

Title	From Armed Compound to Broken Arm: the meaning of gates in Israel and Canada	
Keywords	Gated communities, Israel, Canada, meaning, security	
Authors	Jill Grant and Gillad Rosen Dalhousie University and Hebrew University of Jerusalem	
Address	Box 1000, Halifax, NS, Canada	
Telephone	902-494-6586	
Fax	902-423-6672	
E-mail	Jill.grant@dal.ca	gilladr@pob.huji.ac.il
Paper No	PUG 006	

**FROM ARMED COMPOUND TO BROKEN ARM:
THE MEANING OF GATES IN ISRAEL AND CANADA**

Jill Grant and Gillad Rosen

Abstract

Historical and cultural studies of gated communities reveal the range of patterns and motivations behind a phenomenon that some have treated as primarily a product of contemporary neo-liberal conditions. Enclosed communities are by no means new, nor are they the product of universal principles or circumstances. Among other things, they reflect historical conditions, contemporary concerns, cultural ambitions, and inter-group relationships.

This paper will compare enclosed communities in quite different conditions to explore some of the motivations and articulations of enclosure. Based largely in comparisons of gated communities in Israel and Canada it will illuminate the contrasts within the set of historic and contemporary enclosed settlements, and will seek to develop a framework that accounts for the range of patterns and motivations found.

The paper involves collaboration between a Canadian researcher who has completed a national study of gated communities in Canada and an Israeli researcher who has conducted a similar study in Israel. While many enclaves in Israel feature extensive security measures that may include armed guards, Canadian gated communities typically use weak devices like low fences or lift-arms that are easily broken. The motivations for enclosure differ widely in space and time, and the patterns of enclosure employed generate and reinforce varied social conditions and spatial consequences.

FROM ARMED COMPOUND TO BROKEN ARM: THE MEANING OF GATES IN ISRAEL AND CANADA

1. The Meaning of Gates

Countries around the world have reported the development of gated residential communities over the last several decades. While some authors see gating as a product of post-modernist globalization (eg, Marcuse, 1997), recent studies increasingly suggest that gated communities are not a unitary phenomenon but rather varying local and regional expressions of a global trend to spatial segregation and separation (eg, Crot, 2006; Landman, 2006; Stoyanov and Frantz, 2006).

Do gates mean the same thing in different social and political contexts? As Blakely and Snyder (1997: 1) argue, the meaning of the built environment is not fixed: "The setting of boundaries is always a political act. Boundaries determine membership: someone must be inside and someone outside. Boundaries also create and delineate space to facilitate the activities and purposes of political, economical and social life." How can we understand the ways in which different social groups and nations employ boundaries such as those constructed by walls, gates and signage?

Several detailed studies of gated developments illustrate the way in which occupants, developers, planners and the media work socially to construct the meanings of the gates (Caldeira, 2000; Low, 2003). Landman (2006) argues that South African enclosures are embedded in a context of race and power relations transacted over the last many decades. Stoyanov and Frantz (2006: 60) note that although the language describing gating seems similar in Bulgaria and in the US, "the same words in a different social and cultural context did not convey the same meaning." Examining gating in local context can help us understand how space is produced, organized, reproduced, consumed and interpreted by different groups. Knowledge of the diversity as well as the similarities in gating practices will facilitate the development of theory about this increasingly common type of residential development form.

In some countries fortification and enclosure has long historical roots. For countries which experienced gating in earlier phases of their history the meaning of the walls and gates may be complex and involve a comparison to past memories, values, and ideologies as well as changing local social contexts. Ancient nations like Russia (Lentz, 2006), China (Wu and Webber, 2004), and England (Blandy, 2006) have a historical legacy of enclosed communities often linked to imperial traditions and feudal social structures. Their remaining walls have become idealized and mythologized symbols of a glorious past, used to fuel tourism. Some more recent nation states have experienced considerable political and social upheavals within which enclosed and separated communities have become highly entrenched and contentious, as is evidenced in South Africa (Landman, 2006; Jurgens and Gnad, 2002) and Israel (Rosen and Razin, 2006).

Aside from a few historic private enclaves constructed for elites in major urban centers, in many countries gating largely appeared in the late 20th century. For instance, in Argentina (Roitman, 2005; Thuillier, 2005), Portugal (Raposo, 2006), Australia (Hillier and McManus, 1994) the US (Blakely and Snyder, 1997; Low, 2001), and Canada (Grant et al, 2004) relatively few gated middle class residential projects were built before the 1980s. In the Americas and Australia, some early colonial settlements had simple fortifications, but the communities experienced a short-lived history of enclosure. In some of these nations a cultural legacy of the "frontier" reinforced myths of social mobility and equality of opportunity in open communities.

As scholars document case studies of gated projects around the world, we can begin to identify the commonalities and differences in ways that contribute to theory-

building. In their introduction to a special issue of *GeoJournal* on gated communities, Brunn and Frantz (2006:3) suggest several directions for further research: “we need to identify the origins, functions, and morphology of gated communities and cities in countries where we have few thus far; ... we need additional studies on the forms and functions these gated communities are taking.” In this paper we consider these issues by examining the functions of enclosure and the security devices utilized in two contrasting situations.

It proves useful to compare extreme cases in trying to understand the range of phenomena grouped under the “gated community” rubric. Such comparisons can articulate the cultural values and conditions that set the context within which gated communities are appearing as a residential development option. While both Canada and Israel are advanced developed countries in the northern hemisphere, and while both have a relatively small number of documented gated communities, the circumstances that lead to gating and the forms and functions of the communities created differ significantly between the countries.

To advance theory-building around gated communities, Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004: 918) created a “checklist of features defining gated communities” that recognized that access-controlled developments can differ quite dramatically in the kinds of security features and amenities they have, and in the functions that the enclosure might signify. In this paper we apply elements of the checklist to compare and contrast the gated communities experience in Canada and Israel and to test the effectiveness of the checklist as a device to characterize national or regional differences in the phenomenon. In Israel, three types of gated communities take divergent approaches to enclosure: traditional enclaves rely extensively on social control mechanisms and signage to enforce symbolic boundaries (Table 1); frontier enclaves have barbed wire fencing and armed guards to prevent intrusions (Table 2); new gated communities are private urban and suburban enclaves employing security devices to display status as well as exclude non-residents (Table 3). In Canada, many enclaves have gates across the access roads but feature extremely permeable boundaries: security measures are modest at best (Table 4).

We compare the functions and kinds of enclosure and security features to see how they relate to the cultural context within which gating occurs in Israel and Canada. Israel has a long-standing history of overt conflict over space. In recent decades, violence has occurred often and has sometimes threatened residential environments. Consequently, people take barriers seriously, using them to separate people and to define or claim space. In this context, where gated communities appear they may have significant walls or fences and armed guards to control entry. By contrast, Canada has a long-standing history of peace and order, with limited overt conflict over space. Residential environments are generally perceived as safe and open. In this context, where gated communities appear they have limited security functions. Our comparison indicates that the motivations of residents, developers, and planners for enclosure contrast markedly; as a consequence the articulations of enclosure present dramatic contrasts in what gating means.

2. Gated Communities in Israel

Since Israel's establishment in 1948, the Arab-Israeli conflict has been a dominant factor in public decision-making, particularly in issues of security and land development. Thus, security in general, and fortification and gating in particular, are embedded in Israeli life and landscape. Common security measures include surveillance technology, guards at shopping centers, public buildings, schools and kindergartens as well as fortified higher education institutions in the form of enclosed campuses that are

fenced and guarded. Despite the deeply rooted security situation, Israeli neighborhoods are considered rather safe, except for property crime. Thus we cannot assume that new forms of gating are motivated by an exceptional need for security, as is the case in many metropolitan areas of the developing world (Landman, 2002; Roitman, 2005). Under Israeli conditions the gating of contemporary projects is mainly associated with new socio-cultural values of privacy and prestige (Rosen and Razin, forthcoming); gating is used as a design tool which creates additional imagery of security in an already controlled landscape.

Israeli society could be considered a divided and heterogeneous one, where residential segregation is associated with particular fault lines: settlement type (urban-rural), ethno-national (Israeli-Palestinian), religious-cultural (secular-religious) and socio-economic (class-based). By contrast with the Canadian case where society is pluralistic and tolerates socio-cultural differences, Israeli society, although quite heterogeneous, is strongly influenced by the process of building a democratic Jewish nation-state that until the 1970s promoted a melting pot model.

Fortified or enclosed communities have been deeply rooted in Israeli society, developing in varying institutional and cultural settings. Rosen and Razin (2006) identify three major groups of gated/enclosed enclaves: landscapes of heritage / traditional enclaves (emphasizing ethno-religious communities), fortress or frontier landscapes (emphasizing geopolitical conflicts and nation building processes) and neo-liberal landscapes of new gated communities (emphasizing individualism and privacy). Each of the three represents different social-historical processes. In general Israel is a socially heterogeneous society spatially segregated into homogeneous clusters. Gating expresses, reinforces and reproduces the social boundaries between groups.

2.1 Traditional enclaves

In a land of sacred significance for several major religions, landscapes of heritage abound. Within valued heritage spaces we find a range of traditional enclaves which suggest that people live “gated lives” even though they may not erect physical walls and gates (Brunn, 2006). Traditional enclaves in Israel typically house ethno-religious communities that prefer to keep social and spatial distance from others in the urban context. Many such districts or neighborhoods are found within cities like Jerusalem or the Bedouin city of Rahat. They may include 250 to 4000 residents. The communities impose their own form of segregation to reduce contacts with outsiders.

To facilitate the intended social segregation of the enclaves, residents employ a range of social and symbolic mechanisms (Table 1). Enclosure protects the unique cultural values and lifestyles of those within the community by creating effective symbolic boundaries that limit the behavior of insiders and outsiders within the enclave. In ultra-orthodox communities in Jerusalem, for instance, female visitors are required to cover their bodies and groups of young men prevent drivers from entering on the Sabbath. Social control mechanisms in place support indigenous values. The enclosure functions effectively to control outsiders so that they cannot disrupt the community.

While traditional communities usually do not build walls and rarely erect gates, they use signage extensively to mark territory (Figure 1). Signs play a vital symbolic role in identifying differences in behavioral expectations. Warning signs request strangers to dress and behave in accordance with internal religious codes of behavior. Although paid security guards are not common, roving groups of young men occasionally question outsiders entering their residential areas. “Eyes on the street” are everywhere in the community, reinforcing local ethnic and religious mores.



Figure 1: Signs in a religious enclave warn outsiders to behave. [Source: G Rosen]

2.2 Frontier enclaves

Outside the major cities we find another category of gated community: frontier enclaves. These fortified settlements established the frontier to hold and use territory in an unstable political context. They typically have 450-700 residents. Enclosure functioned as a means to secure people and property from ethnic-national conflicts and from petty crime (Figure 2). The physical enclosure conveyed a general image or message to strangers (especially to those of differing ethnicity) that a kibbutz or other settlement was protected. The enclosure also helped to create identity for the settlement while creating a clear boundary between insiders and outsiders. In the context of continuing geopolitical conflict between Jews and Palestinians, the physical enclosure represents a tangible reminder of contested claims over land and rights.

We can argue that enclosure helps to control the real-estate market for members in frontier communities. Cohesion in communities like kibbutzim is sustained by social sorting committees who select members able to meet the costs and to work effectively with others. The kibbutz forms a club realm, with shared collective amenities (Webster, 2002). In some cases barriers limit access to publicly owned land within the enclosed settlement, thus privatizing public space.



Figure 2: Armed guards may check visitors in frontier settlements [Source: G Rosen]

Given the role of the kibbutzim in Israeli history, the symbolic functions of enclosure are interpreted differently by varying parties (Table 2). Some see the frontier settlements as flagship developments promoting values of Zionism and communitarian aspirations amongst ideological communities of limited membership. Others see class-based segregation poorly trying to imitate the American dream of suburban living. Critics describe enclaves as promoting ethnic exclusion and colonialism.

Since frontier settlements are located outside of areas where Jews are the majority group, the enclosure provides a feeling of security for the property and lives of individual members. Concrete physical security features reduce opportunities for petty theft or other criminal activities by outsiders. Enclosure marks in a clear way the distinction between the insiders who are members of the community and any outsiders who may wish to enter but may require surveillance.

The boundaries of frontier enclaves typically include low fences, barbed wire fencing, slide gates, and/or swing gates. Such physical measures present a real boundary between those inside and those outside. Marking the community's boundaries is important symbolically in the struggle over land. It gives residents a feeling of shared identity and community, as does the common design forms of buildings and streets within the enclave. Speed bumps and other devices limit traffic speed within the settlement to provide a safer environment for residents.

Direct security measures ensure control over outsiders trying to enter the settlement. Enclaves typically employ armed guards who patrol the premises and manage the entry at designated times. Residents enter using a code at the gate. Because of their remote locations, perceived threats, and visible difference in property and amenities from their neighbors, the settlements employ extensive security measures. While the gates and guards are a legacy of the past, contemporary shifts in the meaning of the settlements from ideological outposts to lifestyle developments introduce new functions: privacy and prestige are added to the security motivations that drove earlier generations of residents.

2.3 New gated communities

Neo-liberal residential enclaves of a type similar to those found in many parts of the world are appearing in the suburbs of Tel Aviv. These fortified private communities reflect a class-based desire for lifestyle amenities and prestige (Table 3). Developed by private sector interests, sometimes in collaboration with local government, these communities reflect contemporary patterns of spatial segregation as interpreted in the Israeli context (Rosen and Razin, forthcoming). They are smaller than the other enclaves, with an average of 270 residential units.

Physical closure of these new development projects creates a sense of identity for the neighborhood and helps in marketing the units (Figure 3). The enclosure provides residents with spatial and visual privacy. Gates and walls secure property in inner city projects and in recreational sites. Residents enjoy the associated prestige of living in a gated development. Speed bumps slow down traffic, especially in projects aimed at seniors. By contrast with the frontier community settlements where residents choose new members, the new gated communities depend on homeowners' associations for collective governance. Rather than enclosing a collective and cooperative community, the walls here segregate wealthy individuals who form class-based consumer clubs (Webster, 2002; Webster and Glasze, 2006). The enclosure provides a tool for manipulating and enhancing market prices and for protecting the club amenities shared by residents: club amenities vary considerably between projects.



Figure 3: New gated communities for the middle classes in Israel [Source: G Rosen]

The enclosure of new projects symbolizes a growing class divide with associated differences in lifestyle and expectations of privacy. Enclosure also displays power and status to those outside the development while preventing non-residents from entering the private residential club. Other interpretations of the enclosure include crime prevention as the gates project an image of an overwhelmingly fortified neighborhood. Critics view these projects as constituting intrusive regeneration projects designated to replace non-wealthy groups; where they occur in mixed residential areas of Jews and Arabs they are viewed as ideologically- and state-promoted colonization. Most of these projects appear in urban areas of mixed socio-economic population groups. Guards and perimeter fences, employed even where the entry gate may remain formally open to anyone, project a strong image of privacy and exclusivity.

Enclosures in new gated communities often feature walls, barbed-wire fencing, and vegetated hedges. Lift-arm or sliding gates are common. Since urban Israeli neighborhoods are considered relatively safe, the use of such measures functions mainly to project an image of safety in a wider context of perceived insecurity. Thus, the need to market security recognizes given threshold standards of safety in the country. For example, fences, surveillance cameras, and security guards at the entrances of malls are the everyday situation in Israel. The mostly upper middle class and upper class populations living in the new enclaves can afford to replicate such expensive means of control along with private house alarms.

Since private suburban enclaves are the latest version of enclosed settlements in Israel, perceptions of the earlier forms continue to color how others interpret them. Neo-liberal enclaves thus find themselves accused by the media, NGOs or local residents of continuing the Israeli legacy of colonialism and ghettoization. We suggest that new enclaves represent a local interpretation of a global phenomenon whereby the affluent classes sort themselves into private and privileged communities.

3. Gated Communities in Canada

While the Israeli case offers three distinct types of gated communities with varying histories, the Canadian experience offers no significant differences between types except in relation to size. Most gated projects are relatively small, with fewer than 100 units (Grant et al, 2004). Almost all are relatively recent in origin, dating to the post-1980 period. These projects are new gated communities that primarily serve the upper middle classes.

By virtue of the definition used to create the inventory of Canadian gated communities, all the projects profiled have gates across the entry streets (Grant et al, 2004). In many cases, however, communities leave the gates open or erect barriers that limit access to vehicles but not to pedestrians. Especially in rural areas, pedestrians can easily walk around the gates to enter the community (see Figure 4). The presence of the gate, however, may engender the kind of self-othering behavior that Rofe (2006) describes in Australian enclaves: in seeing the barriers and other signs of privacy the prospective visitor feels unwelcome and may choose not to enter.



Figure 4. The lift arm gates at Abbecombec Ocean Village have been broken off and not replaced. [Source: J. Grant]

Properties within Canadian enclaves are often architecturally similar, creating a strong design identity. Symbolically significant entry features marking the development's name distinguish the projects from neighboring communities and create a clear identity for the enclave (Figure 5): ironically, the most exclusive of the enclaves do not identify a community name on their gates, preferring to preserve residents' anonymity. Some affluent projects separate themselves from the public realm with beautiful vegetation, ornate fountains, or guard houses (Table 4). Signage to remind visitors that they are entering a private community where speeds and parking are tightly controlled distinguishes the private enclave from the public streets. The streets of the enclave are not connected to other communities except at gated entries, thus creating a traffic calming effect (Greene and Maxwell, 2004).



Figure 5: Extravagant entry features identify the more expensive gated enclaves in Canada
[source: J. Grant]

Most often the gated projects are class based. Units within the developments appeal to particular income levels and household types. The residents of projects are relatively homogeneous in age and family status. The developments generate medium-density housing with shared recreational amenities like pools or club houses. Many of the enclosures reveal particular lifestyle choices: they may be associated with a golf course, for instance. Enclaves prove especially popular for seniors: this helps to explain why the settlements concentrate extensively in British Columbia where the climate is more moderate than most of the country. Most of the developments are attractively packaged condominium projects, although some involve land leases. Homeowners' associations of the type employed in American enclaves (McKenzie, 2006) are relatively rare in Canadian developments because condominium corporations generally manage the projects.

One of the principal functions of the enclosure may be to enhance property values. Developers and purchasers perceive the gates as increasing property values by offering residents an added amenity. The enclosure gives residents visual or spatial privacy by preventing through traffic and strangers coming into the residential neighborhood. At the same time, the gates display the power and status of the occupants. Restricted entry to the community protects club amenities and limits outsiders from entering to use shared pools, golf courses, club houses, or parks.

While some Canadian projects have relatively high fences and significant security measures, most gated enclaves have relatively permeable boundaries. In some cases, waterways, coastlines, ravines or other topographic features constitute unenclosed development boundaries. Low or limited fencing is not intended to deter committed criminals. Some projects have brick or concrete walls, but more have open wrought-iron fencing with vegetation to soften the edges. Some jurisdictions have regulated the fencing to prevent long stretches of opaque walls lining collector roads. For the most part, those involved in marketing and regulating gated developments deny that security is the driving motivation for the walls and gates (Grant, 2005). Projects are sometimes securely fenced and bounded in cases where the housing is very expensive or in situations where infill development is surrounded by other neighborhoods. Barbed wire (as is popular in Israel) or electrified fencing (as Landman, 2002, describes in South Africa) do not appear around Canadian enclaves.

Enclaves typically mark the private nature of their streets by using different pavement materials, by building narrow street dimensions, or by erecting speed bumps or chicanes to slow traffic. Signs often establish very low speed limits and restrict visitor parking. Some projects have entry structures that look like guard stations: these sometimes house mailboxes and call boxes for visitors to contact residents for entry. Most gated projects have sliding or swing gates that completely block the street entry when closed, but some use lift-arm or swing-arm gates. Code entry and automatic gate openers are the common means of gaining access to the communities.

While many homes within gated developments have private house alarms, the communities collectively employ few security mechanisms. Only a small number of very large projects (with over 1000 units each) employ guards or use video surveillance. Armed guards are not employed in Canadian enclaves. For the most part, security measures are limited and rudimentary.

4. What Do the Gates Mean?

While applying elements of Grant and Mittelsteadt's (2004) checklist proved useful for organizing the comparison of communities in Israel and Canada, we find it incomplete in some ways. Different cultural conditions reveal missing or simplified elements in the framework. For instance, the range of signage that may be used to segregate users is wider than just "no parking" or "private property" messages. In Israel, messages about appropriate clothing and about activities on the Sabbath constitute significant symbolic barriers to entry by non-members. The Israeli case also illustrates additional types of activities used to control space: "vigilante" or local resident groups can control activities in and public access to space.

The political and historical context within which gates appear may be insufficiently developed in the framework for analyzing gated communities created by Grant and Mittelsteadt (2004). Studies that compare gating across nations increasingly illustrate the differences in gating that result from cultural and historic context, forcing us to find ways to embed this understanding in our theory and in our analytical tools. We might argue that situating gated enclaves within historical traditions of social and spatial separation in a region helps to illuminate the choices that people make in contemporary circumstances. Hence gated middle class communities in Canada take quite a different form than those in Israel. The enclaves in Israel reflect a history of inter-group conflict and separation strongly reinforced in contemporary context with effective walls, gates, and guards. The gated developments in Canada weakly insert spatial barriers to mark social difference in a history of relative social harmony.

The cases reviewed indicate that articulations of enclosure differ partly in relation to the motivation for enclosure (eg, whether the need for security is strong, or whether

gates simply mark class) and partly in response to the larger historic and cultural context of inter-group relations (eg, whether law and order can generally be secured). In Israel the nature of the boundaries differ by the perceived risk, the motivation for enclosure, and the location of the settlement. In new gated communities social, economic and symbolic motivations related to class and lifestyle lead to substantive physical boundaries and economic structures that limit access to those of different status: the larger context of insecurity encourages developers and residents to strengthen the community boundaries. For the frontier settlements the risk of confrontation in a contested landscape generated an infrastructure of protection and community identity that has become entrenched and reinforced through time and experience. A long-standing history of enclosure may validate the option as powerful and appropriate even as it is contested. For Jews historically subject to imposed confinement in ghettos and ethnic quarters, protective walls have become a strategy for reclaiming control of space. In a context of political struggle, gating is a spatial strategy with strong symbolic significance.

We might argue that in some ways Canadian gated communities are more like the traditional Israeli ethnic enclaves than they are like the new gated developments. The focus is on disciplining outsiders and reinforcing the identity of insiders, not on preventing access. In the inner-directed traditional Israeli religious enclaves in ancient cities social and symbolic measures dominate: the community asserts the dominance of its own values about human behavior in its spatial context by using signage and the threat of social intervention to condition the behavior of strangers. Boundaries are permeable and perceptions of insecurity minimal. In Canada, too, the walls and gates of many enclaves are more symbolic than real boundaries. Open gates or broken gates are not uncommon, and walls may be low or non-existent. Security concerns are limited in most of the enclaves: in a context of relatively strong social order only minimal spatial markings may be necessary to convince others to stay out. Signs at the entrance and within the community help insiders to develop a sense of shared identity, and let outsiders know that they are entering a place of difference. Like the occupants of ethnic enclaves in Israel, Canadians who choose to inhabit a gated community make a lifestyle choice. Clearly, though, the community within the traditional enclave in Israel is much more encompassing and cohesive than even the tightest Canadian gated development.

The cases reveal quite different symbolic constructions around gating. What do the gates “mean”? What role do they play in mediating social difference and social interaction? In Canada the gates are symbolic markers of social difference and desires for class exclusion. They identify residential districts that seek to keep others away from the streets and doors. Gating is clearly linked to property values and often with trade-offs associated with living in higher than conventional suburban densities. In the relatively secure Canadian context the gates can fulfill these functions without being physically robust: even broken gate arms discourage visitors from entering.

In Israel, the security concerns are real. There the physically robust gates of frontier settlements and new gated enclaves represent a history and proliferation of difference that is socially produced and spatially reinforced. Armed guards and barbed wire fencing control the access of non-members in the context of highly contested and sometimes violent geopolitics. Here the gates mean business and trespassers are unlikely to be tolerated. A history of conflict generates a context in which residents choose to take few chances. By contrast, though, the traditional enclaves show little interest in physical security: for them, the desire for social separation takes priority. Hence we see that shared historical circumstances alone cannot explain the forms that spatial markings take: ultimately, the production and reproduction of space reflects the specific cultural values of a social group in contemporary circumstances.

In conclusion we might argue that the motivations of enclosure differ within and between gated enclaves. Particular gated communities may reflect some or all of these collective motivations:

- Some seek to keep the “other” out. These enclaves reinforce social identity within and may generate social capital by building commitment from members. The extent to which they define difference and insist on compliance varies.
- Some seek to keep the “other” in. Ethnic ghettos or quarters may serve as mechanisms for states to manage, control, or discriminate against particular groups.
- Some try to keep factions apart. Where states lack the means to maintain adequate public safety and social control, physical separation may become an option to prevent conflict between groups.
- Some try to keep classes apart. Where the social distance between rich and poor is growing, some classes may use physical means to achieve greater privacy, social separation, and economic returns.
- Some attempt to create community for collectives of individuals. In societies where categories of individuals (eg, single women, elderly persons) feel vulnerable in mixed neighborhoods, security systems may substitute for social networks.
- In the contemporary “global city”, developers see gated enclaves as a marketing tool to appeal to niche populations.

As we examine gated communities in differing cultural and historic contexts we can learn more about the way in which culture and politics mediate how this urban form is implemented and interpreted.

References

Blakely, E. J. and M.G. Snyder. 1997. *Fortress America: Gated communities in the United States*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.

Blandy, S. 2006. Gated communities in England: historical perspectives and current developments. *GeoJournal* 66: 15-26

Brunn, S.D. 2006. Gated minds and gated lives as worlds of exclusion and fear. *GeoJournal* 66: 5-13

Brunn, S.D. and K. Frantz. 2006. Introduction. *GeoJournal* 66: 1-3

Caldeira, T. P.R. 2000. *City of Walls: Crime, segregation and citizenship in Sao Paulo*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Crot, L. 2006. “Scenographic” and “cosmetic” planning: globalization and territorial restructuring in Buenos Aires. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 28,3: 227-51

Grant, J. 2005. The social construction of security in gated communities. *Town Planning Review* 76(3): 339-61

- Grant, J. and L. Mittelsteadt. 2004. Types of gated communities. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 31,6: 913-30
- Grant, J., K. Greene, K. Maxwell. 2004. The planning and policy implications of gated communities. *Canadian Journal of Urban Research / Canadian Planning and Policy* 13,1: 70-88
- Greene, K. and K.D. Maxwell. 2004. Taking matters into their own hands: traffic control in Canadian gated communities. *Plan Canada* 44,2: 45-7
- Hillier, J. and P. McManus. 1994. Pulling up the drawbridge: fortress mentality in the suburbs. *Metropolist Now: Planning and the urban in contemporary Australia*. K. Gibson and S. Watson (eds). Sydney: Pluto Press, pp 91-101
- Jurgens, U. and M. Gnad. 2002. Gated communities in South Africa – experiences from Johannesburg. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design* 29: 337-53
- Landman, K. 2006. Privatizing public space in post-apartheid South African cities through neighbourhood enclosures. *GeoJournal* 66: 133-46
- Landman, K. 2002. *Gated Communities in Brazil and South Africa: Comparative Perspectives*. CSIR Building and Construction Technology, Pretoria
- Lentz, S. 2006. More gates, less community? Guarded housing in Russia. In *Private Cities: Global and local perspectives*. G. Glasze, C. Webster, K. Frantz (eds). Oxford: Routledge, Pp. 206-21
- Low, S. 2003. *Behind the Gates: Life, security, and the pursuit of happiness in fortress America*. New York: Routledge
- Low, S. 2001. The edge and the center: gated communities and the discourse of urban fear. *American Anthropologist* 103,1: 45-58
- Marcuse, P. 1997. The ghetto of exclusion and the fortified enclave: new patterns in the United States. *The American Behavioral Scientist* 41,3: 311-26
- McKenzie, E. 2006. The dynamics of privatopia: private residential governance in the USA. In *Private Cities: Global and local perspectives*. G. Glasze, C. Webster, K. Frantz (eds). Oxford: Routledge, Pp 9-30
- Raposo, R. 2006. Gated communities, commodification and aestheticization: the case of the Lisbon metropolitan area. *GeoJournal* 66: 43-56
- Rofe, M.W. 2006. New landscapes of gated communities: Australia's Sovereign Islands. *Landscape Research* 31,1: 309-17
- Roitman, S. 2005. Who segregates whom? The analysis of a gated community in Mendoza, Argentina. *Housing Studies* 20,2: 303-22

- Rosen, G. and E. Razin. 2006 From traditional and frontier enclaves to new gated communities: tailor-made communities in Israel. (Manuscript, Dept of Geography, Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
- Rosen, G. and E. Razin. Forthcoming. Gated communities in Israel: a new phase of spatial segregation. *Israeli Sociology*
- Stoyanov, P. and K Frantz . 2006. Gated communities in Bulgaria: interpreting a new trend in post-communist urban development. *GeoJournal* 66,1/2: 57-63
- Thuillier, G. 2005. Gated communities in the metropolitan area of Buenos Aires, Argentina: a challenge for town planning. *Housing Studies* 20,2: 255-72
- Webster, C. 2002. Property rights and the public realm: gates, green belts, and Gemeinschaft. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and design* 29,3: 397-412
- Webster, C. and G. Glasze. 2006. Conclusion: dynamic urban order and the rise of residential clubs. In *Private Cities: Global and Local Perspectives*. G. Glasze, C. Webster, K. Frantz (eds). London: Routledge
- Wu, F. and K. Webber. 2004. The rise of 'foreign gated communities' in Beijing: between economic globalization and local institutions. *Cities* 21: 203-13

Table 1: Checklist of features *commonly* defining traditional enclaves in Israel

function of enclosure	physical		economic		social	/	symbolic	/
	secure people and property		enhance property values		give visual or spatial privacy		display status and power	/
	create identity for project	/	protect club amenities		control those inside	/	control those outside	/
security features	<i>nature of boundary</i>				physical		symbolic	/
	wall		fence - opaque		fence - visually open		fence - electric	
	low fence, chain, or bollard		fence - barbed		speed bumps or chicanes		pavement texture or color	
	faux guard station		mirrored glass on guard house		"private property" signs		"no parking" signs *Other signs	/
	hedge or vegetation		topographic feature		water		desert	
	swing-arm gate		lift-arm gate		slide gate		swing gate	
	<i>nature of security</i>				devices in road bed		guards at designated times	
	guards at all times		patrolling guards ** eyes on the street	/	card entry		code entry	
	auto opener entry		surveillance cameras		armed guards		house alarms	

* Signs warning outsiders to act in accordance to internal religious codes of behavior. These signs may include warnings to any outsider, demanding them appropriate behavior in these so called sacred spaces. Such signs specifically address dress code of secular women entering the area.

** The guards in these neighborhoods are not official guards hired to perform a security job, but more as a condition of mutual protection where the entire community is aware to

strangers entering its boundaries and thus requiring surveillance and sometimes even questioning by groups of local residents (mostly young men).

Table 2: Checklist of features *commonly* defining frontier enclaves in *Israel*

function of enclosure	physical	/	economic	/	social	/	symbolic	/
	secure people and property	/	enhance property values		give visual or spatial privacy	/	display status and power	/
	create identity for project	/	protect club amenities	/	control those inside		control those outside	/
security features	<i>nature of boundary</i>				physical	/	symbolic	
	wall		fence - opaque		fence - visually open		fence - electric	
	low fence, chain, or bollard	/	fence - barbed	/	speed bumps or chicanes	/	pavement texture or color	/
	faux guard station		mirrored glass on guard house	/	"private property" signs		"no parking" signs	
	hedge or vegetation		topographic feature		water		desert	
	swing-arm gate		lift-arm gate	/	slide gate	/	swing gate	
	<i>nature of security</i>				devices in road bed		guards at designated times	/
	guards at all times		patrolling guards	/	card entry		code entry	/
	auto opener entry		surveillance cameras		armed guards	/	house alarms	

Table 3: Checklist of features *commonly* defining new gated communities in *Israel*

function of enclosure	physical	/	economic	/	social	/	symbolic	/	
	secure people and property	/	enhance property values	/	give visual or spatial privacy	/	display status and power	/	
	create identity for project	/	protect club amenities	/	control those inside	/	control those outside	/	
security features	<i>nature of boundary</i>				physical	/	symbolic		
	wall	/	fence - opaque		fence - visually open		fence - electric		
	low fence, chain, or bollard		fence - barbed	/	speed bumps or chicanes		pavement texture or color		
	faux guard station		mirrored glass on guard house		"private property" signs	/	"no parking" signs		
	hedge or vegetation	/	topographic feature		water		desert		
	swing-arm gate		lift-arm gate	/	slide gate	/	swing gate		
	<i>nature of security</i>				devices in road bed		guards at designated times		
	guards at all times	/	patrolling guards	/	card entry		code entry	/	
	auto opener entry		surveillance cameras	/	armed guards	/	house alarms	/	

Table 4: Checklist of features *commonly* defining gated communities in **Canada**

function of enclosure	physical	/	economic	/	social	/	symbolic	/	
	secure people and property		enhance property values	/	give visual or spatial privacy	/	display status and power	/	
	create identity for project	/	protect club amenities	/	control those inside		control those outside	/	
security features	<i>nature of boundary</i>				physical	/	symbolic	/	
	wall		fence - opaque		fence - visually open	/	fence - electric		
	low fence, chain, or bollard	/	fence - barbed		speed bumps or chicanes		pavement texture or color	/	
	faux guard station	/	mirrored glass on guard house		"private property" signs	/	"no parking" signs	/	
	hedge or vegetation	/	topographic feature		water		desert		
	swing-arm gate		lift-arm gate		slide gate	/	swing gate	/	
	<i>nature of security</i>				devices in road bed		guards at designated times		
	guards at all times		patrolling guards		card entry		code entry	/	
	auto opener entry	/	surveillance cameras		armed guards		house alarms	/	

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4