



Edmond de Rothschild Foundation (Israel)

The Edmond de Rothschild Research Series

A collection of studies in the area of:

Baron de Rothschild's ("Hanadiv's") Legacy

2018

The Edmond de Rothschild Research Series

A collection of studies in the area of:

Baron de Rothschild's ("Hanadiv's") Legacy

2018

Dear Partners,

The Edmond de Rothschild Foundation (Israel) is spearheading philanthropic dedication to building an inclusive society by promoting excellence, diversity and leadership through higher education. Catalyzing true change and developing a cohesive society through dozens of innovative projects across the country, the Foundation provides growth and empowerment opportunities to the many communities in Israel. We develop and support novel solutions and creative partnerships, while evaluating result-driven programs with true social impact.

In keeping with its philosophy of strategic philanthropy, the Foundation established the **Edmond de Rothschild Research Series**, to promote excellence in research and expand the knowledge in the Foundation's areas of interest. The booklet before you centers on **Baron de Rothschild's ("Hanadiv's") Legacy**, as part of the first research series which focused on three main areas:

- 1. Access to and Success in Higher Education:** As part of its efforts to reduce social gaps, the Foundation strives to insure access to and success in higher education for periphery populations. It supports programs aimed at improving access to higher education options through preparation and guidance, reducing academic student dropout rates, and translating graduates' education into commensurate employment.
- 2. Measurement and Evaluation:** The Foundation seeks to constantly enhance its social impact and therefore, emphasizes measurement and evaluation of the projects it supports according to predefined, coherent criteria. The Foundation encourages evaluation as a continuous process that follows the course of programs from the planning stage and throughout their operation, and promotes the development of systematic data collection and analysis tools for all program aspects.
- 3. Baron de Rothschild's ("Hanadiv's") Legacy:** The Foundation is the expression of the Rothschild family's long-term commitment to the pioneering spirit of Israel. Harnessing a philanthropic legacy of more than 130 years, we are investing in groundbreaking agents of change and fostering modern-day pioneering in Israel.

A call for proposals was sent out to Israel's higher education institutions; academic steering committees were established in all three areas; and a total of 13 research proposals were approved. The researchers created new knowledge and distributed it, between the years 2014-2016, through various academic and non-academic channels. With the conclusion of the project, we are presenting summaries of all the completed studies and their main findings. The full publications of these studies can be found on the Foundation's website: www.rcf.org.il.

We would like to thank all the researchers from Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv University, the University of Haifa, Bar-Ilan University, the Open University, Myers-JDC-Brookdale Institute, and the Center for Educational Technology, who participated in this research series.

Enjoy your reading,

Elli Booch

Director of Philanthropy

Vardit Gilor

Program Officer

Table of Contents:

The Rothschild Administration and the Ottoman State

Dr. Yuval Ben-Bassat, University of Haifa

8-12

Baron Rothschild's Heritage and Imprint on Israel's Cultural Landscape: Settlement Planning and Building 1882-1914

Prof. Yossi Ben-Artzi, University of Haifa

14-19

Intercultural Exchanges in the Hebrew School - Education in the Baron Rothschild- and JCA - Supported Colonies 1885-1914

Dr. Tali Tadmor-Shimony, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

Prof. Nirit Raichel, Kinneret College on the Sea of Galilee and Gordon College of Education, Haifa

20-24

The Rothschild Administration and the Ottoman State

Dr. Yuval Ben-Bassat, University of Haifa

Purpose and contribution of the study

As of the early 1880s, the Jewish French philanthropist Baron Edmond de Rothschild (1845-1934) took several Jewish colonies established in Eretz-Yisra'el directly under his wing – and indirectly supported the entire Jewish settlement project. In return for his support, the colonies that received direct aid agreed to be run by an administration established by Rothschild. This administration employed agricultural experts to guide the colonists and modernize agriculture; founded and financed public establishments, such as schools, hospitals, and religious institutions; and funded the economic activity of the colonists.

The Rothschild administration operated in a centralized and hierarchical fashion and, for all intents and purposes, abrogated the colonists' independent status by forcing them to obey officials whose vision and goals were often at odds with their own.

This has led several researchers to claim that, by performing duties usually carried out at the governmental level, the Rothschild administration served as a de facto government for the colonists. Determining the value of this claim calls for an examination of this administration's activities within the Ottoman framework, particularly given the vast reforms (the Tanzimat reforms) initiated in the Empire in the second half of the nineteenth century and its efforts to achieve modernization and exercise greater centralization and control over its provinces.

In this regard, the complex relationship between the Rothschild administration in late nineteenth century Ottoman Eretz-Yisra'el and the Ottoman authorities in Istanbul and the Levant has not received the attention it warrants in research to date, despite its crucial importance to the history of the yishuv, the premises of the Jewish-Arab conflict, and the final decades of Ottoman rule. Existing research on the Rothschild administration tended to focus on the aims of the administration, its support of the Jewish colonists, its bureaucratic nature, its financial policies, the education system in the colonies it supported, the relationships with Jewish organizations and settlement groups, its cultural impact, the expertise of Rothschild's agricultural advisors, and the like. The difficulty of working in the Ottoman archive until a few years ago and the language skills required prevented such research from taking place and the investigation of the Rothschild administration in Eretz-Yisra'el largely remained in the realm of studies on the yishuv and the Zionist national revival in this land.

At the time of this research, no study had been dedicated to examining the relationships between the Rothschild administration and the Ottoman authorities in both Eretz-Yisra'el and Istanbul. This is particularly regrettable, given the critical importance of Rothschild's activity in the history of the yishuv and the Jewish settlement activity in Eretz Yisra'el as of the late nineteenth century. The topic, if covered in the literature at all, is often summarily

presented in a few statements, which, at times, are no more than simple clichés. Moreover, the relevant literature is almost entirely based on Zionist sources or on the correspondence of the Rothschild administration, but it has never been examined based on the Ottoman archives while embedding the administration's activity in the Ottoman framework.

The general aims of this research project were to explore the complex ties between the Rothschild administration in Eretz-Yisra'el and the Ottoman authorities at the end of the nineteenth century. More specifically, the initial project had three goals:

1. To explain the nature and extent of the Rothschild administration's activities within the Ottoman framework. In this regard, the claim that the Rothschild administration, to a large extent, fulfilled many of the functions with regards to the Jewish colonies normally carried out by governments appears to be at odds with Ottoman centralization measures and official state policies.
2. To explore the ways in which the activity of the Rothschild administration fit with what is known about the growing importance of Eretz-Yisra'el in Ottoman view, and especially its fear of European involvement exercised through protection granted to foreign subjects by European powers and the settlement of various foreign colonists throughout the country.
3. To account for the apparent contradictions in the official Ottoman approach towards the activities of the Rothschild administration, which, while eliciting considerable suspicion among Ottoman officials and being the target of several of their investigations, was also allowed a great measure of autonomy to run its own affairs and regularly worked with Ottoman officials to promote the colonies' affairs.

The research method

This project is based on archival materials housed at the Prime Ministerial Archive in Istanbul, the Başbakanlık Osmanlı Arşivi, the world's largest and most important Ottoman archive. Among the collections examined are those of the Ministry of the Interior (Dahiliye Nezareti), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Hariciye Nezareti), the Ministry of Finance (Maliye Nezareti), Yıldız Palace (Yıldız Sarayı), and the Grand Vizierate (Sadaret). In addition, the relevant vast secondary literature, including texts which directly refer to the activity of Baron Rothschild in Eretz-Yisra'el, as well as the literature on the Ottoman Empire in which the Rothschild administration operated, were examined. The latter is especially important in order to situate the analysis of the administration in the appropriate imperial setting, something which is largely missing in the existing literature and which the current research posed as one of its main aims. I also reviewed primary documents collected in several local and national archives in Israel, which, for the most part, are written in Hebrew or in French.

My research at the Ottoman Archives in Istanbul unearthed a large number of previously unknown documents, written in Ottoman Turkish and French, which provide first-hand documentation of the ties between the two sides and the attitude of the Ottoman authorities toward the activity of the administration. The extensive official and unofficial connections between the Rothschild administration and the Ottoman authorities at both the local and imperial levels were often used to promote the Jewish colonization project, solve problems faced by the colonies, protect them in times of need, and obtain the annulment of orders issued against them.

All of these contain valuable, previously un-researched documents about the activity of the Rothschild administration in Eretz-Yisra'el. Collected and scanned during four visits to the archive in Istanbul, these documents include official correspondence between Ottoman officials and functionaries in Istanbul, Beirut, and Jerusalem; reports by investigative committees whose role was to evaluate the activity of the Rothschild administration; official memoranda; petitions in French and Ottoman Turkish submitted to the Ottoman authorities by Elie Scheid, the chief administrator of the Baron's administration in Eretz-Yisra'el; as well as petitions submitted by the rural Arab population against the activity of the Jewish colonies.

Another set of documents spans the exchanges between the Ottoman government and the British branch of the Rothschild family. In reviewing these documents, my goal was to examine whether the latter's business with the Ottoman Empire and the Empire's dependency on loans provided by the Rothschilds had any influence on the activity of the Rothschild administration in Eretz-Yisra'el. Additional archival references for the current project were drawn from my in-depth research on the first aliya and the field work I have conducted in dozens of archives, chiefly in Israel.

The archival findings concerning the relationships of the Baron's administration with the Ottoman authorities were catalogued and categorized, in a long and complex process, which entailed reading thousands of Ottoman documents. The findings were then embedded into the context of existing research on the Ottoman Empire at the end of the nineteenth century, its rule in the provinces, the way it treated the activities of non-governmental foreign entities in the areas of its domain, the Empire's policies vis-à-vis the Holy Land, and its attitude towards Jewish immigration and settlement activity in the Empire in general and in Eretz-Yisra'el in particular.

Thus, this research project not only sheds new light on the yishuv and Zionist activity in Eretz-Yisra'el at the end of the nineteenth century, but also anchors the analysis in its broader Ottoman context while using rare Ottoman sources, an approach sorely lacking in current historiographies of these topics – which tend to operate in isolation from each other, as though they were in parallel spheres.

Main findings and their significance

The Ottoman documents retrieved from the archive in Istanbul and which concern the Rothschilds can be divided into two main themes. The first of these deals with the activity of the administration established by Baron Edmond de Rothschild during the almost two decades in which he supported the Jewish settlement activity in Eretz-Yisra'el. These documents include reports, petitions, surveys and censuses, title deeds, and official bureaucratic correspondence. The second theme spans correspondence between the British scion of the family with the Ottoman government with regards to loans the Rothschild Bank regularly made to the Empire as of the mid-nineteenth century, including contracts, negotiation documents, official Ottoman correspondence, and polite exchanges between the two parties.

Ottoman officials were fully cognizant of the importance of the Rothschild administration for Jewish colonization activity. Time and again, local officials in the Levant complained about the administration's activity and called upon the government to modify its policies and

take steps against the administration in the context of a general policy limiting the Jewish immigration and settlement activity, in fear of the emergence of a Jewish national problem in Palestine, which would threaten the Empire's integrity and cause resentment among the Arab population. Numerous investigations were opened against the administration's activity, committees of inquiry were dispatched to the Levant, reports were prepared, but to no avail: The central government did not take any concrete measures against the administration and did not act to implement the recommendations of the investigative committees or other suggestions sent by local officials. This may have stemmed, in part, from a political decision – given the dependency of the Ottoman government on loans received from the Rothschild Bank, although currently I cannot prove this point. It should also be noted that the colonies paid much-needed taxes, helped fuel the economy, and provided various services to their environment – and the Ottoman authorities were well aware of this, given the Empire's chronic shortage of funds.

One issue that hampered the Ottoman attempt to curb the Rothschild administration's support of the Jewish colonization and settlement activity was the fact that the colonies were spread over at least three Ottoman provinces: Jerusalem, Beirut, and Damascus. The relevant correspondence clearly shows the difficulties caused by this fact for the government, the confusion it elicited, the inability to collect information on the ground, the different policies each governor implemented, and the peculiar circumstances in each province. In this regard, the research confirms the assumptions raised in the proposal, that the confusion reigning in the Ottoman bureaucracy, the inability to enforce decisions, the foreign status of the colonists and the administration members who were protected under capitulations by foreign consuls, bribes, and loopholes in the Ottoman system – all helped the Rothschild administration pursue its goals.

The documents shed light on the activity of Elie Scheid, who headed the Baron's administration and who was in close contact with Ottoman officials. In the letters he wrote and petitions he submitted, Scheid made considerable efforts to demonstrate to Ottoman officials the benefits which the Empire would derive from the continuation and expansion of Jewish colonization activity and from the prospect of having loyal Jewish subjects in the colonies.

The Ottoman correspondence also provides, for the first time, the imperial perspective on an entire series of events and instances with which we were previously familiar only from the Jewish point of view. These include the issue of registration of the lands bought near Zikhron Ya'acov for the establishment of its daughter colonies, or lands registered under the name of Emil Frank, whose untimely death created a difficulty in transferring lands – which, in fact, belonged to Baron Rothschild – back to the administration.

One issue which the Ottoman documents gives support to is that the administration in fact served as a local government for the colonies. The scope of the issues with which it dealt vis-à-vis the Ottoman authorities was enormous, and it enabled individual settlers to refrain from having to deal directly with the government. For instance, there is evidence of the registration of land and purchase of land for settlement, obtaining building permits, lobbying to allow the colonists to become Ottoman subjects and to improve the situation of the colonies, handling the construction of public buildings and industrial initiatives, the voicing of concerns about security situation and attacks on the roads, etc.

It will take further research to prove or disprove the direct connections and influence between the business dealings of the Rothschild family with the Ottoman Empire, particularly its British branch, and the colonization activity sponsored by Baron Rothschild in Eretz-Yisra'el. Did the Ottomans deliberately choose to ignore this activity, given their reliance on loans from the Rothschild family? This will hopefully be answered in a book I am currently writing. It is clear, however, that all the senior Ottoman officials who dealt with Jewish colonization activity in Palestine were familiar with the "Rothschild brand."

The cornerstone for the current research on the activity of the Rothschild administration in Palestine will be further developed in the coming years, with the aim of publishing a monograph on this under-researched issue.

Baron Rothschild's Heritage and Imprint on Israel's Cultural Landscape: Settlement Planning and Building 1882-1914

Prof. Yossi Ben-Artzi, University of Haifa

Purpose and contribution of the study

In recent years, there is a growing awareness of the historical values of Israel's cultural landscape, and the history of its settlement has been re-appraised by a generation of scholars who have greatly contributed to our knowledge of the history of the Jewish settlements in modern times from the historical, geographical, economic, and cultural angles. In this context, Baron Rothschild's *moshavot* (colonies) earned a special place in research, being a fundamental component of the formation of Jewish activity, in a time prior to the establishment of any official "national" and Zionist institutions.

Immense public criticism from such figures as Ahad Ha'am and the struggle of the workers of the Second Aliya against the farmers of the moshavot forged, at that phase, a negative image of the latter, which was to be embedded in the settlement historiography for a generation or more. Because of the Baron's administration's guardianship, the farmers' great dependency on the funding they received through the administration, and the farmers' submission to it, and because of the attitude toward Hebrew labor and the preference for Arab labor, the Baron's administration and (despite the differences between them) the Jewish Colonization Association (JCA), as well as the farmers were negatively perceived, to the point of accusations against them with regards to deviations from basic Zionist ideas. The political dominance of the Labor Movement over the course of a generation or so further ingrained these and, for practical purposes, the official Jewish nation, the Zionist institutions, and the State of Israel did not establish even a single settlement in the form of a moshava.

For numerous and complex reasons, a shift in the historiographical attitude toward Baron Rothschild's work and towards the moshavot in general occurred during the third decade of the state's existence, as the passing of one hundred years of settlement had provided some retrospect for the period. Historical and geographical research presented a new image of the moshavot and of the work of the Baron and his successors. From a century's perspective, it became evident that during almost one-third of this period (and later), especially at its pioneering and primary stages, the Baron and the farmers in the moshavot became the bearers of the main settling activity and the materialization of the Zionist idea. Until 1914, and perhaps even until 1921, when the first kibbutz and moshav were established, the main land acquisition, settlement, agriculture, absorption of immigration, and the shaping of the "new Jew" were all done in the moshavot.

Thus, the approach towards the work and contribution of Baron Rothschild changed, and with it came a reassessment of his crucial role in the existence and realization of the idea of the return of the Jewish people to its land and to agricultural work – more than any established Zionist or pre-Zionist agent – between 1882-1914 and beyond. Furthermore, literary works by various scholars along with some moshavot "Jubilee albums" provided a more realistic historiographic perspective – that was echoed in terms of public interest and sympathy.

Along with this shift, historical buildings became a focus of interest and the object of heritage preservation; the culture created in the moshavot attracted literature, poetry, and art scholars. Almost every colony established an archive, a museum, a public library, and public events, and, to a large extent, the moshava was restored to its proper place in the history of Jewish settlement in Israel.

After years of specific and sporadic struggles over the preservation of historical sites, the Israeli government initiated an ambitious plan for "Preserving Heritage Sites" in general and of "Built Heritage" in particular (2010). Some of the heritage sites in the plan are found in the moshavot of the First Aliya, but their selection seems to have been done at random and unsystematically, and, in any event, does not encompass the entire cultural landscape of the moshavot, including those of the Baron Rothschild. Those charged with the task of documenting and preserving heritage sites often lack the appropriate tools to evaluate the true place of remnants of the cultural landscape in previously inhabited towns and villages, and the documentation they compile falls short of elucidating some of the most important questions in the field of conservation of the built heritage: construction style and sources, the identity of the architects, planners, builders, etc. This leads to preservation that is partial, deficient, or even contrary to the original ideas of Baron Rothschild and his administration.

Although the planning and construction of Baron Rothschild's colonies was previously addressed in research (e.g., Ben-Artzi, 1988; Aharonson, 1990), these works included a preliminary and general work, and were based on scant archival material than that which was opened and made publicly available in recent years. Thus, numerous questions regarding colony planning and construction remained unanswered: Which ideas dictated the planning and construction of residential buildings, public buildings, and farmyards? Did they manifest a certain ideology regarding the Jewish farmer and settlement? Who were the planners, where did they study, and what did they seek to implement in the country's landscape? Was the Baron himself involved in questions of construction, design, and the imprint of his work on the moshavot landscape?

The significance of the questions arising from past research outstrips historical-geographic research that seeks to elucidate the formation of the cultural landscape of the past. The revival of the public struggle for the preservation of buildings and sites from the yishuv's early days requires a comprehensive survey of Baron Rothschild's legacy in the State of Israel's current landscape.

The current study was launched to provide a professional, research-based, and systematic basis to examine issues arising in this context, with relevance for the ongoing planning, building, and preservation processes in the present landscape. Its specific objectives are to survey and map the constructed heritage sites of Baron Rothschild and his administration in the moshavot built in the years 1882-1914; to systematically document the heritage sites built in these colonies during the said period; to probe research archives in Israel and abroad, towards illuminating various sources for the physical planning and construction of

the Baron's moshavot, and exposing the ideological or conceptual motivations behind the planning, construction, and spatial design of the settlement landscape; and to present the results to planning, conservation, and education entities that deal with the built heritage of the country in general and the landscape of Jewish settlement in its early stages in particular, for planning, preservation, documentation, public discussion, and educational purposes.

The research method

A comprehensive field survey was carried out in 17 moshavot directly established by Baron Rothschild's administration or indirectly supported by it (e.g., settlements in the lower Galilee which had been established by the JCA and whose planners and builders had previously served in the Baron's administration).

For the purposes of survey uniformity, a pilot study was conducted in the moshavot of Bat Shlomo, Shfeya, and Zikhron Yaakov. The public and residential buildings that remained entirely or to a large extent as they were originally built were identified in the survey, and basic documentation of the buildings was recorded. An initial registration and documentation of some 500 buildings and detailed documentation of a sample of about 20 public buildings and 10 residential buildings, farm buildings, and agricultural auxiliaries was conducted.

Furthermore, comprehensive archival research was conducted to locate documentation related to planning and construction: agreements, contracts, plans, maps. The main archives were the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem; the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People in Jerusalem; the Palestine Jewish Colonisation Association (PICA) Archives in Waddesdon Manor, Aylesbury, England; the archives of Rishon Lezion, Zikhron Ya'akov, Mazkeret Batya, Ilaniya, Yesod Hama'ala; and the State Archive in Turkey – through Dr. Yuval Ben-Bassat.

Main findings and their significance

The most striking research finding is a confirmation and reinforcement of the decidedly professional character of the physical planning and building in the Baron's moshavot.

It also emerges that the Baron's administration acted in this area as a "state in progress" – or, to the very least, as the Zionist "Settlement Division," long before it was actually established. In the absence of another body who would assume responsibility for the settlement enterprise from a general, national outlook, the Baron and his administrators exercised the type of action typical of an ostensibly national body, in spatial consideration, in choice of settlement sites, and in developing a regional view quite early in settlement history.

Land acquisition policy and territorial planning: Shortly after he began his work in Palestine, Baron Rothschild realized that the random and spontaneous establishment of colonies was fraught with great risk, high probability of failure, and a waste of resources. He decided to create a spatial array of three "settlement centers" in the three pioneering moshavot – Rishon Lezion, Zikhron Ya'akov, and Rosh Pina, with the hope that large-scale land purchases, as close as possible to their centers, would create Jewish territorial contiguity. In the second stage, relatively small moshavot of 22-28 families were to be established, based on vineyards as their economic-agricultural base. Experts assessed some 70 dunams would

be needed for a family vineyard, with additional ground for vegetable crops and a small animal farm. Thus, each moshava would require some 2,000 dunams in the first phase – and 10,000-12,000 dunams for several small moshavot ("daughter colonies"). The latter were to be within walking or riding distance from the regional settlement center, where residents would receive most of the services they needed, and where their produce would be collected and processed. A system of roads and paths would be paved to connect them, and water sources would be established – altogether, enabling savings in terms of service costs for each moshava. A kindergarten and an elementary school, as well as a synagogue and a bathhouse would be built for each moshava; all other services would be located in the larger settlement center. Administration and professional guidance would also be conducted in one location and no local buildings or services would be required in daughter colonies.

Ultimately, this vision was realized in Zikhron Ya'acov and its daughter colonies, with the accelerated development of the settlement center offering all possible services and the establishment of Shfeya and Bat Shlomo, and later Atlit and Givat Ada, as daughter colonies. In Rishon Lezion and Rosh Pina, a different settlement reality emerged, without the formation of this planned region.

This spatial vision was perfected in the Lower Galilee in the years 1900-1908 by the JCA's "Palestine Committee," headed by the Baron, with the establishment of a training farm in Sejera, whose graduates, along with others, established settlements in each of the Lower Galilee's three levels – Ramat Tavor, Ramat Yavne'el, and the Jordan Valley – the moshavot of Kfar Tavor, Yavne'el, and Mellhemiya (Menahemia). In the second stage, Ba'it Gan was built near Yavne'el and Sejera near its name-sake training farm, and in the third stage, Kinneret and Mitzpa were established. Over 70,000 dunams of land were purchased for territorial continuity, and routes connecting the settlements were laid. Tiberias served as their urban center.

Zikhron Ya'acov and its daughter colonies, the JCA project in the Lower Galilee, and the attempt of settling Houran, all preceded in their spatial vision the acquisition of lands in the Ha'amakim District by 30 years, and the State of Israel's Lachish project by 70 years.

Physical planning: An essential finding that emerges from the detailed field and archival research efforts is that from the very beginning of their settlement work, the Baron and his administration employed professional planners, surveyors, map editors, and later architects, engineers, construction companies, and expert builders. The research revealed dozens of previously unknown land-survey maps, programs for a comprehensive settlement system in various moshavot, building plans, and schemes of soil and water in the PICA archive in Waddesdon. This wealth of planning, schemes, and land-surveys was the work of a group of European professionals – or young Israelis sent to study abroad or trained in Eretz-Israel. The full report (in Hebrew) includes several examples. The complete collection of maps and programs accumulated during the study may serve as a basis for further research.

The professional apparatus: One of the objectives of this research was to expose the executive mechanism serving the planning and construction of the Baron's moshavot. The research has uncovered fuller information than previously available about the professionals employed by the Baron's administration and JCA – surveyors, engineers, architects, contractors, and builders (whose names are listed in the full report in Hebrew).

While the research revealed numerous documents, it has encountered difficulties in tracing the professional path of the Baron's administration in the areas of construction and architecture, and was based, among other sources, on press clippings from the period. It should also be noted that little evidence of professional discussions at the highest levels or of correspondence with the Baron himself, concerning the physical design of the colonies, was found. For the most part, existing information is drawn from third-party testimonials, memories, and myths.

This indicates the need for further study. Few archival materials were discovered so far about these experts' professional training, recruitment, employment in the administration, their lives, and descendants. In some cases, the study succeeded in reaching family members, but adequate historical material was not found. The attempt to locate information in training institutions was also unsuccessful. Adolph (Abraham) Starkemth is an example: Appointed in 1895 as chief engineer on behalf of the Baron, he was, together with architect David Varon, responsible for large-scale construction in the moshavot from Metula to Mazkeret Batya, and as such, is a key figure in understanding the planning and construction of the Baron's moshavot.

The most important findings are the 500 residential, farm, public, and other buildings in the 17 moshavot surveyed, forming a cultural landscape originating from the work of Baron Rothschild and his administration. All colonies founded with the help of the Baron or supported by him include one or another form of this cultural landscape.

The findings bear witness to Baron Rothschild's tremendous contribution to Jewish settlement in modern-era Eretz-Israel and to his impact on the cultural landscape of the State of Israel. The main expressions of this contribution are, of course, massive land purchases, the planting of vineyards and orchards, agricultural fields, water wells, drainage channels, and roads in the fields and the moshavot. But these do not carry any contemporary visuality or distinctiveness in the landscape. Construction in the moshavot, on the other hand, remains prominent and impressive in the present-day landscape: The system of orderly streets, the large and diverse public buildings, the numerous residential buildings, and the still-functioning farm structures are impossible to ignore. The heritage of Baron Rothschild and his administration is imprinted, to this day, on Israel's cultural landscape; hence the importance of the quantitative findings of the study, in the context of providing the groundwork for the measures to commemorate, preserve, and educate about this heritage in the State of Israel.

The findings indicate an urgent need to bring to light the influence of Baron Rothschild and his administration on the landscape and current texture of Israeli settlement. In several towns, such as Rishon Lezion, Zikhron Ya'akov and Rosh Pina, this imprint was publicly recognized, but much less so in the many other settlements established and supported by Baron's administration. While the concept of "the era of the Baron" is anchored in Israeli historical consciousness, it has no expression in the landscape itself. The work of Baron Rothschild is indeed ingrained in collective consciousness and memory, but mainly in its historical contexts, and not always positively.

The study's quantitative and qualitative findings point to the Baron's prominent presence in the current landscape and attest to the sustainability of his administration's professional and aesthetic work. Acknowledging this presence can be instrumental in moving beyond the Israeli public's historical recognition of the concept of "the Baron" – to a more tangible recognition through preservation, commemoration, and education regarding the landscape he gave rise to and its place in the story and texture of settlements today.

The findings of the field survey and the accompanying visual material enable the 17 relevant local authorities to apply the provisions of the Planning and Building Law with regards to buildings marked for preservation, and in issuing appropriate directives in each case. Currently, only a fraction of the local authorities in Israel have, in fact, established building preservation committees as required by the law, and only a few of them have maintained conservation records. The findings of the survey, which will be available to the authorities and to the public, will equip them with tools and information to facilitate their choice of an appropriate conservation policy.

To date, few moshavot have successfully turned the Baron's constructed heritage into a contemporary economic asset. In Zikhron Ya'akov, for example, a major public effort ultimately convinced local authorities to take advantage of the built heritage to promote local tourism and art – in lieu of real-estate exploitation of the area and old buildings. That success proves that a holistic approach to planning, based on research findings, may turn other moshavot with their hundreds of historic buildings and complexes into attractions for domestic and foreign tourism – with significant economic leverage, which, in turn, may help further preservation of the built heritage of the Baron.

In summary, with their implications for multiple society aspects, from education to culture, urban planning, and economic issues, the findings of this research, if properly published, could be a turning point in reference to Baron Rothschild's practical contribution to shaping the cultural landscape of the State of Israel at a time when it was only a distant dream.

Intercultural Exchanges in the Hebrew School – Education in the Baron Rothschild- and JCA-Supported Colonies 1885-1914

*Dr. Tami Tadmor-Shimony, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
Prof. Nirit Raichel, Kinneret College on the Sea of Galilee and Gordon College of Education, Haifa*

Purpose and contribution of the study

The purpose of this study is to examine the phenomenon of Hebrew (Zionist) education in the moshavot (colonies) backed by Baron Rothschild or the Jewish Colonization Association (JCA) as an outcome of the confluence of an emerging national ethos with European cultural, social, and pedagogical influences. Transnationalism was chosen as the conceptual framework in addressing this question, towards gaining an understanding of the emergence of "education for all" and the educational norms that accompany us to this day.

The contribution of this research is expressed in several areas: Rectifying the exclusion of philanthropic education and the nonprofit sector from Eretz-Israeli historiography in general and educational historiography in particular; adding layers to the interface between national education and humanistic pedagogy through transnationalism views; examining educational issues that keep their place on the public agenda ever since; and new insights on the professional and gender identity of the educators.

The study corrects the exclusion of philanthropic and nonprofit sector organizations operating in the moshavot within the context of educational historiography. Funding for education by the Baron's administration and later by JCA enabled two phenomena, which were to leave a mark on Hebrew education in the coming years. The first of these is the establishment of public education for the first time in Eretz-Israel, at a time when there is no compulsory education. The second phenomenon is funding for the consolidation of a national ethos. The schools in the moshavot were among those "responsible" for imagining a new Hebrew-speaking national community, and this activity was made possible by funding of bodies that did not patently define themselves as Zionist. These aspects, toned down in previous research, can shed light on the interface of public education, philanthropic education, and nonprofit education.

The study shows that issues currently engrossing the educational discourse were no less present already in the late nineteenth century in moshavot schools. The most fascinating topic is the relationship between teachers and students. The study reveals that the more the teachers perceive their role as an ideological mission, the less they are willing to pay heed to the parents' opinions.

The study adds another layer to the discussion of the mutual influences among national education, humanistic education, and the norms of the cultural mission. The adoption of pedagogic norms and their adaptation to the Eretz-Israeli reality is evident in the characteristics of formal education, in agricultural studies, in the choice of subjects and the building of the curriculum, and in the taught contents – from the field trip to the sewing classes for girls.

The research method

This research is interdisciplinary and therefore requires the combination of a number of research methods used in social and cultural history and in studies of philanthropy and the nonprofit sector; philosophy of education; and curricular history. The historical background of the period, of the moshavot, and of the central figures were investigated using tools of social and cultural history, which are based on cross-referencing various primary sources (including retrieval of documents from archives and newspapers of the period) and relying on secondary sources.

The transnationalism history paradigm, through which this study attempts to examine the emergence of education in the Baron- and JCA-supported moshavot, includes three sub-categories:

1. Transfer history, which deals with the transition of an idea, a norm, and/or an educational perception from one area to another, such as the educational activity around the garden in a school in the moshava (colony), by adopting the concept in which the school is seen as a cultural space.
2. A category of comparative history that deals with the comparison of a phenomenon or a cultural or educational model between different societies and/or countries. The significance of the use of comparative history is exemplified in the framework of the discussion of the gendered space of the marriage bar, which prevented female teachers who married to continue their work. The marriage bar was the accepted norm in many Eastern and Western European countries, but it was not imposed in the French Third Republic, which aspired to expand secular education and compete with ecclesiastical education. The marriage bar was similarly not enforced and in Ottoman Eretz-Israel in its moshavot, whose teachers included married couples, like Simcha and Luba Wilkomitz in Rosh Pina and Ze'ev and Pirha (Bluma) Carmi in the settlements of Yavne'el and Menahemia.
3. The entangled history, defined by Noah Sobe¹ as an expression of inter-cultural influences. The use of the tangled history lens is expressed in the discussion of the school agricultural garden in Rosh Pina. The weight of entangled history is further increased when it comes to the shapers of Eretz-Israeli education. Most of the school and kindergarten teachers, save those who grew up in Eretz-Israel's Hebrew education frameworks, developed and worked in several cultural spaces. They crossed several boundaries of communities different from their own source community, and most of them crossed various geographic and political lines. Most of these educators felt at home with more than one language and wanted to teach in a language that was not their mother tongue, i.e., Hebrew.

¹ Noah W. Sobe "Entanglement and Transnationalism", in Thomas S. Popkewitz (ed) *Rethinking the History of Education – Transnational Perspectives on its Questions, Methods, and Knowledge*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, pp. 93-106.

Main findings and their significance

1. Learning in Hebrew is considered one of the landmarks of the history and educational historiography of Eretz-Israel. However, we claim that alongside the teaching and revival of Hebrew as a language, an important turning point occurred in Eretz-Israel at that time: For the first time, public educational institutions were established for groups of children from specific settlements. Based on Jewish philanthropy, Baron Rothschild and the nonprofit sector, JCA – this came at a time when compulsory education was not implemented in Ottoman Eretz-Israel's Jewish communities and public space.
2. The nature of the funding frameworks indicates the transfer of patterns of philanthropy and nonprofit sector that were accepted in Europe and in Jewish society. Thus, for example, the Baron's philanthropic work relied, on the one hand, on the social norms of France's economic elite, and, on the other hand – on the idea of Jewish solidarity.
3. The schools and kindergartens of the moshavot served as a central meeting point for educators, students, parents, members of the moshava committee, the Baron's administrators, and, from the early twentieth century, also JCA officials. The encounters in the schools opened the path to a process of mutual acquaintance between the school's stakeholders and enabled the interaction between a variety of modern and traditional cultural and educational perceptions. The differences in these perceptions led to dialogues among the educators; between the educators and the parents; between educators and parents and the administration; and between the administration and the moshavot committees. This discourse was one of the motivations for disseminating the various perceptions into the Jewish-national educational work and its expression in different patterns of curricula, teaching methods, and the attitude to students and to their parents.
4. Three different educational systems operated in the moshavot: Relatively large schools, with distinct bureaucratic characteristics (such as number of classes, range of subjects, secretariats, janitors, and administrative functions); medium-sized schools that included several teachers and several multi-age classrooms; and one-room schools with a single teacher, akin to rural schools in Europe, the United States, and Canada. The support and scope of the educational systems in the moshavot were not uniform.
5. The educational practice in the moshavot was a four-sided partnership, between the Baron's administration, which functioned as a philanthropic framework; JCA, a nonprofit organization; the teachers' guild – a professional society; and the moshavot committees, whose influence changed from moshava to moshava, and whose operation was reminiscent of the Jewish community's patterns of activity.
6. The learning content, teaching methods, and messages conveyed by the educators to their students in the moshavot arose chiefly from their professional and personal biographies. Most educators grew and worked in several cultural spaces. They had traversed community, geographic, and political boundaries, and most of them were comfortable with more than one language – and wanted to teach in Hebrew, a language that was not their mother tongue. The analysis we conducted of the teachers' biographies, through two categories – the environs in which they developed and the modes of knowledge infiltration and transfer – revealed four main environments: Eastern Europe; the Ottoman Empire, including studies in the Alliance network; the Old

Yishuv; and those who were born in the moshavot and matured towards the mid- or late first decade of the twentieth century. The level of training the teachers received was categorized according to the knowledge transfer model developed by Sobe and Ortegón², and includes both education and training in an "institutionalized knowledge framework" and education that rises from "casual knowledge," with the scales tipping towards casual knowledge.

7. The educators grew up in environs in which gender relations were not uniform, although they all experienced a clear gender division. Some of them sought to change gender boundaries and create new gender markers in the moshavot. Applying the entangled history lens allows us to appreciate how the gendered spaces in which the educators lived influenced their behavior in this context. This approach enables us to see which gender perceptions travelled from the teachers' home environments and were realized in the moshavot, and which gender assumptions were changed or adapted to the reality of Eretz -Israel. The lens of entangled history enables us to examine the effect of the marriage bar on family patterns in the moshavot; in contrast to the norm in most Western countries, where the marriage bar was a social norm, in the moshavot this norm did not exist. The result of breaking with the marriage bar was the phenomenon of teacher families, whose members taught at the same educational institutions, in the Baron's and JCA moshavot.
8. The discourse on the professional identity of the "Hebrew teachers" ranges from the need to improve their professional skills to the discussion of the nature of the ideological component and the weight of each component in the profile of "the good Hebrew teacher". In this discourse, the clear effects of field-accepted professional norms are evident. The teachers in the moshavot grappled with an issue that is also relevant in our times – whether the teacher should be, first and foremost, a professional, with a preference for a Jewish-national identity – or should the primary emphasis be placed on teachers' Jewish and national identity, even at the expense of their teaching qualities.
9. Three educational concepts formed the basis of the Hebrew school in the Baron's and JCA moshavot, one of which was based on the historical precedent of Jewish society and the other two on universal models of student-centered education: The traditional approach that seeks to focus on religious studies, while opening a window to "practical" studies; the classic humanistic approach that seeks to expand the child's education and prepare him/her for independence; and the romantic humanistic approach that recognizes the uniqueness of childhood and seeks to focus on the child's needs by departing the classroom into nature and enriching the child's means of expression.
10. All the educational partners were aware of the power of education to function as a socializing agent that shapes the desired portrait of the future generation. The moshava school pondered over the sketching of the portrait of desired adult, in light of the three existing farmer models, which at times co-existed, with some overlap, in one moshava. One model was that of the educated farmer, an agricultural worker whose education was not limited to the knowledge required for this work. This adult figure emerges from the curriculum of the schools of the moshavot Zikhron Ya'acov and Petach Tikvah, and is derived from the lifestyle and aspirations of urban families who settled in the

2. Noah W. Sobe and Nicole D. Ortegón, "Scopic Systems, Pipes, Models and Transfers in the Global Circulation of Educational Knowledge and Practices," in T. Popkewitz and F. Rizvi (Eds.) *Globalization and the Study of Education*, New York: NSSE/Teachers College Press, (2009), pp. 49-66.

moshavot and did not want to adopt the image of the ignorant and crude peasant familiar to them from Eastern Europe, or alternatively, the image of the Arab falach that had captivated Baron Rothschild. The second model was a practical farmer with agricultural knowledge and minimal education. The learning contents appropriate to this model of the rural student, unlike the urban counterpart, does not call for a broad education, as the student – who is part of an essential labor force in the agricultural sector – has no intention of pursuing higher education. This model was in line with the Baron's and JCA's class perception and accommodated the revolutionary teachers who wanted to create a Hebrew farmer, and sometimes even parents, who subscribed to a conservative style of life, compatible with an Eastern European educational tradition. The third model was that of the religious farmer, who integrates agricultural work with Torah decrees connected with the Land of Israel. Student training in this model includes studies in the heder and basic mathematics skills. It can be said that the model of a practical Hebrew farmer as an educational goal was considered feasible, although the Gedera Plan (1904), which became the official curriculum of the schools in the moshavot, was not minimalistic and included studies that opened a window to the world beyond the village.

11. The relationship between the center and the periphery is reflected in the curriculum and the desired adult image. The school curricula in the moshavot of the central region – Rishon Lezion, Zikhron Ya'acov, and Petach Tikvah – were similar to those in the municipal schools in Tel Aviv-Jaffa. In other words, they aimed at the desired urban adult model. In contrast, the curricula of the moshavot of the northern region – Kfar Tavor, Menahamia, and Yesod Hama'ala – reflected the desirable adult models of farmers and were derived from the school in Rosh Pina.
12. The schools in the moshavot also dealt with the issue of public health. The process of medicalization of education took place in the schools of the Baron's and JCA moshavot, that is, educating for personal hygiene as part of a wider educational approach stemming from the adoption of a modern cultural code. The school provided solutions to pupils' actual health needs while educating them in matters of norms of behavior, politeness, order, aesthetics, and proper culture. The education for cleanliness and hygiene began with the funding of the Baron's administration, continued during the JCA period, and was part of the declared policy of the Teachers Union.

In summary, this work addresses the public education that developed in the moshavot supported by Baron Rothschild and JCA, the pedagogic discourse, and the cultural educational concepts guiding it. It describes the portraits of educators, their educational programs and the latter's contents and sheds light on the concern for pupil's health, as well as the disagreements among the various education partners. By applying the lens of entangled history, the twists and turns of the encounter between the cultural influences of different people and spaces emerge. The aspiration of creating a new domain of education that differed from the existing one intensifies the significance of the intercultural encounters and their role in shaping it.



Edmond de Rothschild Foundation (Israel)

104 Rothschild Blvd. Tel Aviv, Israel

www.rcf.org.il | foundation@caesarea.com