend of large-scale metropolitan reforms was halted, and the emphasis shifted to gradual and minor changes in existing systems with the aim of adapting to the changing conditions as much as possible.

Endnotes

1. Gabay (1981):77.
2. See also Ben-Shahar (1973):24.
3. Razin (1994):13.
4. About Toronto Municipal Reform, see: Colton (1980).
5. See: Barlow (1991); Stevens (2006); Elcock (1994).
6. Barlow (1991); Stevens (2006); Elcock (1994).
7. Colton (1980).
8. For further details, see: Golan (2001).
9. Gush Dan is the common name of the Tel Aviv metropolis, which includes the urban area of Tel Aviv and the cities around it. By definition, Gush Dan is the largest urban area in Israel. According to this tradition, the inheritance was allocated to the Dan tribe in the centre of the land of Canaan, hence its name.
10. Commuters: People who live in a particular locality and travel daily to their jobs in another locality, usually in the big city.
11. For more information on the geographical term, see Shahar (2009):4.
12. Despite the definition of the Central Bureau of Statistics in the early 1960s, over the years the distinction between conurbation and metropolitan areas has become blurred, and currently both words are used in both research and publications of the Bureau itself as synonyms. See, for example, Razin, (2012).
13. Shavit & Bigger (2013):23.
14. Zion Hashimshony, in interview: "Reality must be flexible and we must adapt to the current day-to-day development of the city"; see, "In a year, the preparation work of the master plan to Tel Aviv will end," *Maariv*, 5 January 1966.
15. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archives, Minutes of the Ninth Council at its 85th Session, 23 March 1964, 40.
16. Minutes of the Ninth Council at its 85th Session, 41
17. Minutes of the Ninth Council at its 85th Session, 41.
18. Minutes of the Ninth Council at its 85th Session, 41.
19. Minutes of the Ninth Council at its 85th Session, 41.
20. After an active participation in the first seven meetings Zilbiger passed away.
21. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archives, file: 25-762, container 7424.
22. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archives, file: 25-762, container 7424.
23. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archives, file: 25-762, container 7424.
24. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archives, file: 25-762, container 7424.
25. 'Proposal to Establish an Umbrella Municipality for the Haifa Area', *Ha'Tsofe, (The Viewer)*, 9 July 1969.
26. Schory (1971).
27. Rahat (1972).

28. Rahat (1972).
29. Rahat (1972).
30. Shahar & Brin (2005):316.
31. *Davar*, 19 May 1971.
32. *Davar*, 19 May 1971.
33. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archive, file 25-762, container 7424.
34. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archive, file 25-762, container 7424.
35. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archive, file 25-762, container 7424.
36. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archive, file 25-762, container 7424.
37. Krishek (1989):197.
38. Krishek (1989):197.
39. Keenan (1971).
40. Keenan (1971).
41. Keenan (1971).
42. Shahar et al. (1983) :204.
43. Shahar et al. (1983) :204.
44. Shahar et al. (1983) :204.
45. Shahar et al. (1983) :204.
46. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archive, file: 25-761, container 7424.
47. Razin (1994):32.
48. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archive, file: 25-761, container 7424.
49. Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archive, file: 25-761, container 7424.
50. Shahar & Brin (2005):306.

References

- Barlow, Max. 1991. *Metropolitan Government*, Routledge, London 1991.
- Ben-Shahar, Haim. 1973 'Municipal Reform in the Dan Region', *City and Region*, 2(1): 22-40.
- Colton, Timothy J. 1980. *Big Daddy: Frederick G. Gardiner and the Metropolitan Toronto Building*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.
- Elcock, Howard. 1994. *Local Government, Policy and Management in Local Authorities*, Routledge, London.
- Gabay, Miriam. 1981. 'Municipal Reforms in Western Europe in Recent Years', *City and Region*, 4(3): 77.
- Golan, Arnon. 2001. *Spatial Change – War Outcome: Former Arab Territories in the State of Israel 1948-1950*, Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva.
- Grossman, David (ed). 1983. *Between Yarkon and Ayalon*, Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press
- Keenan, Eli. 1971. '6 Cities Looking for Unity', *Davar*, 21 May.
- Krishek, Arie. 1989. *Citizen of the City: Pinchas Eilon's Life and Work*, Tel Aviv: Reshafim

- Rahat, Menachem. 1972., 'Proposed Umbrella Municipality for Municipalities in Western Galilee', *Maariv*, 27 November.
- Razin, Eran. 2012. *Metropolitan Areas, Municipal Statistics Committee and Geographical Classifications*, November. Available from: https://web.archive.org/web/20151127063018/www.cbs.gov.il/moatza/vada_2_23_3.pps
- , 1994. *Towards Municipal Reform of the Tel Aviv Metropolitan Area in the 1990s*, Jerusalem: The Florsheimer Institute for Policy Studies
- Schory, Shlomo. 1971. 'Umbrella Municipality for Greater Haifa or a Separate Bay City?', *Davar*, 31 March.
- Shahar, Arie. 2009. 'Development trends and spatial structure of the Gush Dan', in Baruch Kipnis (ed.), *Tel Aviv-Yafo: From a Garden Suburb to a World City*, Pardes, Haifa: 1-19.
- Shahar, Arie & Brin, Eldad. 2005. 'Issues of Delimitation and Systems of Municipal Cooperation in the Tel Aviv Metropolitan Area', in: David Nachmias and Gila Menachem (eds), *Tel Aviv-Jaffa Studies: Social Processes and Public Policy*, volume 3, Dyonon, Tel Aviv.
- Shahar, Arie, Peled, Israel, Eilon, Pinchas, Elazar, Daniel & Adar, Zvi. 1983. Municipal Problems in Gush Dan: A Dialogue with Arie Shahar, Israel Peled, Pinchas Eilon, Daniel Elazar and Zvi Adar', in: David Grossman (ed), *Between Yarkon and Ayalon*, Bar Ilan University.
- Shavit, Yaacov & Bigger, Gideon. 2013. *The History of Tel Aviv: A Rejuvenating City. 1952-73*, Ramot, Tel Aviv.
- Stevens, Andrew. 2006. *Local Government*, Politico's Publishing, London.

Archives

Tel Aviv Municipality Historical Archives

Journals and Daily Press

City and Region

Davar

Ha'Tsofe

Maariv