

**ARCHITECTURE AND NATIONALIST IDENTITY;
THE CASE OF THE ARCHITECTURAL MASTER PLANS FOR THE
HEBREW UNIVERSITY IN JERUSALEM (1919-1974)
AND THEIR CONNECTIONS WITH NATIONALIST IDEOLOGY.**

**A PhD dissertation by Diana Dolev,
Supervised by Prof. Adrian Forty, The Bartlett,
UCL.**

September, 2000



ABSTRACT

The Hebrew University emerged from a need to provide Diaspora Jews with higher education, and was developed by the Zionist Organization into an image of the Third Temple, a sanctuary for learning that would create a Zionist dominance in Jerusalem. The inclusion of "Hebrew" in its title indicates the University's connection with the Zionist cultural revival that intended to create a Hebrew culture and identity. Locating the University on Scopus created a new sanctifying meaning to both Mount and University. After the 1949 war the University moved to the "Nation's Quarter" on Giv'at Ram, but the devotion to the sanctified Scopus never diminished, until the 1967 war enabled the return of the University to its original location. Five different master plans were prepared for the first Mount Scopus campus, none of them fully implemented. Each presented an interpretation of the University concept that also related to prevailing styles and ideological trends. Erich Mendelsohn had a central role in the few buildings that were constructed. The second campus presented a serene and functional campus, yet its subdued affluence was quite outstanding within general deprivation. Immediately after the 1967 war a new campus was constructed on Scopus, in the form of a megastructure. The circumstances of the "return" to Scopus, of its planning and construction, as well as the effects of occupation shed light on the significance of the new campus. To some extent, the recruitment of the University to political goals and the implementation of an ideology prevented a number of architectural plans from offering designs that would first and foremost fulfil their purpose as academic institutions. Furthermore, as it has been a central national institution, at certain periods it became influential as a propaganda tool, a vocation quite alien and harmful to its true calling.

CONTENTS

List of Plates 6

List of Abbreviations 9

INTRODUCTION: University architecture and national revival - The problem of an architectural realization of the Zionist vision of a university. 10

A Literature Review. 22

PART I – THE ZIONIST ORIGINS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY.

Chapter 1: An Introduction to the Question of Zionist Ideology and the creation of Hebrew art and architecture. 28

Chapter 2: The development of the idea of a Hebrew University in Zionist Ideology. 73

Chapter 3: Considerations of location for the Hebrew University. 113

PART II – THE FIRST CAMPUS (1919-1948).

Introduction 137

Chapter 1: Patrick Geddes and Frank Mears (1919-1929):

The “Heavenly Jerusalem”. 138

Chapter 2: Fritz Kornberg (1923) and Julian Levi (1929): east versus west. 162

Chapter 3: Erich Mendelsohn (1934-1938): a merge of east and west. 173

Chapter 4: Richard Kaufmann (1944-1948): a University City. 191

PART III – THE SECOND CAMPUS (1954-1958) – GIV’AT RAM.

Richard Kauffmann, Joseph Klarwein and Heinz Rau. 202

PART IV - THE THIRD CAMPUS (1967-1978): THE RETURN TO MOUNT SCOPUS.

David Reznick, Shmuel Shaked and Associates. 212

PART V - CONCLUSIONS:

The Hebrew University as a case study: The effect of the connection between nationalist ideology and architecture on the visual image of the University. 230

Plates 235

List of References 275

Biographical Note 282

Glossary 291

List of Plates

1. Map of Israel, 1949-1967.
2. Map of Israel since 1967.
3. Map of Jerusalem.
4. A general view of the first Hebrew University campus (1944), Mount Scopus (HUPA).
5. Aerial view of the Hebrew University, Giv'at Ram, from south-east (HUPA).
6. Aerial view of the Hebrew University, Giv'at Ram, from south-west (HUPA).
7. Aerial view of the Hebrew University (1980), Mount Scopus (HUPA).
8. A general view from the west of the Hebrew University, Mount Scopus (HUPA).
9. A view of a typical Arab village in Palestine.
10. A general view of Rishon Le'Zion , a *moshava*, in its early days (Rishon Le'Zion Museum Archive).
11. A Templar house in the German Colony, Haifa.
12. The buildings of the first Bezalel School of Art in Jerusalem.
13. I. E. Lilien: "Moses on Mount Sinai", illustration, *Die Bucher der Bibel*, 1908.
14. Z. Raban, illustration, *Song of Songs*, Jerusalem, 1923.
15. Y. Barsky, Gymnasia Herzlia, facade, (1909) Tel Aviv (Photography department, Eretz-Israel Museum in Ramat Aviv, x89-306-3).
16. Y. Barsky, Gymnasia Herzlia, plan (CZA).
17. Y. Barsky and B. Schatz, drawing of the proposed facade for the Gymnasia Herzlia (*Ost und West*, 1909).
18. G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, drawing of a reconstruction of the Holy Temple, 1901.
19. A. Baerwald, The Technion Building, Haifa.
20. A. Baerwald, proposed housing for Yemenite Jews, 1912 (*Alexander Baerwald 1877-1930; Architect and Artist*, Exhibition Catalogue, 1989, 13).
21. N. Gutman, "The Goatherd", 1927, oil on canvas, The Gutman Museum, Tel-Aviv.
22. A. Melnikov, "The Roaring Lion", 1925-1930, stone (h. 3 m.), Kfar-Gil'adi.
23. Y. Danziger, "Nimrod", 1939, Nubian sandstone (0.95 X 0.33 m.), Israel Museum, Jerusalem.
24. R. Kaufmann, a proposed plan for Nahalal (an agricultural settlement), 1921 (in Elhanani 1998: 18).

25. A diagrammatic view of the Old City's visual space viewed from the south; Mount Scopus is at the far end of the eastern range (in A. Kutcher, *The New Jerusalem; Planning and Politics*, London, 18, no. 11).
26. An aerial view of Mount Scopus in 1917, with the Gray-Hill residence and grounds (in Schiller E. 1980: *א.א. שילד, צילומי ירושלים וא"י הראשונים*, (*The First Photographs of Jerusalem and Eretz-Israel*), Jerusalem.
27. The Dome of the Rock, Temple Mount, Jerusalem.
28. F. Komberg's provisional open theatre, for the opening Ceremony of the Hebrew University, April 1, 1925 (The Komberg family bequest).
29. P. Geddes, The Hebrew University master plan, 1919 (HUPA).
30. P. Geddes, model of the proposed Hebrew University (HUPA).
31. F. Mears, a drawing of the proposed Hebrew University, view from the west (HUPA).
32. F. Mears, a drawing of the proposed Great Hall, view from the west (
33. F. Mears, a drawing of the interior of the proposed Great Hall (in *Die Hebraische Univesitat in Jerusalem; anlässlich der eröffnung am siebenten nissan funftausendsechshundertfunfundachtzig erten april neunzehnhundrtfunfundzwanzig herausgegeben von dem vorbereitenden komitee*).
34. F. Mears, a drawing of the proposed Hebrew University, view from the south (The Geddes Papers, T-Ged12/2/375/4).
35. W. H. Bartlett, print, "Jaffa Gate", title page for *Jerusalem Revisited*, 1855, London.
36. F. Mears, a drawing of a proposed interior quadrangle, the Hebrew University (The Geddes Papers, T-Ged12/2/375/4).
37. Cover page of a United Palestine Appeal Year Book, 1937.
38. F. Komberg, a master plan for the Hebrew University, 1923 (*The Proposed Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, Palestine*, London, The Zionist Organization, 1924?).
39. F. Komberg, a drawing of the proposed Hebrew University, view from south-west (HUPA).
40. F. Komberg's signature, an enlarged detail.
41. F. Komberg, a drawing of a proposed courtyard in the eastern part of the Hebrew University campus (The Komberg family bequest).
42. F. Komberg, drawings for the proposed open-air theatre (The Komberg family bequest).

43. The Ottoman *khan* on the western slopes of Mount Scopus (demolished) that temporarily housed the Institute of Jewish Studies (HUPA).
44. J. Levi, master plan for the Hebrew University, 1929 (CZA).
45. J. Levi, a drawing (over a photograph) of the north west view of the proposed Hebrew University campus (CZA).
46. J. Levi, a detail of plate 45, the proposed Rosenbloom Building (CZA).
47. J. Levi, a drawing of the proposed Rosenbloom Building (CZA).
48. J. Levi, a drawing of the interior of the proposed Rosenbloom Building (CZA).
49. A. S. Alschuler, Temple Isaiah, Chicago.
50. A. S. Alschuler, Temple Isaiah, interior.
51. B. Chaikin, the open air theatre in the Hebrew University, 1933 (HUPA).
52. E. Mendelsohn, model for the proposed Hadassah-Hebrew University Medical Centre, 1935 .
53. E. Mendelsohn, master plan for the Hebrew University, 1936.
54. E. Mendelsohn, model for the Hebrew University, 1936.
55. E. Mendelsohn, general view of the Hadassah-Hebrew University Hospital on Mount Scopus.
56. E. Mendelsohn, sketch including the proposed Rosenbloom Building.
57. E. Mendelsohn, sketch of proposed Student's Club, detail of Plate 56.
58. E. Mendelsohn, the Students' Club.
59. I. Yawicz and K. Rubin, Jewish Antiquities Museum in the Hebrew University, 1941.
60. J. Weiss and R. Kauffmann, the Rosenbloom Building, 1940.
61. R. Kauffmann, master plan for the University City, Mount Scopus, 1944 (Hebrew University Year Book, 1944).
62. R. Kauffmann, master plan for the Hebrew University campus, 1944 (Hebrew University Year Book, 1944).
63. R. Kauffmann, model for the proposed University City (HUPA).
64. R. Kauffmann, J. Klarwein, H. Rau, master plan for the Hebrew University on Giv'at Ram, 1953 (CZA).
65. R. Kauffmann, J. Klarwein, H. Rau, master plan, Hebrew University, Giv'at Ram, 1958 (CZA).

66. D. Reznick, (1967?) early master plan for the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus (A Hebrew University publication).
67. D. Reznick, S. Shaked and associates, master plan, Hebrew University on Mount Scopus (A Hebrew University publication).
68. The Hebrew University, detail of the interior pedestrian passage (HUPA).
69. F. Ferguson and D. Reznick, The Mormon University, Jerusalem, 1987.
70. Scarborough College, Toronto, general view.
71. Scarborough College, internal pedestrian street.
72. University of Alberta, Edmonton, view of the internal pedestrian street.

List of Abbreviations

CZA - Central Zionist Archive.

EAC - "*Engere Aktions Comite*", the reduced executive of the Zionist Organization.

GAC - "*Grosses Aktions Comite*", the enlarged executive of the Zionist Organization.

HUA - Hebrew University Archive.

HUPA – Hebrew University Photography Archive.

JNF – Jewish National Fund, or its Hebrew version - KKL – Keren Kayemet Lelsrael.

PLDC – Palestine Land Development Co.

SAC - the same as EAC.

WA - the Weizmann Archive.

**INTRODUCTION:
UNIVERSITY ARCHITECTURE AND NATIONAL REVIVAL -
THE PROBLEM OF ARCHITECTURALLY REALIZING THE ZIONIST VISION OF
A UNIVERSITY.**

The corner stones for the Hebrew University were laid on July 24, 1918, immediately after the British conquest of Palestine (which had been under Ottoman rule) was completed. The ceremony, which marked an important turning point in the Zionist movement activities, was attended by General Edmond Allenby as a representative of the British government and Dr. Chaim Weizmann who represented the Zionist Organization and the Jewish population of Palestine.

Since then, in the time span of more than eighty turbulent years, the Hebrew University shifted locations from Mount Scopus to Giv'at Ram and back to Mount Scopus (see map of Jerusalem, plate 3). On the two sites three different campuses were built to house the University in different periods between 1918 and 1978 (when the third campus was completed). The first campus was built on Mount Scopus between 1919 and 1948 (plate 4). It was replaced by the Giv'at Ram campus which was built between 1954 and 1958 (plates 5, 6). The third campus was built again on Mount Scopus on the former site of the University, between 1967 and 1978 (plate 8). The Giv'at Ram campus and the second Mount Scopus campus exist at the present, but of the first Mount Scopus campus only a few of the old buildings exist scattered in the present campus. Since the present Mount Scopus campus completely transformed the old one by size, form and scale, it is regarded an entirely different campus. Each campus emerged as a consequence of new historical, ideological and political circumstances.

The choice of "Hebrew" to name the University of the Jewish people is itself an indication of its political and ideological significance. It was part of the Zionist quest for a new national identity, and a wish to link with its ancient roots in the land of the Hebrews. Therefore, any analysis of the history of the Hebrew University cannot ignore its historical and ideological aspects. The Hebrew University maintained its place as a leading institution both on the academic and the national level also after the Zionist movement had basically achieved its goal and the state of Israel was established. Therefore the

dramatic political and social events circling around the establishment of the state, the wars, the massive immigration and the territorial expansion after 1967, had more impact on the Hebrew University and its architecture than on any other institution in Israel.

"If we are to understand buildings and environments, we must understand the society and culture in which they exist", Anthony King wrote.¹ This dissertation attempts to show how the understanding of the political, cultural and social circumstances, and the identity problem of the Zionist national revival in Palestine/Israel provides a better understanding of the architectural images of the Hebrew University. As it has been preconceived for political reasons rather than academic ones, the Hebrew University differs from most traditional universities in the West; therefore the investigation of its architectural history should create a relevant research structure.

University architecture has not been investigated as much as other public or educational buildings and its interrelations with national identity issues have been quite overlooked. Therefore this thesis cannot involve much comparative analysis. However, the planning and construction of the Hebrew University has involved a large number of different concepts, styles and even locations which provide a complex multi-layered subject. On the whole the architecture of universities has always been related to their social and cultural environment as well as to their functions. Furthermore, universities have always had manifold relationships with authorities, whether municipal, state, royal or religious and their functional definition has varied to a great extent (for instance the college system in Oxford differs from the London University system). Many universities, though, have been influenced by the tension between their striving for independence and freedom of thought and research, and the need to interrelate with an outside authority. Therefore each university would have its own interrelations between form and the different variables (function, culture etc.). This thesis concentrates on relations between the architectural concepts and forms of the Hebrew University campuses and changing political, social and ideological forms that have developed during the Jewish national revival and the first twenty-five years of Israel's existence. The research attempts to test the assumption that there is a correlation between political and social trends and architectural forms through the case of the Hebrew University and to explore ways of investigating it. The thesis also looks into the effect of political and ideological

considerations on the concept of the University, the choice of site and stylistic preferences.

The central questions the thesis is concerned with are:

1. Why were the three campuses so different from each other architecturally, although they served the same function and the same institution?
2. Why is the investigation of political and social developments in Jewish society necessary for the understanding of the different architectural aspects of the three campuses of the Hebrew University and *vice versa*?
3. What architectural aspects of the Hebrew University are significant for the understanding of the development of the Jewish national and cultural identity?
4. How did the architects of the different master plans respond to the fact that the Hebrew University was a nationalist symbol?
5. How can the case of the Hebrew University campus reflect on the larger issue of university architecture and national and cultural identity?
6. How does the investigation of the architectural master plans of the Hebrew University contribute to recent critical research of Zionism?

Since the first master plans for the first campus had to deal with an undertaking of giving form to a utopic and amorphous vision, with no tradition to indicate an architectural concept or style, the first campus brings up specific questions, such as:

1. How did the idea of a university emerge as a central undertaking of the Zionist movement?
2. How did the vision of a Hebrew University connect with different trends in Zionist ideology?
3. What happened in the process of turning an abstract vision of a University into form?
4. What tradition, heritage or other foundation could instruct the planners and architects how to approach the task of creating a formal image of the Hebrew University?
5. Did the different plans manifest in form the distinction of the University as a Hebrew University and its status as a central enterprise of the Zionist movement?

The second campus was erected after the establishment of the state. Its investigation centres on the juncture between the architectural planning of the Giv'at Ram campus and the new political, social and cultural circumstances that followed the fulfilment of the Zionist goal. Formally, politically and ideologically the Giv'at Ram site has born less weighty ideological significance than Mount Scopus. Hence a major factor in the discussion of the Giv'at Ram campus is its location beyond the sites of the Old City and the Temple Mount and the tremendous influence this had on a number of aspects of perceiving and planning the University.

The first steps towards planning the third campus were taken immediately after the 1967 war, when Israel occupied the West Bank and east Jerusalem. The "return" to Mount Scopus was a political act. The chapters dedicated to the third campus investigate the connection of the new campus with the old myth of Mount Scopus, created at the time the University was established, and analyse the effect of the new political situation on the architectural decisions.

Because of its interdisciplinary approach the research encompasses, besides the architectural analysis of the Hebrew University campuses, also political, social and ideological developments in the Zionist movement and the state of Israel. Therefore, in addition to the obvious questions which would be of interest in any architectural analysis of a university (the functions of the institution, its educational and academic orientation, its location, an architectural tradition it wishes to follow, etc.) this thesis also studies the Hebrew University's connection with ideological identity and political circumstances. At the basis of this discussion of the founding of the Hebrew University by the Zionist Organization lies the recognition that the Jewish national movements should be discussed using methods similar to the discussion of any other national movement. This does not ignore the fact that it was in many ways also unique. As each national movement has its own characteristics, no movement quite similar to Zionism is known in history. The source of this distinction is the unique history of the Jews, who were entirely dispersed all over the world for about two thousand years, and yet preserved a separate national identity, while on the whole national revival movements (such as in east Europe

in mid nineteenth century and in the 1990's) were centred on a desire for autonomy of a people sitting on their land, sharing a cultural heritage, a language and a history. The study of Zionist and Israeli nationalism, therefore, should include also a perception of the settlers in Eretz-Israel as an *émigré* society, whose cultural variety reflected (and still does) on the attempt to create an authentic and unified national identity. The positioning of a University at the apex of the nationalist undertaking was also not common practice. Hence there is no absolute equivalent to the erection of the Hebrew University as the flagship of Zionist activity in Palestine, that emerged from a state of an ephemeral image to a material group of buildings, becoming part of the nation's ethos.

The Hebrew University evolved from a merge of the universal idea of a university with ideas connected to the Jewish national revival movements. The study of the place of the Hebrew University in the national and cultural revival reveals a common image of a University which shines like a luminous crown hovering high over the debates and actions, which accompanied it. The idea of the Hebrew University became a symbol which, to a certain extent, took the place of the Temple, the most sacred emblem of Jewish existence. The image of the University as the vision of the future re-erected Third Temple was in constant use in Zionist propaganda, as a symbol of the national revival in the land of the forefathers. Perhaps the image of the University became a configuration of "*Limud*" (the Hebrew term for learning) in the minds of many secular Jews. In Jewish heritage *Limud*, mostly of religious texts, was regarded sacred and was at the core of Jewish existence in every congregation all over the world. After the Emancipation general education became just as important to emancipated Jews, as the religious *Limud* was. Perhaps the source of this image, which goes beyond a mere acquiring of academic education, derived from the European concept of the University.

What was the traditional European concept of the University? Since its first days in Bologna, Salerno and Paris of the Middle Ages, the *universitas magistrorum et scholarium*, the body of students and teachers, was distinguished from other institutions by a number of traits. These traits were taken from the most powerful institutions of the time - the church, the monastery and the guild.² The University's structure of lectures, the set curriculum, the hierarchy of staff and the awarding of degrees, were all characteristics of those institutions. Only slight alterations can be found today in this

structure of a university, which has become accepted universally. Furthermore, the University embraced some of the moral qualities of those institutions as well, and created for itself the unique distinction which is pursued to this day. From the church the university took "the idea of the supranational organization, something above and beyond parochial interests".³ From the monastery, the "idea of separateness, an institution insulated from the practical world, a self-governing community to make its own rules and develop its own way of life".⁴ From the guild, "the concept of a community of individuals bound together by an oath of mutual support and common obedience to elected officials and with authority to select its own members".⁵ All of these put together create the University's distinction as a free and independent institution by definition, and a position which one can perhaps describe as a sceptre placed in front of society, brought about by academic achievements open to all. Although to many a University is merely an institution which supplies education and a profession, terms such as "objectivity", "autonomy", "community", "neutrality" and "freedom" were and are brought up in debates over the essence of the University and its functions.⁶ The University, then, fulfils a central social and practical function but at the same time it strives to maintain, what Karl Jaspers defined as its independent quest for truth.⁷ An assumption that this basic concept of the University should be confronted with the significance of the Hebrew University for the Jewish national revival and the creation of the new cultural identity is at the basis of this study.

For forty years the Hebrew University existed as an abstract idea before any practical measures were taken to implement it. The emergence of the idea was entirely devoid of a physical image. This can be accounted for the lack of a Jewish architectural heritage as a whole (except for local synagogue architectural styles) and hence obviously a lack of a university architectural tradition as well. It seems that the mere discussion of the idea of a university had been quite sufficient for the needs of the preliminary steps toward creating a national revival. Tracing the motives for adopting a university as the foremost and primary emblem of the Jewish cultural and national revival is a basic component of the study of the emergence of the idea of a Hebrew University. The motives, which were declared by different leaders at different periods, are partly based on genuine necessities, and partly on propaganda needs. The chapters dedicated to nationalist ideology and the emergence of the idea of a Hebrew University in this study will deal with this dichotomy.

Another consideration was of a completely different nature; it was believed that a Jewish University would make use of its academic tools (the study and research of Jewish history, language, literature, folklore, etc.) to nourish national values. Furthermore, a university was conceived as a means for the advancement of science, agriculture, industry, medicine, and other fields of knowledge that were imperative for the development of the Jewish settlement in Eretz-Israel, the Land of Israel (the ultimate goal of the Jewish national revival movements).⁸ Following those lines, as part of the national revival scheme the University was to become a principal agent of the educational system that would bring up the new Eretz-Israel Hebrew person (as opposed to the Diaspora Jew of the ghetto). At the time British rule had begun and hopes to accelerate Jewish immigration were aroused, the University took up an important role as a major Zionist propaganda tool.

The actual erection of the campuses and the buildings involved people from different cultural backgrounds and architectural traditions. The promoters and founders of the Hebrew University were Zionist activists from Russia, England, France, Germany and the USA. The architects as well, came from a variety of architectural schools, as the following partial list shows. Patrick Geddes, the Scottish town planner who prepared the first Hebrew University master plan, was the only non-Jew assigned for the Hebrew University project. Like Geddes, Erich Mendelsohn, too, was internationally famous. He left Germany with the rise of the Nazis and arrived in Palestine shortly afterwards. During his five years stay, he planned private and public buildings in Palestine (The Holy Land, the Land of Israel, was named Palestine throughout the Ottoman rule and the British Mandate rule). His most ambitious project in Palestine was the Hebrew University, for which he designed a master plan and a number of buildings which are still in use on the Mount Scopus site. Others were Jewish architects who immigrated to Palestine where they became leading architects. Fritz Kornberg, Richard Kaufmann, Joseph Klarwien and Heinz Rau came from Germany, Benjamin Chaikin from England, David Reznick from Brazil. Ram Karmi belongs to a second generation of architects in Palestine/Israel. This multi-national involvement must also have had its effect on the architectural outcome, and the connection between a school and style with the significance of the Hebrew University at a particular period is taken into account in the research.

Zionist ideology presented a desire to melt the multi-ethnic customs of the Jewish immigrants in Palestine into one mould of a new Jewish/Hebrew person and a collective identity; a desire that reflected on all cultural and educational aspects of life. The process that led toward the achievement of the Hebrew collective identity arouses questions that are relevant to architectural research as well as all other cultural agents. Silberstein (1999) presented those questions quite simply: "Who is included in or excluded from Israeli cultural space? Whose voice will be granted a hearing? Who will be allowed to speak?"⁹ The architecture of the Hebrew University campuses was part of the quest for the new Jewish national and cultural collective identity. This leads to a number of questions: Who was included or excluded from the Hebrew University campuses by means of their location and form? Who was included or excluded from designing the Hebrew University campuses? How does the study of the architecture of such a central undertaking as the Hebrew University illuminate the attempt to develop a local Jewish/Israeli architectural style? Is the Hebrew University distinguished architecturally from other universities in Israel? How were the architectural master plans of the University connected to the effort to create a collective national identity?

The difference between the first campus and the later ones does not lie entirely in the change of architectural style. Firstly, while the early planners of the Hebrew University carried the heavy burden of having to create something out of nothing, the later campuses were designed in accordance with local architectural styles that prevailed at the relevant period. Secondly, the time span of the construction of the first campus was almost thirty years, while the others were built within a reasonable period of time for such large scale building projects. Thirdly, a number of master plans were prepared for the first campus by different planners and architects at different periods, each representing a different architectural style. The result was a hotchpotch of buildings, not quite related to each other. The other two campuses followed one master plan each, thus acquiring a unifying architectural style.

For over forty years after its establishment the Hebrew University was the only university in the country. Even today, when it is one of seven universities in the country, it maintains a unique national position although there is no essential difference between the seven universities. Yet the Hebrew University, which also houses the National

Library¹⁰, stands out for its historical and national significance. Therefore the various aspects of the founding of the Hebrew University are of interest for historians, but have been researched only in recent years.¹¹

The history of the Hebrew University is an inseparable part of the historiography of the Zionist movement and of the state of Israel which until recently had been institutional; it participated in the patriotic obligation to present Zionism not only as a necessity for the survival of the Jewish nation but also to picture it as absolutely just and righteous. To achieve this not only have certain issues become a taboo (for instance the questioning of myths such as the merit of self sacrifice for the sake of the home land) but also a specific terminology substituted common terms, thus creating an existence unique to the Jewish people (for instance the use of *aliyah* – ascent, for Jewish immigration to Eretz Israel). Recently this historiography faced a transformation when a number of historians freed themselves from prevailing biased points of view, which are probably understandable in the situation of a struggle for independence and the creation of a new national identity. The major circumstances and results of this situation were pointed out in detail by Professor Zeev Sternhell.¹² Sternhell wrote that one important reason for an institutional Zionist historiography is the fact that until recently the methods used to investigate the early history of the Zionist movement and the Jewish settlement in Palestine were not the same as those used in the study of any other society (i.e. giving priority to raw material of the period). According to Sternhell, there has been a tendency to rely unquestioningly on eyewitnesses' memories, and not just any eyewitnesses - only those who could contribute to an unblemished picture of Jewish society. There still is a common requirement to hear only one-sided versions of the story of the establishment of the Jewish state, since there is a general consensus that the justification of Zionism should not be threatened; thus the history of those years has been partial and recruited to Zionist ideology. Another aspect of traditional Israeli historiography, Sternhell wrote, is the damage caused by the prevailing separation of Jewish history from general history in schools and universities.¹³ This institutionalised separation, which emanates from a concept that Jewish history is a separate area of study, has brought about heavy consequences to twentieth century history and especially to the study of the history of Zionism. First of all this approach has paralyzed critical and comparative analysis. It has

also contributed to the perpetuation of myths flattering to Israel's collective identity. No doubt new trends of critical historiography are part of a growing awareness in certain circles in Israeli society to the need for a free discussion of central issues without being labelled as anti Zionist. However, the "new historians" (or "critical sociologists", the terms are used in a positive or a negative sense, depending on the user), in their attempt to confront myths, aroused a controversy¹⁴ that has become part of Israeli cultural discourse.¹⁵ The distance in time from the major events of the establishment of the state of Israel leads to a detachment from an emotional charge necessary for objective research. Each of those historians, who were mostly educated in Israel and raised on national heroic myths, have had to make a personal decision whether to continue the path of the institutional approaches or to take up critical methods of investigation. But in Israel academic discussion of complex aspects of twentieth century history merges with the public debate over the future of Israeli society and national identity. Therefore any such discussion arouses concern and intense emotions.¹⁶ However, this thesis, which is a pioneer enterprise because it deals with an untouched topic using primary material and critical investigation methods, attempts to be part of the recent trend.

My own personal experience vividly verified for me how difficult it is to see clearly through the mist of myths, "truths" and distinguishing terminology, that have been part of one's education and entire social and cultural environment. The investigation of national topics is a constant struggle against stereotyped conceptions, which are often conspicuous when detected in others, yet not so easy to identify within oneself. Thus, during the decade of my interest in the architectural aspects of the Hebrew University I have also struggled my own personal way through a process of comprehension and growing awareness to different social and nationalist aspects. Since the very first steps of my study I myself went through an unveiling process, revealing at every stage that the basic assumptions that were at the origin of my perception were founded on biased presuppositions. This study, therefore, has been not only a scholarly experience; it also became part of my personal voyage toward a clearer civic and political awareness. Those had already been aroused by my social and political commitments; although I have spent most of my adult life teaching and studying, I have also been involved in educating for peace (between Jews and Arabs), and in activities to promote human rights

in Israel and in the occupied territories, struggling against prevailing militaristic trends and against the occupation. No doubt those activities originated in the first place from a critical approach, and yet on the long path of the research I found myself falling into traps of biased propaganda I was not aware of before. The fact that my supervisor, Prof. Adrian Forty, does not come from the same social and political background as I do was most advantageous in this respect, for he asked questions where I took for granted. His constant demand for clarifications of different issues forced me to reconsider what until then I regarded as axiomatic.

It would be necessary to consider also substantial doubts which some scholars raise as to the capability of modern architecture to express moral, social and political ideas at all (Manfredo Tafuri, for example). I expect this thesis to shed new light on the problem in general, and on the architectural realization of the Hebrew University versus its utopic vision in particular. I hope the investigation of the historical and aesthetic aspects of the Hebrew University architecture will forward the historiography of architecture in Palestine and Israel, and advance the knowledge and understanding of Zionist activity and its principal institution.

In accord with the interdisciplinary nature of the thesis, the method applied to the investigation of the problem presented here is a juxtaposition of the different constituents; the political, cultural, social and architectural together with the different aspects of academia. The different juxtaposed factors change with every master plan, architectural trend and social and political circumstances, thus creating a dynamic web of components in a dialectic relationship with each other. Hopefully from this web a more significant understanding of the architecture of the Hebrew University and its connections with political, social and cultural issues will eventually emerge.

Notes:

¹ King 1980: 8.

² See Ross 1976: 13.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*: 4.

⁷ Jaspers 1960: 19.

⁸ Kolatt 1997: 5.

⁹ Silberstein 1999: 3.

¹⁰ The National Library attained special importance for the whole Jewish people, for it contains national literary treasures, collected from Jewish congregations around the world.

¹¹ A book on the founding of the Hebrew University in its first years was published in September 1997, following a seminar on the subject a couple of years ago in the Hebrew University: Katz & Heyd (eds.) 1997.

¹² Sternhell 1998 (1995): ix, x. Also Berkowitz 1993: 5.

¹³ See also Myers 1995: 238 n. 93, and Rein 1997: A. Rein, א. ריין, "היסטוריה כללית והיסטוריה יהודית: במשותף או בנפרד? לשאלת הגדרת לימודי ההיסטוריה באוניברסיטה העברית בעשור הראשון לקיומה, 1925-1935", ("History and Jewish History: Together or Separate? The Definition of Historical Studies at the Hebrew University, 1925-1935"), in Katz & Heyd (eds.) 1997: 516-540.

¹⁴ Sternhell 1998 (1995): x. See Karsh 1997: E. Karsh, *Fabricating Israeli History; The 'New Historians'*, London. Karsh severely doubts the credibility of the group of Israeli historians generally referred to as "new historians" or "post-Zionists". Silberstein 1999, is the most recent and comprehensive study of the new historiography and its ideological significance.

¹⁵ See Silberstein 1999.

¹⁶ Sternhell: xi.

A LITERATURE REVIEW

A primary source for the investigation of any topic connected to the architectural aspects of the Hebrew University would be a systematic history of its design and erection. Yet the few publications on the architectural history of the Hebrew University are fragmental and scarce. The only existing methodical history of a Hebrew University campus is my MA thesis (see Dolev 1990), dedicated primarily to the history of the design and plans of the individual buildings. Consequently the material for the research includes mainly primary sources; archival materials, interviews, correspondences and autobiographies. Hence a marked passion for authentic documents may be discerned throughout the dissertation, most of which are revealed here for the first time to tell the story of the Hebrew University architecture. Files in both the Hebrew University Archive (HUA) and the Central Zionist Archive (CZA) in Jerusalem hold correspondences, protocols, minutes, memorandums and architectural plans. The documents provide basic primary information first of all about the architectural planning of the University and also records on issues such as the role of the University as understood by different parties, the interrelations between the University and the architects and the University and the State. Most of the documents up to the establishment of the state of Israel are in English or German, with some in Hebrew, as University officials, faculty and architects were immigrants and did not master the Hebrew language. Another reason for the diversity of languages is that many of the relevant documents were correspondences with Zionist activists and donors in Europe and the United States, who were involved with the establishment of the Hebrew University to a great extent. This did not seem to be a problem for all concerned, as it was quite usual for those educated people to master a number of European languages. After 1948 most of the internal correspondence was in Hebrew, but when persons from abroad are concerned the correspondence was mostly in English. In the HUA the files that hold most of the relevant material are 31, 31/1, 2, 136/1, 024, 35, 35/1 027. In the CZA, files Z4/3494 I, Z4/ 2790, Z4/1712 contain relevant material concerning the activities of the London Office of the Zionist Organization and files L12/ 39 and L12/ 63 contain documents concerning the activities of the London Hebrew University Committee.

Tracing the history of the first Mount Scopus campus through the available primary sources is especially complex due to the fact that many organizations, in Palestine and abroad, were involved in its establishment and also quite a few architects and planners. Furthermore, political events have had some influence even on the preservation of the documents. Komberg's house in Talpiot in Jerusalem was burnt down by Arab rioters in 1929, and a large part of his private documents was lost. Some documents from the Hebrew University archive prior to the 1948-49 war may have been lost, as the archive remained on the evacuated Mount Scopus and was moved to the western part of Jerusalem in secret by Israeli policemen who were allowed to guard the premises. Despite a possible loss of documentation, it seems that the ample use of letters for communication in those days makes up for any such contingency.

Secondary sources include publications from a number of fields of knowledge, to cover the range of subjects the dissertation deals with, due to its interdisciplinary nature. As pointed out above, on the whole, written material on the architectural aspects of the Hebrew University are scarce. Two of the first Mount Scopus campus planners, Patrick Geddes and Erich Mendelsohn, were internationally famous and therefore there are publications, as well as primary sources concerning their work. In the case of Geddes there is first of all his own written report (Geddes 1919) and a couple of other publications by him which refer to his planning ideas (Geddes 1901, 1915) as well as an abundance of letters he and his assistant, Frank Mears had written (CZA files L12/39, L12/63, Z4/1721, Z4/2790; HUA files 2, 31, 31/1). Another important primary source is the correspondence between Geddes and Mumford in Novak (1995). The Geddes plan is discussed in Baordman (1932), Mairet (1957) and Meller (1979, 1980 and 1990). Although Meller's research is the more recent, critical, and founded on documents, as far as the Hebrew University project is concerned inaccuracies and unfounded assumptions have been detected.

Whereas there are quite a few publications on Erich Mendelsohn's work, though not as many as one would expect for such a prominent architect, his plan for the Hebrew University has not been thoroughly researched. The most useful source is his own letters (Beyer 1967)¹ and the documents in the HUA (files 02, 027).

Material for the investigation of the Giv'at Ram and second Mount Scopus campuses consists mainly of primary sources. But as there are similarities in approach

and architectural considerations and style to universities of the 1960s and 1970s in England and Canada, some material on those universities has been referred to ("Campus Architecture", *Architectural Record*, January 1975). As the present Mount Scopus campus can be defined as a "megasturucture", definitions and evaluations of this architectural style in general and in reference to other megastructures as in Banham (1976) were significant for a more profound understanding of the campus.

Other aspects of the establishment of the Hebrew University, such as the ideological connections between the national revival and the University, the emergence of the idea of the University and the choice of its location, were investigated recently and published in Katz and Heyd (1997). The fact that a special interdisciplinary seminar (which finally produced the book mentioned above) took place in the Hebrew University, is evidence of the large scope of connections this institute encompassed throughout its history. The possibility of an interpretation of the choice of the Mount Scopus site and of certain master plans as being a version of Zionist "imperialism" has been inspired mainly by Crinson (1996). Crinson did not mention the Hebrew University campus, as his book is about British buildings in the Middle East in the nineteenth century (including Jerusalem). His interpretation focuses on the buildings as expressing the power and prestige of the nations they represent. Yet his theory lends itself to the case of the Hebrew University as well, for Jerusalem's political role has become even more intense and complex in the twentieth century. Crinson's book also sheds light on the central issue in this thesis - the juxtaposition of western architectural styles and the oriental surroundings in general and the historical and religious sites of Jerusalem in particular.

The connections of the University with the ideology of the Zionist movement and its vicissitudes require material concerning a number of issues. The question of national identity in Zionist ideology focuses mostly on Eretz-Israel, yet in fact it was to a great extent a creation of the Diaspora, as Berkowitz (1996) shows. He explains that the invention of the new Hebrew culture did not begin with the Jewish settlement in Palestine, but rather in the Diaspora, in order to create a unification of the dispersed Jewish people. Although Berkowitz did not reveal new facts, he interpreted the history of the Zionist movement in a new way. One essential aspect of the invention of a new culture was the creation of a past. Myers (1995) contributed his thorough analysis of the invention of a

Jewish past by the Jerusalem School, a group of Jewish scholars who emigrated from Germany and founded the Institute of Jewish Studies in the Hebrew University.

As to the brief investigation of the development of a local Hebrew culture, this section of the research looks mainly at the one hundred years old process of establishing a self-image. In order to create the national revival this self-image has been intentionally separated completely from the mainstream of Jewish culture. Since this trend is still active and dominant in Israeli social and cultural existence, any available critical research of it is recent and scarce. Zalmona's (1981) concise article is a pioneering point of departure for the investigation of art and its connections with Zionist ideology and Hebrew identity, although he perhaps is not captious enough in regard to his sources. A comprehensive history of architecture in Palestine/Israel has not been published yet, therefore Ben-Arzi's (1997) history of the design and construction of the first Jewish colonies in Palestine, is an important source of information. Furthermore, never before were the buildings of that period included in the context of Hebrew culture since they preceded the establishment of the Zionist Organization. Even-Zohar (1981) has been bold in his attempt to analyze the emergence of Zionist culture by using methods similar to those used in modern western historiography of nationalism and culture. In an article that has become a major reference point for any discussion of culture and art in Israel he analyzed the common practice of using a distinct terminology for Zionist purposes in contexts associated with nationalist meaning (school textbooks, history books of the establishment of the State of Israel, journalism, etc.) in order to create a differentiation between Zionist nationalism and other nationalisms. Even-Zohar offered a pioneering insight into major issues concerning the development of art in Israel. He was the first to suggest that Hebrew culture had been invented by nationalist motives and was not an outcome of a natural process as cultural agents wished to present.

The borders of the research touch the larger context of the study of nationalism and its connections with political and social identity and with cultural issues. The general study of the subject has been amply investigated in recent years. Among his many publications Anthony Smith (1998) contributed a most comprehensive theoretical survey of the subject of nationalism. It serves also as a useful guide to debates on the subject. The book looks at the subject within the larger context of policy and culture, and includes examples on Zionism. Hence it is useful for the effort of the new historiography of Zionist

nationalism to analyze the Jewish national revival through the use of generally accepted theories and terminology.

The discussion of the architecture of the Hebrew University and its connections with political and social developments, is part of the larger question of the existence of a dialectic relationship between political and social trends and architectural forms. There are a few publications dedicated to this issue (Barbara Miller-Lane's *Architecture and Politics in Germany 1918-1945* (1968) is a major example), which set a starting point for any discussion of the subject. As to the investigation of university architecture and its social and cultural connections two publications inspired this thesis: Helen Lafkowitz-Horowitz, *Alma Mater, Design and Experience in the Women's Colleges from their Nineteenth-Century Beginnings to the 1930s* (New York 1984) and Paul V. Turner's *Campus; An American Planning Tradition* (Cambridge Mass. and London, 1984).

Anthony King's (1980) approach to the complexity of investigating a meeting of cultures and its political and social connections, in his study of architecture in the British colonies, was most revealing although the situation in Palestine/Israel was not identical to that in the British colonies.

One of the major problems of investigating issues connected with the Zionist movement (and perhaps this applies to most national revivals) is to remove oneself from the nationalist ideology, especially if the researcher has been brought up within its educational system (as mentioned in the introduction, this applies to me). Recently a number of social and cultural historians in Israel created a shift in Zionist historiography; their critical research has begun the new trend sometimes called "post-Zionism". Their publications provide a historical reference point for the investigation of the political, ideological, social and cultural environment in which the promoters and architects of the Hebrew University had worked. Among them Tom Segev's (1999) comprehensive and balanced history of Palestine under the British Mandate rule offers not only valuable information but also a reference point that illuminates the need for cross-section investigation that includes all parties involved in this area (Jews, Arabs and the British). Kimmerling (1988, 1993) stands out as an able analyst and his unbiased interpretations are illuminating and instructive. Last but not least, Silberstein's (1999) comprehensive survey and analysis of the new Israeli historiography would have provided a broader

reference basis had it not been published so recently. It is a most substantial contribution to the study of Israeli nationalism and culture.

Notes:

¹ I have recently learned that the English translation of Beyer's book is abbreviated. Only the original German book contains the entire corpus of Mendelsohn's letters.

PART I

THE ZIONIST ORIGINS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY.

CHAPTER 1

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE QUESTION OF ZIONIST IDEOLOGY AND THE CREATION OF HEBREW ART AND ARCHITECTURE.

In a speech at the inauguration ceremony of the Hebrew University in 1925, Chaim Nachman Bialik, the “national poet”, expressed the need for a culture in order to create a new Jewish nation: "The term 'culture', in its inclusive and humane sense, temporarily took the place of the theological term 'Torah' in the nation's consciousness. We have come to the understanding that every nation that wishes to acquire an existence devoid of shame must have a culture; not only to make use of it, but to create it, to genuinely create it, with the nation's own tools, materials and its own stamp".¹ Bialik thus presented a profound insight into the nation's problematic task to invent² its own creation, in his opinion - almost *ex nihilo*, and the choices it had made in the process. His words also point out that for the Zionist movement and the Jewish community in Palestine a conscious and deliberate search for a unique culture was necessary in order to become a nation. Like many others, Bialik expected the activities of the young Hebrew University, to contribute to the formation of a Hebrew culture.

This chapter will attempt to combine political and social events with cultural and artistic trends that participated in the Zionist quest for a Hebrew entity. It focuses mainly on those events that had influential impact on the Zionist search for a Hebrew identity and on the inclusion or exclusion of different factors in the favoured identity along the process.

An authentic Hebrew culture was regarded a central postulate of Zionism as a national movement since its genesis in the last quarter of the nineteenth century.³ The affiliation of a national revival with an invention of an appropriate culture is quite in accord with recent research on nationalism. It involves a cross-section investigation of interdisciplinary fields of knowledge, involving history, sociology, social history, political science, literary and artistic criticism⁴ and focuses on the invented quality of national identity. Yet it concludes that nationalism and its cultural promoters are not as Bialik suggested a *creatio ex nihilo*, but artifices constructed through claims of a mythic nature,

which evolve from exalted origins.⁵ Paradoxically, although Zionism's goal was to build a state for the Jewish people in an evident sense as well as metaphorically, architecture was not as immediately accessible a cultural agent as literature and poetry were.⁶ Visual arts in general and particularly architecture, did not benefit from a long and well-developed heritage as literature and poetry did.⁷ Yet perhaps the role of architecture has been underestimated, for this aspect of the national and cultural revival has not been thoroughly investigated yet.

Whatever the cultural agent of the national movement, the period of about one hundred years of Zionism cannot be seen as unanimous in the meaning it conveyed. Not only autonomous stylistic developments have been responsible for changes of trends and meanings, but differing and constantly changing approaches to nationalist issues had their impact as well. Architecture, poetry, literature, the theatre, painting and sculpture participated in molding the varying tones of the invented content of Jewish culture in Eretz-Israel. Hence stylistic changes evolved from ideological motivations as well as other influences (of international artistic trends for instance), in a variety of ways which were not fully investigated yet.

Inventing a culture necessarily involves many different apparent and hidden factors. One important factor is a reliance on a past, and in the case of Zionism, as in the case of other modern nationalisms, there was a need to create an appropriate past that would promote the national need; a past that would provide not only territorial roots and a reliance on a heroic Golden Age, but also a bondage between communities dispersed for centuries around the world.⁸ Tracing the artistic and architectural efforts to create a reliance on an invented past reveals some of the unique problems of the Jewish national revival. It is connected also to the conception of indigenous culture and its interpretation within the general quest for a cultural revival. In that respect early immigration waves to Palestine (until the 1930s) were unlike other immigrations around the world, including later immigrations to Palestine or the State of Israel⁹ for while throughout history immigrants strove to assimilate with the local culture of the new country Jewish immigrants were determined to give up their old culture only for the sake of the newly invented Hebrew culture.¹⁰ For the Jewish immigrants assimilating with local Arab culture was out of the question, although at different periods they did affiliate with it to a certain extent, as will be explained later. The Arabs in Palestine were perceived as a marginal group of dispersed

inhabitants possessing no real culture of their own. Furthermore, Palestine was often described as a desolate land in travellers' writings and in Zionist publications.¹¹ Therefore Zionists had to search elsewhere for ideological materials for the new, invented Hebrew culture.

The history of Zionist creative production in Eretz-Israel begins with modern Jewish colonization in Palestine (the "new *Yishuv*"), prior to the establishment of the Zionist Organization (mostly by Jews from Eastern Europe). The problem of an appropriate formal inspiration for building the settlers' houses emerged as soon as the first *moshavot* (see glossary) had been erected. The pioneering settlers were quite aware of their vocation as the founders of a new Jewish society, though they did not yet acquire a developed set of principles. The land they wished to settle on was under Ottoman rule (since 1517), inhabited by a majority of Moslems and minorities of Christians, Druze, and a small community of Jews (the "old *Yishuv*") who dwelled in several towns: Jerusalem, Tiberias, Saffad, Nablus and Hebron. From 1876 on, small groups of Jewish settlers arrived from Eastern Europe and founded the first *moshavot*, thus setting the foundation for the "new *Yishuv*".¹² In 1881-1882 a larger wave of settlers arrived, mostly members of "Hibbat-Zion", or "Bilu", two contemporary pre-Zionist Jewish movements. Although there were differences of approach towards national issues between different groups and leaders, in general they all strove to achieve a Jewish national revival in Eretz-Israel.¹³ Those groups, whose nationalist ideas were formed basically by the discrimination they suffered from in their homelands and by prevailing nationalist tendencies, were determined to develop an autonomous Jewish society in Palestine. Hence their rejection of local Arab society or Jewish "old *Yishuv*".¹⁴ However, although they were aware of their vocation as the founders of a new Jewish society, they did not yet acquire a developed set of principles that could determine a set of forms to the new culture. Their houses in the *moshavot* were not as declarative as some of the architectural enterprises created after the arrival of the more ideologically oriented second immigration wave (1904-1914). Since architecture, more than other art form, is directly connected to the land, its materials, its topographical and climatic characteristics, one may assume that this art form would be more connected to indigenous architecture. Hence the history of Zionist architecture, beginning with the first *moshavot* and to the present day, evolves to a great extent around

the problem of the preparedness to accept the local architecture and its variety of interpretations.

The fact that the Baron Benjamin Edmond Rothschild of Paris was the most important patron of early Jewish settlements is relevant to the understanding of the debate over an appropriate style for the first *moshavot*. Rothschild was not a member of any of the Jewish national organisations but he was interested in a solution for the problem of the Jews; his involvement was a response to the settlers' plea for help after they encountered fatal difficulties in their early settlement attempts. He was not an adherent of the cultural revival either, and since he left the concrete implementation of his philanthropic intentions in the hands of his initially anti-Zionist administrators, no nationalist significance determined the architectural style they promoted. Therefore architectural forms in the *moshavot* had not been dictated directly by Rothschild; they had been subject to a variety of other considerations.

As the planning and building of the *moshavot* was the first authentic creation of the Jewish settlers in Eretz-Israel, the investigation of its architectural forms is imperative for the understanding of the forces that determined the future development of Zionist architecture.¹⁵ The *moshavot* being agricultural settlements, it is appropriate to look for similarly rural sources of inspiration. Local indigenous Arab architecture at that time was chiefly rural, the stone houses consisted of small units with flat or domed roofs. Domestic functions, such as washing and cooking, took place mostly inside a walled courtyard. The picturesque pattern of the Arab village did not follow a planned design; the houses looked as though they were piled next to each other haphazardly (plate 9), maintaining a constant dialogue with the topography and surrounding scenery. Yet although it was well adapted to local conditions, the settlers rejected local Arab architecture as a source of emulation. The main reason was that they conceived themselves as an instrument for achieving a new distinct way of life and a new Hebrew, anti-Diaspora, person. As mentioned above, the roots of the pioneers' ideology were set in the ground of their own historical fate as a minority and the profound influence of prevailing trends of nationalist separateness in east Europe. Consequently they wished to apply this separateness also in relation to the indigenous inhabitants and their culture. However, in the early *moshavot* Arab indigenous architecture was not completely abandoned and its influence can be detected through direct and indirect references; the Jewish settlers adopted some of the Arab construction

methods, the preparation of building materials, the use of stone, stonecutting and certain design elements such as arches and vaults.¹⁶ Mostly, whatever formal influences can be detected, they had been indirectly introduced through the reliance on Templer¹⁷ architecture. Templer architecture in Palestine is an example of an integration of styles as a result of specific needs and what seems like an absence of ideological setbacks. Ben-Arzi (1997), who investigated the architectural history of the *moshavot*, pointed out the German Templer colonies (built between 1860s and 1870s) and rural architecture in European countries from which the settlers came, as the two main formal sources for architecture in the *moshavot*. Ben-Arzi claimed that rural European architecture had limited influence for the same ideological ideas that brought about the rejection of local indigenous architecture.¹⁸ But while the traditional aspect of Arab houses made them unacceptable, European characteristics such as tiled roofs and wooden carved cornices were common. However the Templer houses probably had a larger impact, especially as they were based on a modern plan established by the Templers during their sojourn in Palestine. Their angular houses consisted of two storeys, many spacious rooms and tiled roofs (plate 11). In comparison to European and Arab traditional houses, the Templer houses were successfully adapted to modern needs as well as local conditions; they were built well apart from each other and the arrangement of the backyards answered the needs of modern agriculture and farming. It seems that Templer architecture had a more significant impact on the *moshavot* first and foremost because it served as proof that Europeans could settle in an eastern country;¹⁹ their houses were certainly well suited to the needs of Europeans in Palestine. Templer architecture in a few cases had been a direct contributor to building in the *moshavot* when Templer builders, who were known for the quality of their work, were hired to plan and build dwellings and public buildings in some of the *moshavot*.

However, the question of the choice of an architectural style for the *moshavot* was not answered unanimously. An incident that occurred during the establishment of Metullah, a *moshava* in the Upper Galilee, illustrates the debates and tensions which were aroused due to diversity in attitude of the different parties involved. In Metullah, which was erected by the Baron Rothschild administration, a disagreement occurred between the settlers on one hand, and the "Hibbat-Zion" leaders and the Rothschild administrators on the other. "Hibbat-Zion" leaders and ICA (Jewish Colonization Association; see glossary)

members under the direction of the Baron Rothschild, believed that the *moshavot* should resemble Arab villages. In the case of Metullah an ICA official used security to defend his opinion saying that an Arab style would not draw the attention of hostile passers-by. Ahad Ha'am's report on what had eventually happened to the ICA initiative sheds light also on the universal tension between ideology and practicality: "...ICA decided to build Arab style dwellings with a domed roof of stone instead of a tiled one as in Europe. An architect was sent from Paris especially for this purpose and he constructed five 'Arab' houses, each costing about 4,000 francs, more than the European ones would have cost!" In the winter the costly domes leaked and the settlers had their way: European tiled roofs were constructed to replace the domes.²⁰ The fact that an architect was brought from France to build local Arab style houses in Palestine is evidence of the inability and refusal of the European initiators, administrators and settlers to relate directly to the indigenous reality, even when on a theoretic level they expressed their wish to do so. The incident also reflects upon the tension between the Zionist pioneers who actually settled in Palestine and their promoters in the Diaspora over the domination of the Jewish scene in Palestine. Paradoxically, though, the settlers who directly encountered the indigenous reality in Palestine rejected it, while the Diaspora leaders, whose contact with life in Palestine was ideological and abstract, endorsed an affiliation to indigenous architecture.

Eventually two building types emerged in the *moshavot*, almost all *moshavot* under the Baron Rothschild and the ICA patronage followed a uniform plan of small two room houses. The other thirteen private *moshavot* allowed for a free style of architecture, which developed into a more spacious plan and even two-storey dwellings, with tiled roofs, after Templer and European examples. Rishon Lezion (plate 10) was a private *moshava*, founded in 1882 by Hibat Zion and Bilu members, that was compelled to turn to Rothschild for support after facing hardships, poverty and famine. The illustration shows different shapes and sizes of the first houses, including a couple that resemble Templer style. Thus early Jewish settlement had been conscious enough of its special nationalistic role to reject indigenous Arab culture, but did not yet develop tools to create a distinct style. Later, after the establishment of the World Zionist Organization in 1897, attempts towards the creation of a new culture intensified and were intentionally opposed not only to Jewish culture left behind by the Zionist immigrants, but to everything the old Jewish settlement in Palestine (the "old *Yishuv*") stood for as well. The "old *Yishuv*" resembled

the Diaspora Jews and was far removed from Zionist ideas of productive life. Even the early *moshavot*, since they had been sponsored by Rothschild, were also perceived by the Zionist Organization as dependent on others as the “old *Yishuv*” had been. The fact that Rothschild and ICA dictated an architectural style inspired by indigenous architecture added to its rejection by later Zionist settlers.

To understand the connections between Zionist ideology and Zionist building enterprises in Palestine a number of questions should be asked: Why did the wish for a new identity of a “new Jewish person” become an important factor of Zionist ideology? What was this identity? What were the changing political and social circumstances connected to the quest for a new identity? And finally, what effect did this quest have on local architecture? These questions, although central for the investigation of the connections of political issues and cultural developments, will be dealt with only briefly in the following passages, as they concern a scope too wide to be thoroughly explored in this context. Yet as brief as it may be, it is essential to attempt a proposition for a basis of understanding of the forces at work at the time the foundation was set for the national and cultural revival.

Since its emergence, Zionism had focused its efforts on its ultimate goal of establishing a Jewish state, and from the beginning the territorial choice had been Eretz-Israel (although at a certain stage Theodor Herzl, the founder of the Zionist Congresses and the Zionist Organization, was prepared to consider Uganda as an alternative temporary solution). As Anthony Smith pointed out, more than any other aspect of nationalism, it is the territorial dimension that demands the power of symbolism and imagery.²¹ The urge to possess land, which characterizes nationalism, is not confined to political properties; it is desired for its symbolic value hence it is described in terms such as the land of “our ancestors”, the historic land etc. The task requires creating necessary symbols, images and concepts of nationalism, ideology and language, to formulate an affiliation of the people with the territory (Greek, Armenian and Black nationalisms, says Smith, have been nourished by symbolic powers of a historic territory and were able to mobilize their peoples only by presenting a vision of a revival of the ancestral territory in order to turn it into a homeland. Yet the most “dramatic” case, according to Smith is Zionism²²). The choice of Eretz-Israel, Zion, as the destination country for Jews was a religious and historical one, certainly not conditioned by economical or strategic interests

as is the case in most immigrations. Many symbols of the national revival had come from the Jewish religion, first and foremost the language, which was the "sacred tongue" of the Bible. The only common denominator of immigrants from different parts of the world was the fact that they were all Jews²³, even when there was no common religious life any more. From the beginning there had been a promise suggested in the Zionist movement that a state of its own would cure the maladies of the Jewish people; that not only a new culture, but also a new Jewish person, a new identity would emerge.²⁴ Yet unlike most other nationalisms, it was not a pre-existing national culture that aroused and created the Jewish national revival but quite the opposite; the national movement was the major generator of the new national culture.²⁵ To understand the circumstances that led to this development, some background information is required. As it is not the subject of this thesis, and anyway, the historiography of the development of Zionist culture and Hebrew identity is brief and incomplete, the forthcoming abbreviated account will not be comprehensive or profound, yet hopefully it would serve the necessary background for the issue presented here.

Religious rites and a common historical fate bound the Jews of the Diaspora together ever since the dispersion of the Jews. Each community developed its own cultural trends, which obviously were influenced by local culture. Therefore, at the rise of the national movement, there was no one national culture. Zionism emanated not only as a response to anti-Semitism (although the Dreyfus trial in France in 1894 had been a major catalyst), but also from a disaffection towards many elements of Jewish life in Eastern Europe at the end of the nineteenth century, especially among secular Jews. Jewish culture in those communities was in a state of decline, and there was an inclination to dispense with many of its traditional constituents; there were assimilationists who were willing to give up Jewish culture altogether. Zionist leaders believed a creation of a common culture that would serve a common national identity is crucial for the fulfilment of Zionist goals. Although Zionist *Weltanschauung* encouraged its secular members to affirm Jewish distinctiveness, it also required a critical approach towards Judaism (which had been articulated among assimilated circles in the eighteenth century and since) while incorporating commendable aspects of the civilizations with which the Jews had had contact.²⁶ This brought about a demand from Zionist agents of culture to provide a clear and definite content for the national revival. Most of the historiography of cultural aspects

of Zionist movements emphasizes their association with Jewish statehood. Zionism actually wished to mould a future in the image of an “authentic” past, the past that is common to the entire Jewish people, the past in its ancient homeland.²⁷ This past should be rediscovered and resurrected to provide a national regeneration.²⁸ Yet recent research also looks at the Zionist attempt to create a Jewish people as a national-cultural entity, separate from the link with the wish to establish a nation-state. M. Berkowitz points out that bearing in mind that Jewry had been deeply divided along religious, geographical, linguistic, social, economic and political lines, the first and foremost obligation of the Zionist Organization had been to invent ways to create a more unified entity, a “vicarious nationalism”; one important means of creating the “vicarious nationalism” was to fabricate a national culture which did not demand of Jews to necessarily settle in Eretz-Israel.²⁹ Thus a new way of identification as a Jewish people had become possible for Western Jews, unifying the Jews who remained in the Diaspora in Europe in a joint interest in the welfare of the Zionist settlement in Eretz-Israel. It is interesting to note in this connection, that official membership in Zionist organizations never numbered more than a fraction of assimilated Jews prior to the First World War.³⁰ Furthermore, the Zionist settlers in Palestine developed an agenda of their own resulting from specific local circumstances, quite often separate from the Zionist agenda in the Diaspora. This situation had an enormous effect on different aspects of social, political and cultural life in Palestine, and on the European Zionists’ actions and decisions. For instance, the new-*Yishuv* was dependent on Zionist leaders in the Diaspora for the recruitment of immigrants to settle in Palestine. On the other hand, in order to maintain the Western and modern image of the new Jewish settlement, Zionist leaders obscured the presence of Jewish immigrants from Yemen and other Arab countries in the *moshavot*. Those immigrants are absent from the story of the modern Jewish settlement in Palestine as they were not affiliated with the World Zionist Organization, since they arrived in Palestine independently, and also due to the fact that they were associated with the “inferior” mentality of the local Arabs. It is possible that the fact that on the whole those Jews were quite observant, was another alienating factor; the religious aspect of their affinity with Eretz Israel was not in accord with the anti-Diaspora nature of Zionist trends. As a consequence of the rejection of traditional Jewish life the majority of those Jews who accepted the new Zionist culture were European, middle class, urbanized, and characterized by their detachment from

orthodoxy and Yiddish and had shown an inclination towards higher education. Among those there was a large number of university students.

The Zionist Congress³¹ had been the major culture agent of the national revival.³² Since the centre of Zionist Movement activities was in Germany until 1920, German influence prevailed over all political and cultural actions. The Congress involved cultural activities such as an exhibition of works by Jewish artists organized by Martin Buber (see appendix: biographical note) for the Fifth Congress in 1901. The issue of the "cultural question", the *Kulturfrage* (as it was referred to in the Zionist Congresses), was discussed there as well as the issue of the Jewish "New Man". Furthermore, the Jewish National Fund (established by the Fifth Congress), officially a tool for purchasing land in Eretz-Israel, became the principal instrument tying Jews to Zionism and also the most effective transmitter of nationalistic myths and symbols.

Yet the *Kulturfrage* caused a debate that reveals the bond between national and cultural issues in the minds of Zionist leaders and ideologists. Herzl, himself a well educated person, a reporter and a writer, believed in the centrality of culture in Jewish life and that Zionism contained a form of *Bildung* (a term which combines character formation and moral education).³³ But in his opinion the cultural issue did not belong on the Zionist agenda, not because it was not valuable in itself, but since only the founding of the future Jewish State and not an attempt to define its cultural identity *a priori* would solve the problem of a people without a state.³⁴ Others (Ahad Ha'am, Yoseph Chaim Brener) believed that there was no future for the Jewish people and the Zionist dream without a cultural renaissance, which would redefine the Jewish people in secular terms. "Hibbat Zion" members, and later the Zionists, sought for a "pure" and "authentic" existence of the "Hebrew nation in its land".³⁵ Yet they were all united by the concept that cultural autonomy could eventually be achieved only in an autonomous Hebrew speaking society in Eretz-Israel.³⁶ They also all contributed to the creation of the image of the "New Jew" and to Zionist images of Palestine. Prior to the Zionist Movement the recognizable scenes of Eretz-Israel were associated with ancient Jewish heritage - the Wailing Wall and the Tower of David in Jerusalem and Rachel's Tomb near Bethlehem. The Zionist images of Palestine consisted of specific images of landscapes and Jewish settlements that provided a common visual concept and became part of Jewish consciousness in European Jewry. Thus Palestine was perceived, in the consciousness of many Jews, as a

Jewish country, and the images of Palestine were glorified by them.³⁷ Those Zionist images included pictures of settlers in the *moshavot*, mostly at work in the fields, looking happy and healthy. The fact that they often suffered famine and despair was obviously concealed in images issued in Zionist publications. The settlers' dwellings and public institutions (especially schools, which would be discussed later) were also depicted to complete the Zionist picture of an advanced society. Those images were intentionally opposed not only to the indigenous Arab scene and to the Jewish culture left behind by the Zionist immigrants, but to everything the old Jewish settlement in Palestine (the "old *Yishuv*") stood for as well. The "old *Yishuv*" resembled the Diaspora Jews and was far removed from Zionist ideas; hence the term "Hebrew" instead of "Jewish" to identify the new Eretz-Israel culture was used not only to indicate the language (which was revived at that time and became a modern language, while ultra-orthodox Jews have avoided the use of Hebrew unless for religious purposes). It was also used to identify the new Eretz-Israel Jew - the non-Diaspora Jew. The idea of a new Hebrew person and Hebrew culture were the creation of Zionist ideology, which provided the principles for the alternative culture. Those principles stemmed from the sources of the Zionist movement.³⁸

Certain elements within the Jewish national movement served as the ideologists and agents of cultural creativity, mainly through consciously directed publicist, literary and educational activity. As mentioned before, the image of the "New Hebrew Person" they wished to create was an antithesis of the Diaspora Jew stereotype; it was of one devoted to physical labour, preferably in agriculture (to "working the land") and to armed self-defence and above all to the use of the new, colloquial Hebrew. This robust, close to nature image was not only the complete opposite of the stereotype of a Jew, it was also well rooted in Russian and East European cultural trends of the nineteenth century. Those trends were nurtured among educated circles in Russian and East European society in general. Russian poetry of the time and subsequently Hebrew poetry as well reveal a vogue for worshipping simple folk who cultivate the land. These stereotyped images were familiar to Zionists in Russia and Eastern Europe before they arrived in Palestine. Together with the idolizing of simple folk, they brought with them to Eretz-Israel Russian folk music, dances and dress.³⁹ To a certain extent the local Arabs in Palestine were, in the eyes of Zionist settlers, the equivalent of the idealized image of Russian simple folk.⁴⁰

Hence the inclination of the settlers towards oriental stereotypes was only partially and indirectly born through the encounter with Arabs in Palestine.

The attitude towards local indigenous culture is a major factor in the investigation of the creation of a nationalism; in the case of Zionism, the attitude towards Arab culture has been since its early stage a powerful factor that still reverberates forcefully into the present, more than one hundred years later. Yet the Zionist movement never had a unanimous attitude towards Arab culture; different parties and persons have offered a range of opinions. At the beginning of the twentieth century four main different trends prevailed simultaneously⁴¹: there were those among educated Zionists who held an altruistic view, envisioning an inevitable merge with the Orient; most farmers of the early *moshavot* belonged to the other extreme and advocated a patronizing attitude towards the Arabs and a complete separateness from them and their culture; there were those among Zionist Organization leaders and educated Zionists who held a liberal and practical view that attempted to promote ways of maintaining an Arab-Jewish co-existence; and finally the Zionist socialists advanced a blend of socialism with a constructive attitude in seeking a way to implement social ideas in the complex situation. This divergence of views may have accounted for the variety of images by which Zionists perceived Arabs.

On the whole, Arabs were very seldom related to directly and therefore their culture was not viewed for what it was; whatever the attitude of the perceiver they were perceived as stereotypes. One way of presenting a positive image of the Arabs was to portray them as brave warriors and men of the soil, and furthermore - as the preservers of the ancient Hebrew forefathers' heritage. Yet at the same time they were also despised (not exclusively by Zionists; see Patrick Geddes's attitude to Arabs in part 2 chapter 1) as savage, inferior and culturally backward. This generally stereotyped and sterile attitude was based on a Western image of the people of the Orient rather than on real living people amongst whom the Zionist settlers came to live. On the whole, in Zionist contexts, the Arabs were depicted as being marginal on the Palestinian scene, although paradoxically they were in many respects idolized.⁴² Hence, just as the portrayal of Jewish life in Palestine was fragmented and idealized, realistic depictions of Arab society were almost non-existent. Yet as a means towards the creation of a Hebrew culture and a Hebrew person, quite a few Jewish settlers wished to merge with the image they created of the people and the culture of the Orient, and yet preserve their Jewish identity.

Discarding traditional Jewish clothes, and adopting indigenous Arab dress was popular in certain circles, especially by members of "Ha'shomer" (a watchmen association established in 1909, mainly to protect the settlements against Arab robbers!). The "Shomrim" (watchmen) also spoke fluent Arabic, held guns and rode Arab horses. This situation can be interpreted partially as a search for roots in the indigenous people, and it prevailed over all levels of life and fields of art and culture. Yet underneath the Arab *gallabie* the "Shomrim" wore the traditional embroidered shirt worn by Russian folk and European riding boots. The attributes that were supposed to identify the new Hebrew person originated then in a variety of East and West sources.

Literature and poetry, perhaps more than any other forms of art, were recruited to the task of creating the new Hebrew culture and many authors at that time went along with the orientalist trend. In their novels they described persons who came from Europe and wished to adapt themselves to indigenous Arab culture as a means of re-establishing their roots in Eretz-Israel (two major authors in that group were Yoseph Chaim Brenner and Shmuel Yoseph Agnon - a Nobel Prize winner, both immigrants from Eastern Europe).

Yet it was the educational system set up in Palestine for the immigrants and their children that had become the beacon of Zionist *Bildung*. The schools, and particularly the agricultural schools, were the first and foremost tool for the creation of the "New Hebrew Person" both for those who actually studied in them and for those who remained in the Diaspora and were exposed to venerating descriptions in Zionist propaganda.⁴³ Three schools were placed at the front of the Zionist campaign for the creation of the new Hebrew culture and were praised as producing the finest fruits of *Bildung*⁴⁴; they are also central for the discussion of early Zionist architecture and its orientalist trends. The Bezalel School of Art and the Herzlia Gymnasia, which were established and inaugurated in 1906, and the Technion in Haifa, planned about the same time, but did not start functioning until 1925. The story of the schools and of their architecture is intertwined with their political and cultural role, therefore it is necessary to begin with the Bezalel Art School which set the foundation for the art and architectural styles at the turn of the century.⁴⁵

The Bezalel School played a central role in the orientalist trend in the Zionist movement at the turn of the century, and it also claimed a founding role for artistic activity in Eretz-Israel. Its artistic inclination towards the Orient was again an example of an

oriental inclination that was not locally originated. The difference between European orientalism at the turn of the century and the Jewish Palestinian orientalism was that the latter had an ideological variant of its own that connected it to the Orient and could have had immediate and direct oriental sources. Yet as the encounter with the actual Orient in Palestine had little impact on local Jewish culture, it bore different effects on artists at different periods of time. The interpretation of the Orient, whether actual or imaginary, was dependent on political and social circumstances.

Understanding the origins of artistic endeavours by Jewish artists in Eretz-Israel is significant for the appreciation of Bezalel art. Those endeavours were not completely *ex nihilo*, contrary to the impression Schatz wished to establish, accommodating with the spirit of creating a new, unprecedented image of the Jewish person. Although it was the Bezalel artists' aim to create a new, Hebrew, art style, their work can be seen as an extension within the context of the broader question of "Jewish art". Particularly considering that the flowering of Jewish art at the turn of the century was actually part of the national revival in Eastern Europe. Traditionally, visual arts were not cultivated among Jews as much as literature or music, because Jewish religious law forbids creating a likeness of human beings (the second of the Ten Commandments, which was interpreted in different ways along history). Yet at the time of the rising of Zionism, two major developments had occurred in the artistic world of East European Jewry. First, more Jews than ever before had turned to the visual arts, and apart from their universal themes, they also depicted episodes from Jewish life. Secondly, the issue of "Jewish art" had become a focus of interest for historians and art critics. This arousing interest in Jewish art can be interpreted as an expression of the need of the Jewish minority in East Europe to define itself culturally.⁴⁶ Even the term "Jewish art" itself came into use about that time (yet has since been only vaguely defined). At an early stage of the Zionist movement the question of "Jewish art" was part of the "cultural question", discussed in association with national issues at the Zionist Congresses. Martin Buber, a philosopher and theologian, who had studied Art History with Alois Riegl and Franz Wickhoff (and, as mentioned above, arranged the Jewish artists' exhibition for the Fifth Zionist Congress), denied the existence of Jewish art "because a national art needs a soil from which to spring and a sky toward which to rise...a national style needs a homogeneous society from which it grows and for whom it exists."⁴⁷

Historical research has not provided any evidence of Jewish artistic activity in Palestine at the time of the emergence of the Zionist national revival. Even if there were active artists or artisans, there was probably no organized framework for artistic activity. Furthermore, Palestine was a remote and impoverished province of the Ottoman Empire, and the small community of Zionist pioneers was engaged in surviving the severe conditions in the colonies. However, following the efforts of leaders such as Ahad Ha'Am, who spoke of a creation of a spiritual centre in Eretz-Israel, the Zionist Organization supported the establishment of an arts and crafts school in Jerusalem. In fact, the establishment of the Bezalel⁴⁸ School of Art in 1906 was the most outstanding Zionist artistic endeavour in Palestine and the precursor of the orientalist style in local Hebrew art. As will be explained later, this local orientalist style was not a direct outcome of the encounter with the Orient; it was formally influenced by European orientalist trends, but its *raison d'être* and ideological foundation emerged from a different source.

Bezalel was initiated, founded and directed by the Zionist sculptor Boris Schatz (1866-1932).⁴⁹ In 1901 Schatz attended the Fifth Zionist Congress in Basle, to discuss his plans with Theodor Herzl (one of Schatz's sculptures was on display in Buber's art exhibition). His efforts were fruitful: in the Seventh Zionist Congress (1905), the Zionist Organization decided to fund the art school, and in 1906 Schatz arrived in Jerusalem to materialise his utopian dream. Schatz's idea was a revolutionary one in more than one sense; it consisted of a utopic vision of a new authentic art style as well as a rebellious, anti-Diaspora action. Schatz's private biography illuminates the more general issue of the part played by the visual arts in the national revival; it actually demonstrates the route taken by many East European Jews who chose to become Zionists. Schatz was born in Lithuania, where his family was part of a large Jewish community. His parents intended him to become a rabbi, but Schatz, who showed artistic tendencies from an early age, became acquainted with the writings of the Jewish scholars of the Enlightenment period and turned his back on orthodox Judaism. In 1888 he moved to Warsaw to study under the Polish sculptor Antokolsky. Later he moved to Bulgaria where he became the court sculptor and one of the directors of the National Academy of Art in Sofia. Like other Zionists, Schatz too dreamed of a new Eretz-Israel Jew, who would turn his back on the Jewish mentality of the Diaspora, and take up the rather romantic image of a biblical Jew as an ideal. In his utopian book *Jerusalem Rebuilt* (Jerusalem, 1925), Schatz described

Eretz-Israel in the year 2018. His futuristic utopian vision was of a "paradise" where people would stroll attired in oriental robes, call themselves by biblical names and speak the language of the Bible while enjoying a technologically contemporary life style. Furthermore, the description includes a Third Temple, built not as a religious centre, but as a Jewish museum. The Arabs in Palestine, he believed, lived in the same mode as the Jews would have, had they not left the land of their forefathers. Like the *Shomrim*, and following his own vision, Schatz illustrated this idea by occasionally wearing traditional Arab attire.

On the other hand Schatz was also greatly influenced by the writings of John Ruskin, and wished to become the "Hebrew Ruskin".⁵⁰ Following Ruskin, he believed that the art of a people reflects its national ambitions and cultural character. Hence, his idea of a School of Art in Jerusalem was that it should not only create a new Jewish art, but also a completely new art style in the service of a healthier, closer to nature society, away from the old European civilisation. On these lines he believed that he could contribute to the fulfilment of the Zionist dream through developing a new Jewish style of visual art.⁵¹ Indeed, compared to the Jewish community in Jerusalem (the old *Yishuv*), Schatz and the vision of an art school he wished to establish presented an extreme opposite. While the old *Yishuv* members in Jerusalem were a closed, orthodox community, which preserved Diaspora and ghetto customs, Schatz wished for integration among different groups (Jews and Arabs, and Jewish immigrants from East and West) and an openness to the world. While the old *Yishuv* members lived entirely on contributions from Jewish communities abroad, Schatz and other Zionist founders of Bezalel believed that the school would bring about a productive Jewish society.⁵² This latter wish was shared by all Zionists and inspired the ideology of the new Hebrew person as explained formerly.

The Bezalel School was first housed temporarily in a small shack and later Schatz purchased two large Arab buildings, standing next to each other on a hilltop in the western part of town (plate 12). It was Schatz's wish that the Bezalel site would allow a view of the Temple Mount⁵³ since he believed that the school would provide a foundation for the erection of a Jewish art museum, which was his idea for the Third Temple (as a matter of fact the present Israel Museum in Jerusalem emanates from the Bezalel art and archaeology collection). In 1908 Schatz set up his school and lodging there. The building itself has become an emblem (although the Art School is now part of the Hebrew

University campus, the old building has been declared as a national heritage for preservation).

Schatz combined a number of components to create his own idea of a new, authentic, Hebrew art. He shared Ahad Ha'Am's views that the acceptance of the Bible as the major cultural resource of the Jewish nation was unacceptable, and that the Diaspora cultural achievements should not be forgotten. As the former conviction had been in accord with most Zionist activists' beliefs, the latter had been quite renounced. However, Schatz and his colleagues and students in Bezalel, interpreted Ahad Ha'Am's thought by depicting Jewish subjects of the Diaspora. Yet as they were situated in Jerusalem, they had local Jews posing for them, personifying Diaspora Jews. But this was not the only discrepancy Schatz had introduced along his quest for a Hebrew style. Although he founded Bezalel on the basis of the ideas of the Arts and Crafts Movement, the new Jewish artistic style he had in mind was a combination of Eastern European academic Romanticism and oriental craftsmanship.⁵⁴ For Schatz, as well as many other European intellectuals, the East and eastern life and manners signified a romantic model for an affinity to nature, a characteristic that fit in with Zionist ideas of "working the land", and qualities which the Jews in Eretz-Israel should acquire.⁵⁵ Even though the oriental attributes in Bezalel art came from different sources they were all supposed to represent the presumably ancient Hebrew-Biblical roots that were associated with the new art. The iconography mostly leaned heavily on Biblical (Old Testament) scenes and the figures that took place in them were either images of Arabs, or of figures from ancient Middle-Eastern art. Therefore depictions of contemporary indigenous life never appeared in Bezalel art; oriental motifs were used for the depiction of biblical content. In this sense Bezalel concepts followed orientalist artists of mid nineteenth century who depicted topographical scenes of the Holy Land inhabited not with real, living people, but with imaginary biblical images.

This Zionist attitude to biblical sources was completely alienated to Jewish-orthodox attitude, that had been affected by hundreds of years of religious dogma created in the Diaspora. For Schatz it was the East and an idealized image of indigenous inhabitants of the Holy Land, rather than the Jewish religion and the Jews of his own time, that formed the link between Diaspora Jews and the new "Hebrews". Bezalel art thus attempted to visualize a biblical past in Eretz-Israel, that past which Zionism chose to link

with, by means of depictions that would arouse nostalgic feelings towards a dream-land that existed in the realm of the legendary, the land to which every Jew yearned for in his prayers for centuries. Paradoxically perhaps, Schatz and his fellow artists and students had never actually responded directly to their oriental surrounding. The artists who taught in Bezalel went along with Schatz's orientalist style, the Orient being perceived as embodying the ancient origins of Judaism. Yet the Orient provided another source of reference – the ancient world of the Middle East – Egypt and Mesopotamia. Ephraim Lilien and Zeev Raban, who were famous mostly for their Art Nouveau style book illuminations, chose for their subject matter relevant Zionist themes or orthodox and unorthodox scenes from the Bible (for instance Lilien's illustration for *Die Bucher der Bibel*, 1908, "Moses on Mount Sinai", see plate 13, and Raban's illustrations for "Song of Songs", 1923, see plate 14). Moses in Lilien's illustration is depicted as an ancient Mesopotamian monarch (as the figure also resembles Herzl, Lilien must have linked Moses and the founder of Zionism), and the technique of both artists follows European standards of beauty. *Jugendstile* art in Europe at the turn of the century also turned to models from ancient Near-East art, especially Egyptian ones. In the context of the revival of Hebrew culture and art this vogue gained additional meaning. Thus Bezalel style has become synonymous with a particular blend of orientalist and other western styles in the early days of Israeli art. Its workshops housed artists and craftsmen, immigrants from West and East. Yet whereas the Jewish population was small and poor, the greater part of its production of *objets d'art* was exhibited and purchased abroad.

The oriental inclination, manifested in the Bezalel style, was exhibited in architectural projects as well. The architecture of public buildings was naturally more elaborately discussed than private ones. Furthermore, it well may be that the question of style was more acute, because public buildings manifested a physical manifestation, visible to all, of educational as well as propaganda significance. The aptness of an orientalist style within the search for an appropriate Hebrew style was most conspicuous in public buildings, as the example of the Herzlia Gymnasia demonstrates. Herzlia Gymnasia had definitely become the Zionist educational institution *par excellence*, not only owing to its primary position as a Hebrew school, but also for its significant architectural image, repeatedly shown on postcards since its establishment, in the "First Hebrew Town" – Tel Aviv.⁵⁶

The idea of a "Hebrew Gymnasium", was discussed in the sixth Zionist Congress (1903) in Basle, as part of the plan to create a Hebrew culture.⁵⁷ Among other things, it was argued that studies would be carried on in Hebrew (as mentioned before, the renewal of the ancient language was of utmost importance for the national and cultural revival ideology), and that the graduates would become potential students in the planned Hebrew University. The Jaffa Hebrew Gymnasium⁵⁸ was established in 1906 by the Hebrew Gymnasium Association. After bitter debates between the Association and representatives of a number of *moshavot*, it was decided that it was most appropriate and practical that the school should be situated in the Hebrew town of Tel Aviv.⁵⁹ The school epitomized the Hebrew identity that Zionism expected to produce; in a 1913 documentary film produced for the eleventh Congress, the pupils are photographed out of doors, in a gymnastics class and working in the school vegetable garden (occupations associated with the Zionist New Person). It was a German dominated school, with quite a few Zionist leaders among the teachers. Thus the Herzlia Gymnasia served as a tool to demonstrate a harmony between the *Yishuv* and European Zionists.⁶⁰

In 1909 the corner stone was laid for the Herzlia Gymnasia (it was then named the Herzlia Gymnasia after Herzl) building in Tel Aviv, the architect Yoseph Barsky, a Bezalel graduate, was nominated to design it, and in 1910 the building was ready (plate 15). The Herzlia Gymnasia building was in the form of three wings enclosing a courtyard (plate 16), the middle wing was the facade, and the courtyard was behind it (the building was demolished in 1958). Presenting an enormous difference in scale compared to the residential units next to it, and a symmetrical design, the building turned into an imposing fortress, towering above the small houses of the new neighbourhood. Indeed, its importance was manifested far beyond its function as a school; therefore the domination of oriental attributes in the architectural form of the building was greatly denotative. Yet despite Barsky having applied those oriental details to the building, it did not imply an affiliation with the indigenous architecture of the close by Arab town and villages. The Herzlia Gymnasia was rather like an enormous piece of stage scenery set up in front of Tel-Aviv's main street (at that time). Perhaps the approach of the Association members to the building style they had requested, can provide the rationale. Barsky was ordered to prepare a design that would be reminiscent of the ancient wall of the Old City of Jerusalem, "with its small towers and small, narrow windows".⁶¹ He prepared the design

(plate 17) with the collaboration or supervision of his teacher Boris Schatz (whose signature is on the drawing of the proposed facade, although he was not an architect). No documentation has been found to certify the nature of Schatz's participation in the project), shows that he indeed followed the instructions of his clients. An examination of the actual building shows that eventually it was not designed exactly according to the preliminary plan, although the wall-like form has remained. Altogether, the design of the building's facade was in the spirit of the Bezalel oriental fantasy; it creates a quasi-ancient reference. Furthermore, the monumental main entrance presents an even more significant allusion to a heroic past; a careful consideration shows that it is not consistent with a few of the other oriental details of the plan for it derives from ancient Near-East architectural characteristics. Actually it is a replica of the facade of the popular contemporary reconstruction of the Temple of Solomon (plate 18). This reconstruction was prepared by G. Perrot and C. Chipiez and its earliest publication was in their book *"Histoire de l'Art Dans l'Antique"* (Paris 1882-1887). Their reconstruction was based on the Old Testament written description of the Temple of Solomon, and on the examination of remains of ancient monumental buildings in the Near East. Essentially, though, it had been a creation of the imagination. A later publication of the same reconstruction appeared in an article by D. Joseph, titled *"Stiftshutte, Tempel und Synagogenbauten"* in *Ost und West* (1901). The article included some of the drawings from the book and a number of new drawings based on the original reconstruction. E. Lilien (the artist and Bezalel teacher mentioned above) owned the French edition of the Perrot and Chipiez book, and a later English edition (1890) was in the possession of the Bezalel library.⁶² Thus, the Temple reconstruction had become widely spread and especially popular among Bezalel artists. The importance they granted to the Temple had been demonstrated first of all by the choice of the name of the school, after Bezalel son of Uri, the builder of the ancient shrine. Bezalel had thus become the archetype of the Hebrew artist, associated also with the Temple.⁶³ Also, as mentioned before, Schatz had envisaged the building of the Third Temple as an art museum. It is interesting that this image of the Temple was devoid of any religious associations. The Zionist image of the Temple was of supreme significance, but it had been merely as a national and cultural symbol of the ultimate achievement of the ancient Hebrews. Therefore Bezalel artists applied different elements from the reconstruction of the Temple in their designs,⁶⁴ and it was only natural for Barsky and Schatz to visualise the first

Hebrew school, the most significant tool of Zionist *Bildung*, in forms affiliated to the Temple.⁶⁵ This affiliation had become common knowledge; the general Jewish public did not require special interpretation to identify it and appreciate its significance. It was in accordance with the role of the Herzlia Gymnasia as a symbol of the Hebrew cultural revival. The building had become, therefore, a landmark in the attempts to create a new Hebrew architecture.

Another important aspect of the creation of a "Hebrew" architectural style emerges from comments the Hebrew Gymnasia Association members had made after inspecting the first design offered by Barsky and Schatz. It did not satisfy the clients, since they would not have the oriental details blur the Temple-like monumental entrance; they claimed the plan had too many Islamic attributes. Hence the dome and the Islamic ornamentation in the proposed facade had been removed, a few arches were flattened ("to diminish the mosque-like look") and the two "towers" on both sides of the main entrance were accentuated,⁶⁶ to resemble ancient Egyptian pylons⁶⁷ and the sacred Temple. The result of the rejection of the Islamic characteristics was a more unanimously ancient Near-East style, and an accentuation of the elements of the Temple reconstruction. There was no connection whatsoever between the orientalist forms of the facade and the arrangement of the symmetrical plan, which is typical to the tradition of representational European buildings. Yet it was the design of the main entrance of the Herzlia Gymnasia building that has become the emblem of the school, and it appears on the school's stamp even today, when it dwells in a different, modern looking building, in another part of Tel-Aviv.

Adopting the ancient Near-East characteristics had two advantages for the promoters of a new, "Hebrew", style – it created a link with an assumed Hebrew golden age, and avoided an acknowledgement of present existence in Eretz-Israel. The presence of those characteristics must have been relatively powerful, for their contribution to the invented concepts of Hebrew culture had not been exhausted in the 1900s, they reappeared on the artistic scene later on, when called up by new circumstances, as would be explained further on.

A different approach to oriental culture had emerged in the form of another architectural image; Alexander Baerwald's Technion (The Hebrew Technical Institute; plate 19) building in Haifa. It presented a variation on the oriental theme, which did not

attempt to create a past or a fantasy, on the contrary, it was well connected with contemporary indigenous culture. The Technion soon became a landmark in the quest for a Hebrew architecture, in this case in Haifa (an old harbour town on the Mediterranean coast). By the turn of the century Haifa, which consisted of an old Arab section and a German Templer colony, was going through tremendous changes. In 1905 the Ottoman government linked the town and port with the Hedjaz Railway. Hence the population increased, mainly by Jewish businessmen, clerks and artisans who were drawn to Haifa by the growing economic potential, and new residential development took place.⁶⁸ Haifa, then, was not altogether an ideal example of a fulfilment of the Zionist objective. Consequently the Zionist movement began to take increasing interest in Haifa (in Herzl's *Altneuland* the first Jewish city would develop from the town of Haifa). In 1908 the Jewish National Fund purchased the land for the Hebrew Technical Institute and the "*Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden*" (German Jews' Aid Society) financed its planning and construction.⁶⁹ It was thought that a Technikum (later known as the Technion) would establish a wider cultural centre in Haifa, thus substantiating its Jewish presence. The Technion was planned as the central component of an educational quarter (consisting of the "Reali" comprehensive school as well) named "*Atid*" (Hebrew for "future").

The oriental variant Alexander Baerwald (see biographical note), the architect of the Technion, introduced to the quest for a Hebrew architecture, was based on his belief that an architect working in Palestine must choose between a western and an oriental style, and he himself favoured the latter.⁷⁰ He considered the oriental style to achieve harmony with the land and its history and therefore, after he received the Technion commission in 1909 (the construction of which was completed about 1919 and inaugurated only in 1925, after delays due to the First World War and its aftermath⁷¹), he studied indigenous architecture during his frequent visits to Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem.⁷² He also opened an office in Haifa, with Barsky, the architect of Herzlia Gymnasia, as his assistant.⁷³ In 1912, while still in Germany, Baerwald prepared oriental style designs not only for the Technion, but also for different other buildings in Palestine. For instance a Teachers' Seminary in Jerusalem and various designs to house Jewish immigrants from Yemen (plate 20).⁷⁴ These drawings could well be sketches of existing Arab houses, lacking only the quality of an unplanned, or haphazard whole which is the outcome of a dwelling unit which grows according to changing needs, as is often the case



with traditional Arab houses. Those plans were not implemented, however one may assume that the units would not have been laid out in the Arab village manner, for the Arab village grew naturally, without pre-planning, while the Jewish settlements have always been carefully planned. Therefore, although the Baerwald proposed houses had a striking resemblance to indigenous architecture, their context would have been quite different. Baerwald chose indigenous architectural forms as a calculated solution to the question of an "authentic" style for the new immigrants who had gathered from West and East.⁷⁵ Although his oriental style was well rooted in the German eclectic architecture of his time,⁷⁶ Baerwald's direct encounter with indigenous houses produced an architectural style, which is less fantastic and scenery-like than the Herzlia Gymnasia building. The Baerwald designs hold together as integral, three-dimensional units. The drawings explicitly manifest Baerwald's direct fascination with indigenous Arab architecture, which continued after he had settled down in Haifa in 1925.

The Technion building has always been regarded as the most important among Baerwald's building projects in Palestine.⁷⁷ Whether the esteem of the building is due to its contribution to Zionist propaganda or to its architectural merits is yet to be investigated. Or perhaps it is its originally imposing position (which has since been lost due to the congested building around it) overlooking the Haifa bay, that made it stand out and attract attention. It stands on the northern slope of the Carmel Mountain, at the top of a large garden that added to its monumental quality, when entered at the bottom and walking up the path to the main entrance. The building had been designed to serve a western concept of studying and developing technology; consequently the basic design of the facade and the plan follow a traditional European official public building. It is symmetrically divided into two identical wings, by a prominent vault leading to the entrance door. A wide staircase leads to the main entrance. Yet the building presents a variety of oriental details: the use of local cut stone, the dome crowning the entrance, the monumental vault at the entrance, the "blind" vaults at the far end of each wing and the stylised parapet. The Technion and the Herzlia Gymnasia are very much alike – both had a three-winged plan, a symmetrical and representational facade, and oriental details, yet it is the differences that are most significant. The Technion is well placed in its natural and architectural environment; it is not as alienated and disproportionate, as the Herzlia Gymnasia must have been. The oriental details in the Technion building derive from a consistent

vocabulary originated in local indigenous architecture, and there is an emphasis on the volumes of the interior spaces, which echo in the forms of the outer vaults and different openings. Hence they form an integral part of the building, not a selection of suggestive images that are supposed to present a western fantasy of the Orient or a symbolic indication of another building (which does not even exist) - the ancient Temple.

An incident connected to the Technion complex is meaningful in this context of understanding the quest for a collective identity that would express the national and cultural revival. In 1913-1914, before the Technion building had been completed, "the Language Conflict", a controversy over the use of language at the "Reali" school, took place (see part 1, chapter 2). The main sponsor of the school, the *Hilfsverein fuer deutschen Juden* members insisted on the use of German, arguing that Hebrew was not sufficiently precise and lacks modern terms essential for advanced studies. Furthermore, they claimed that the Zionist promotion of the use of Hebrew was motivated by national chauvinism rather than pedagogical practice.⁷⁸ Other Zionists interpreted this as an attempt at German control over the school. On the whole most Zionists believed that the use of Hebrew was central for the national revival and the creation of a Hebrew identity, and that it was a means of socializing students who came from different parts of Europe. The promoters of Hebrew won the "war".

The Herzlia Gymnasia and the Technion buildings did not achieve equal artistic quality, and exemplify two different approaches to the Orient, yet they both present a situation of search and experimentation, which was typical of the pursuits in those pioneering days. Likewise, they display a variety of attitudes towards the oriental repertory, contemporary and ancient, which unfolds also the different ways of relating to the local vista and to Zionist ideology. This equilibrium was to be changed due to new political circumstances, brought about by the First World War and its aftermath – the Ottoman Empire was crushed and England and France divided the region between them. Consequently Palestine went through drastic changes which had altered the relationship between Arabs and Jews, causing a sharp transformation in Zionist ideology.

In 1917 the British army entered Palestine, and by the end of 1918 completed its invasion. The leaders of the Zionist movement and the Jewish settlers in Palestine welcomed the British rule of Palestine. Apart from political benefits of the new rule, they

expected that Zionist inclinations toward the West would gain dominance. Already in 1917, when it was certain that Allenby would complete his mission, Lord Balfour, then a member of the British Government wrote a declaration which promised the Jews a national home in Palestine. In April 1918 the Zionist Organization established the Zionist Commission to Palestine (active until 1921) as its formal delegation, led by Weizmann and later by Menachem Ussishkin (see appendix: biographical note). The Commission has been authorized by the British Government to advise on Jewish colonization issues, including the construction of the Hebrew University. One of the Commission's actions in Palestine was to organize the ceremony of the laying of the foundation stones for the future Hebrew University on Mount Scopus on July 24, 1918. In 1920 it was again Lord Balfour who suggested to the League of Nations a British Mandate rule over Palestine and in 1922 the suggestion had been endorsed. However, in 1921, as soon as the contents of the Balfour Declaration had been revealed, it immediately aroused an Arab resistance movement. Arab riots against Jews in Jaffa in May 1921 were followed by Jewish reprisal actions in which forty-seven Jews (among them the influential Zionist writer Yoseph Chaim Brenner⁷⁹) and forty eight Arabs were killed, and hundreds were wounded. The tragic events made it quite clear to the Zionist leaders as well as to the Jewish settlers that the establishment of the state would not proceed without Arab objection. Yet both the British Government and the Zionist movement did not read the signs properly, for they seem to have shared two mutual hidden assumptions: that eventually there would be a massive Jewish immigration to Palestine, and that the indigenous Arab population would not show much active resistance to the Jewish immigration. Both turned out to be unfounded;⁸⁰ after all, neither the Jews nor the Arabs found the new political arrangements satisfactory. Bloody encounters became a matter of everyday occurrences, as well as revolts of both sides against the British. So, from the early 1920s the Jewish leadership in Palestine was aware of the fact that there was a possibility that a majority of Arabs might rule the future state, and that the hope for a Jewish state might be shattered. Therefore, the Jewish community began establishing organizations which could take the place of those of the colonial state.⁸¹ These organizations were conducted by an elite of native Palestine Jews (whose ancestors originally came from Russia and Eastern Europe in the early 1880s) and of East-European immigrants who arrived in Palestine in the first (1904-1914) and second (1919-1923) immigration waves. The second wave was to a

great extent a direct result of the downfall of the Ottoman rule and the British conquest. Among the immigrants there was a large number of Russian Revolution refugees, Zionist leaders, writers and teachers. This elite group, which introduced socialist ideas (and established the *kibbutzim*), adopted to the full the new image of the Hebrew person, who "worked the land" and was capable of participating in an armed combat. Yet the affiliation of this image to the indigenous Arab had been significantly reduced, although expressions of admiration toward accepted typical traits of the indigenous inhabitants still predominated. Instead the image of the New Hebrew Person consisted mainly of the pioneer and of the "Sabra" (the fruit of a local cactus, that grows mostly around Arab villages, yet somewhat paradoxically is referred to the prickly exterior and tender heart of the Israel-born Jew).⁸²

The drastic political and social changes had an enormous influence on cultural and artistic activities within the Jewish community in Palestine. During the early 1920s, while the Bezalel School still maintained its status as the artistic centre in Palestine it had been severely criticised for its traditionalism, its emphasis on the Jewish Diaspora and its rejection of international modernist trends. It had closed eventually in 1928, the official explanation had been the grave financial difficulties it had suffered. Bezalel's conservatism was more in line with the traditional faction within the international Zionist Organization than with the local political and social trends of the revolutionary Left that dominated the Eretz-Israel leadership in the twenties. Furthermore, since the early twenties a lively artistic activity took place also outside Bezalel, and as a matter of fact, quite as an opposition to Bezalel. The Hebrew Artists' Association, founded in 1920 (it numbered one hundred members in 1928, when Bezalel had closed down), consisted of artists who identified themselves as modernists. Leading artists among them such as Nachum Gutman, Ziona Tager, Menachem Shemi, Reuven Rubin and Israel Paldi had studied in Bezalel, but later rebelled against its strict obsolete concepts. Together with the modernist trends, the centre of artistic activity moved to Tel-Aviv. Perhaps it is paradoxical in a way that in the eyes of Zionists the city of Jerusalem (Zion) resembled everything that was not Zionist - orthodox religious domination, a non-Jewish majority and the alien governing authorities. Tel-Aviv, on the other hand, had no history, it maintained a sense of freedom and renewal, and it consisted of an entirely Jewish population. Therefore it symbolised the fulfilment of the Zionist dream, and the genesis of the Hebrew culture. In

the 1920s most artists lived and worked in Tel-Aviv, where theatres, newspaper networks and publishing houses had been established. Nevertheless the modernist artists were not a unanimous group; it was perhaps the conflict between them and the Bezalel tradition that defined them as a group. The concept of an authentic national style was at the core of the conflict in the 1920s, as well as the perception of the Orient, the nature of the link with Judaism and the acceptance of modernism.⁸³ Quite like Schatz and the Bezalel School, the modernist artists as well were preoccupied with the wish to create a genuine Hebrew art. Furthermore, they too turned to the Orient in their quest for roots. But while the Bezalel artists used the Orient as a repertory for a "stage scenery" for their biblical scenes, the modernists related to the actual local Arabs in their environment and expressed their interpretation of the Orient in pure formal and artistic techniques. The ancient Near-East also remained a source of influence, only now, in accordance with the modern fascination with the "primitive", it was applied due to its affiliation with modern formal values as well as its importance for the Zionist cultural revival. Artistically, the modernists' vision was of a close contact with the new artistic trends in Europe rather than following nineteenth century orientalism and the East-European academism of Schatz.

Nachum Gutman was perhaps the best known among those modernists who observed the local Arabs in their own environment yet depicted them in an idealized way. In his writings (he was also a writer who wrote mainly for children), Gutman referred to the Arab as the antithesis of the Diaspora Jew. In his paintings of the early 1920s, images of Arabs were depicted often in the countryside, doing rustic tasks that were regarded as typical Arab pastime activities (working the land, riding horses, carrying water etc.). The paintings express the artists' admiration for the Arabs' capacity to blend harmoniously in the rural environment while "working the land". The images of Arabs in Gutman's paintings are monumental, thus becoming symbols of the values Gutman cherished. In a painting such as the 1927 "Goatherd" (plate 21) there is a noted influence of ancient Near-East art in the figure's posture and in the two-dimensional way the herd is depicted. The figure stands in the foremost plane of the picture in an unrealistic manner, which is reminiscent of ancient Egyptian and Mesopotamian art. This use of "primitivism", so typical to contemporary modernist trends in Europe, was very popular in Jewish art in Palestine in the 1920s. The artistic use of a primitive style was regarded as a befitting

expression of the idea of national rebirth and of a search for cultural roots in the “innocent” world of the Orient.⁸⁴

Among the modernists a few chose the actual remains of ancient Mesopotamia, Assyria, Canaan and Egypt as their models. Those archaeological remains were considered the components of the environment of the ancient Hebrew forefathers. Thus those artists discarded centuries of a Diaspora experience and the religious dogma which it produced, to proceed from that point in the past when the Hebrews were cut off by exiles from their land and culture. One artist who created in this spirit at that period was the sculptor Aharon Melnikoff, a former Bezalel teacher. Melnikoff consciously and deliberately attempted to create a new Hebrew art. He expressed his own opinion and others' when he said that Jews had been cut off from the world of figurative art for various reasons: “The main one being that European art had been founded on Greco-Roman culture...And so long as Athens served as the fountainhead of art in Europe, Jews instinctively remained outside its confines...Only when art turned once again to the East, did the Jew endeavour to create an adequate place for himself in the burgeoning movement...I bitterly regret that a certain group of Eretz-Israel artists would rather wallow in the dust of Japheth than see the gold of Jacob”.⁸⁵ The last remark was probably aimed mainly at the artists of Bezalel. Melnikoff was also aware of the association between his local solution for an authentic Hebrew art, and contemporary modernist trends in European art.

The most famous piece of sculpture Melnikoff created in Palestine (before he moved to England) was the first Zionist monument ever - the “Roaring Lion” (plate 22), in memory of the defenders of Tel-Hai (a Jewish settlement next to the Syrian border) who were killed in 1920. Melnikoff conceived the “Roaring Lion” in 1922 but it was completed only in 1934. The image of the lion has a long history of being a universal symbol of power and victory, but it is also an emblem of ancient Judaea, consequently its content implied a layer of significance that suggests a connection with the ideas of the New Hebrew culture.⁸⁶ Furthermore, the formal characteristics of the sculpture link it to Zionist artistic ideas described formerly; namely the highly stylised head of the lion is reminiscent of ancient Assyrian sculpture, and like the Giza sphinx, it is posed fronting east, all limbs tightly held together in a compact form.

After Melnikoff's “Roaring Lion” was placed on the burial site, it had acquired a status of a Zionist sacred place and schoolchildren in Jewish schools in Israel are taken on organized annual commemoration pilgrimages to the site.⁸⁷ The fame and popularity

“The Roaring Lion” has gained, can be accounted to the fact that the tragic event of the death of the Tel-Hai defenders by Arab armed forces had an enormous impact on the small Jewish settlement and immediately became a central myth in Zionist ethos.⁸⁸

Trumpeldor, the venerated commander of the Tel-Hai defenders, had become a symbol of the New Hebrew person, a warrior and a cultivator of the land, an antithesis of the Diaspora Jew.⁸⁹ The last words he allegedly uttered “it is good to die for our country” had become standard-bearers for Zionist collective identity. Those words were inscribed on the podium that carries The Roaring Lion, thus “The Roaring Lion” has actually become a symbolic representation of Trumpeldor, the legendary hero (although the monument was erected on the tomb of all eight defenders). Songs and stories of the period show the vast extent of the affiliation of Melnikoff’s sculptured lion with Trumpeldor (mainly in children’s books) and occasionally the lion itself comes to life and associates with Trumpeldor and other heroes of the past.⁹⁰

Those among European modernist trends that were characterized by a rejection of western classical art and the adoption of primitive and eastern art, were easily adapted by Eretz-Israel modernist artists, since they wished to sever all ties with classical Western tradition, considered by them to be “Gentile” and bourgeois.⁹¹ It was only natural then, for the Eretz-Israel modernists, to seek inspiration especially in Rousseau’s naive paintings, Pablo Picasso’s massive figures from 1915 on, and the flat patterns in Andre Derain’s compositions. Another European source of influence was Russian primitivism, which was prevalent throughout the first two decades of the century, and must have been familiar to artists who came to Palestine from Russia.⁹² Ziona Tager, the first Eretz-Israel native born artist (her parents were among the founders of Tel-Aviv) who had studied under Andre Lohte in 1924-1925 in Paris, applied Lohte’s and Derain’s principles to her paintings of that period. Cezanne’s influence was noticed in the work of different artists in those years, and was intended to assist in the breaking up of traditional academic depiction of objects. The most outstanding among those artists was Yoseph Zaritsky, in a series of watercolours that preceded his abstract paintings. Thus the search for a new approach towards an authentic Hebrew artistic style led the Eretz-Israel artists to some of the leading trends of European modernism. Their search for “primitivism” in modern Western art gradually distanced most of them from the affiliation with the Orient and the indigenous.

In architecture modern western values gained reinforcement in the 1920s by a number of architects who emigrated from Europe. They arrived in Palestine after acquiring their education as architects, therefore they brought with them modern architectural principles. Their contribution to the creation of a new Eretz-Israel style was a rejection of any allusion to a past; their ambition was to create a new architectural vernacular based on modern principles such as a compliance to local climate and materials, use of simple functional forms, and abstaining from any form of ornamentation or functionalism.⁹³ A compliance to local characteristics was linked with the Zionist postulate that the national revival coincided with physically redeeming the land⁹⁴, hence an architecture that emerged from intimate knowledge of requirements dictated by the land, would create a mode of forming a style befitting the New Hebrew Person and the myth of his attachment to the land.

Richard Kauffmann was the most outstanding planner, who manifested Zionist ideology in physical environmental planning. He arrived in Palestine in 1920 at the invitation of Dr. Arthur Rupin (see appendix: biographical note), head of the colonizing department of the Zionist Organization (the PLDC), to plan colonies (*moshavot*) and *kibbutzim* that would satisfy the needs of the new immigrants. In 1922 Kauffmann, who was very well acquainted with modern architectural principles, became a member of the International Garden City and Town Planning Association.⁹⁵ His plans became models for organized agricultural settlements. He advocated a need for zoning and for a social-cultural centre in each of the settlements he planned, therefore his planning for *moshavim* differed completely from that of *kibbutzim*; whereas the former were closed concentricities (Nahalal, Kfar Yehoshu'a) the latter were open, meant for expansion (Ein Harod, Tel Yoseph). This approach stemmed from their differing ideologies: the *moshav* was supposed to confine itself as a closed society while the *kibbutz* was planned for growth and the adding of new members (practice, as it often does, repudiates theory). Nahalal (1921) is the most famous among Kauffmann's *moshavot* for its outstanding planning. A drawing of the proposed general view of Nahalal (plate 24) presents a concentric plan, with the public institutions designed to be placed in the middle circle, the dwelling units forming a ring around them and the farms spread out into the larger outer circle behind them. This plan has been regarded a major contribution to an appropriate environment for the New Hebrew person. Besides agricultural settlements he also

planned neighbourhoods in Haifa and Jerusalem in accordance with Garden City principles and various agricultural settlements.⁹⁶

The British Mandate lasted until 1948; the Mandate period consisted of thirty turbulent years in which British officials and military forces were caught up in the bloody Jewish-Arab conflict. Yet after the Mandate had established itself, there had been also other aspects to the presence of British officials and military in Palestine, for they also maintained a typical colonial life style that included social and cultural pastime. British Government headquarters were settled in Jerusalem, first in the German "Augusta Victoria Hospice" on Mount of Olives and later in "The High Commissioner's Residence" (now the UN headquarters) on Mount Mukabra, designed by Austen St. Barbe Harrison, the official British Mandate architect in Palestine in a colonial style. Firm orientalist preferences were evident in local British architecture as well as in the special attitude the British Government had developed towards Jerusalem and the preservation of its unique sites. Until mid nineteenth century the built environment of Jerusalem was inside the walls of the Old City, and divided into four quarters - the Moslem, the Christian, the Armenian and the Jewish. A few buildings were built outside the walls after 1850, mostly by Protestant and Jewish institutions. This initiative gained momentum between 1880 and 1914 when dwellings were constructed on the hills on the western side of the Old City. Yet in the early 1920s Jerusalem was still in poor condition, and did not possess a central position either for the Arab or for the Jewish population. Yet the British Government designated it as the capital of the country and the centre of the British Government administration, thus initiating its growth and expansion.⁹⁷ British architects were employed by the British administration to prepare city master plans and public buildings. Clifford Holliday (the Scottish Church, 1930) and Austen St. Barbe Harrison (the Rockefeller Museum and the High Commissioner's Headquarters and Residence, 1930s) created a new colonial style in Jerusalem. Their architecture leaned heavily on the indigenous architectural vista and on orientalist tendencies.

But on the whole, with only very few exceptions (Benjamin Chaikin, for instance; see appendix: biographical note) local Jewish architects did not go along with this colonial style, especially because the efforts towards a Hebrew style had already turned towards a new path. Furthermore, the official architecture of the alien mandate rule could not have been accepted as an option for Jewish architects in their search for an authentic style.

The British Mandate Government set up administration regulations for every aspect of civil life, among them town planning and building regulations. It also provided some protection for the gradual preparations for the future Jewish State and for the creation of a "Hebrew" society, aspirations that had formerly been threatened constantly by the Ottoman authorities. In fact Jewish society had its own organizations for its self-management which took care of all aspects of life (health, occupation, education etc.). Arab society, having no self-management organizations, had been completely dependent on the Mandate government, and therefore had less control of its own affairs. This state of affairs led towards growing frustration and anger and to the rise of an Arab national movement and armed resistance groups which fought mainly against Jews, but also against the British. The immigration of Jews being supported by the British Government, brought about a rapidly growing Jewish population, which incited Arab opposition and induced the emergence of an Arab nationalist movement. Consequently there had been bloody clashes between Jews and Arabs, which culminated in August 1929 in Hebron. The ancient town of Hebron (mentioned in the Bible as the burial place of Sarah, Abraham's wife) was populated by a majority of Arabs and a Jewish minority. It had actually been one of the few places in Palestine where there had been a Jewish community almost at all times. In 1929 the Jewish minority consisted of "old *Yishuv*" people, and immigrants. As the tension grew all around the country, the Jewish community in Hebron was attacked by Arab riots and sixty-seven Jews were savagely murdered, among them three very young children, and many more had been wounded.⁹⁸ Although they tried hard, the British policemen in Hebron could not prevent the attack. On the same day a Jewish family and their two guests had been murdered in their home in Moza, on the outskirts of Jerusalem.⁹⁹ The murderous attack must have been an outcome of both hatred and fear. The Arabs were anxious the Zionists might cast them out. There has also been mere hatred of foreigners, since Jewish immigrants came from so many different countries (but there is also a list of four hundred and thirty five Arabs in Hebron who saved Jews by hiding them in their houses, some had even been wounded themselves while doing so).¹⁰⁰ The riots continued in Jerusalem for a few more days and spread out to other places around Palestine; there were reports of mutual Arab and Jewish murderous attacks in different places around the country. In Saffad (an ancient town in the Galilee, which also had an old Jewish community) Arabs murdered entire Jewish families. There had been

immediate Jewish murderous reprisals against Arabs. The formal sum total of casualties given by the British authorities was that one hundred and thirty three Jews and one hundred and sixteen Arabs had been murdered, and three hundred and thirty nine Jews and two hundred and thirty two Arabs had been wounded. This detailed information is mentioned here for a double purpose – first, Zionist oriented publications usually present biased data and picture the Arabs as savage and murderous while the Jews are depicted as victims. Secondly, present the depth of the hostility between the two nations. Both sides in the conflict suffered casualties, and those years were traumatic for both Jewish and Arab inhabitants in Palestine. As in former such events, the clashes caused an even greater animosity and a lesser tendency on both sides to come to terms with each other. The entire Jewish world was enraged and multitudes participated in meetings protesting against Arab cruelty and British indifference.¹⁰¹ The situation escalated into a chaos of constant daily acts of terror with a number of devastating climaxes. One was in 1933, when thirty people were killed (among them a child) and two hundred were wounded. The bloody events were a response to the 1933 immigration wave, which brought thirty thousand Jews to Palestine (mainly from Nazi Germany). The protest of the Arabs was against the Mandate government as well as against Jews since it had issued a larger number of immigration permits than ever before. As the immigration of Jews from Europe increased after 1933 due to growing persecution of Jews by the Nazi regime in Germany, there was a constant stream of Jewish refugees settling in Palestine. Local Jewish organizations together with the World Zionist Organization helped them settle in agricultural settlements and in *kibutzim*. In 1936 Tel Aviv tripled the number of its inhabitants and became the centre of Jewish life in Palestine. The British policy in the 1930s of restricting Jewish immigration, actually increased the crisis. When in 1936 there was another crisis; the situation escalated so badly, that risk of being killed or hurt in a terrorist attack had become part of everyone's life. The big Arab revolt, which would continue until 1939 had begun. A British force of twenty five thousand soldiers and policemen was transferred to Palestine to suppress the uprising.¹⁰² Sir Charles Tegart, a leading British police man and an expert on hindering terrorism, had been summoned, and among other things he initiated severe punishments (including extensive death penalties) and the construction of numerous police stations around the country, which were sometimes called "tegarts" and still serve the Israeli police. They were built as small

concrete fortresses, with small windows, closing on internal courtyards. Public building projects, though, had been restricted by the British authorities along those years.

As a result of the political and social situation an ideological reversal had evolved in the Zionist movement, that affected all fields of life, including art and architecture. Growing involvement of local Jewish establishments in Palestine, which controlled almost all aspects of Jewish society, had brought about a radical shift of power. It diminished the World Zionist Organization's power, and Weizmann was not the most influential leader in Eretz-Israel any more, since local self-management establishments and leaders, such as David Ben-Gurion, gained central positions and influence in internal matters.

The architectural scene in Palestine in the early 1930s was divided into two main styles, the British colonial architecture and the Jewish modern architecture. While British architects developed a local blend of European traditional architecture with Middle Eastern motifs for governmental institutions (as specified above), Jewish modern architecture emerged mostly from the International Style and the Bauhaus. An ideological gap prevented the two styles from having any influence on each other, and significantly the British colonial style was based particularly in Jerusalem and the Jewish modern style in the Tel Aviv, in the *moshavot* and the *kibutzim*.¹⁰³ International Style and Bauhaus architectural principles gained momentum among Jewish architects in Palestine when a great number of European architects arrived, especially from Germany after the Nazi party came to power. The social ideology attached to those architectural styles linked with the growing power of the socialist oriented Jewish self-management establishments. The newcomers joined the local modernists of the 1920s and together they completely took over the quest for an authentic Zionist architecture. Most of them were under the influence of the new theories of Le Corbusier, and of Gropius and the Bauhaus. Moreover, a number of young local architects (for instance Zeev Rechter, Arie Sharon, Dov Karmi and Joseph Neufeld) had gone to study in Europe in the 1920s and early 1930s, and thus had become acquainted with new modernist ideas, especially those of the International Style and the Bauhaus.¹⁰⁴ Most modernist architects resided in Tel Aviv where an association of architects called "Chug Ha'adrichalim" (Hebrew for The Architects' Circle), or as it was known – the "Chug" was established in 1932.¹⁰⁵ This unique bloom of Bauhaus principles benefited primarily from their perfectly adaptable philosophy to a prevailing socialist ideology of the Jewish organizations¹⁰⁶ and from the rejection of the

Orient and the indigenous (it also profited from a decline in private residential building, as a result of British mandatory restrictions, and a relative increase in the number of cooperatively owned apartment houses). Thus the search that had begun at the turn of the century for a Jewish style in Eretz-Israel, founded on a conceived ancient past rooted in the Middle East, was replaced by modernist principles that had already spread out around the world. Adopting Bauhaus and International Style vernacular by modernist architects in Palestine was completely in conformity with socialist trends within Zionism and the vogue of elevating the stereotype of the "Sabra". Those principles rejected any affiliation with history and reflected an aura of a new beginning and of progress, thus they served the Zionist rejection of the Diaspora (or any other Jewish past), the socialist rejection of the bourgeoisie and the recent rejection of the Orient.¹⁰⁷ They offered a standardization that could create an appropriate environment for the new Israeli society – the Jews who left the ghetto behind and cherished a life of labour and their newly acquired collective identity. However, besides the lack of a specific identity, International Style could actually be associated also with the simple geometric forms of local indigenous architectural vernacular, hence it fulfilled Gropius's requirement for "proper respect for tradition"¹⁰⁸, and yet exclude conspicuous Islamic attributes. International Style and Bauhaus principles were most prevalent in Tel Aviv, which has since been identified with Bauhaus style, and it is often referred to as "The White City".¹⁰⁹ It had succeeded to become the standard style of the New Hebrew culture in Tel Aviv, to the extent that the old houses that had been built by the founders of the first Hebrew town were denounced as eclectic and therefore inferior (only in recent years their historical value and architectural interest enjoy a resurgence). Through the use of modern architecture principles Tel Aviv had created a standardization of architectural forms that dominated the urban scene in conformity with the Zionist wish for a collective identity.¹¹⁰ In Jerusalem and Haifa though, with their historical sites and mountainous topography, Bauhaus style neighborhoods presented more diverse architectural solutions, hence it did not leave an outweighing impression as in Tel Aviv. *Moshavim* and *kibbutzim*, each group with its specific demands, had also been a natural domain for modernist architects, as they had been placed at the front of Zionist enterprise to create a new collective identity.

The outbreak of the Second World War in Europe had an immediate as well as a long-term effect on social and financial affairs in Palestine, although Palestine did not participate in the battlefields, and its Jewish population did not share the fate of the Holocaust victims. As the Jewish settlement in Palestine had always been dependent on Jewish communities around the world, the destruction of the Jewish communities in Europe and the loss of access to Jewish communities in America caused a slow down of all development projects. Yet legal and illegal Jewish refugees were constantly coming into the country and needing care, lodging and means of livelihood. This growing and pressing need to make place for the refugees created even more tension than before between British, Arabs and Jews. Arab and Jewish extremists formed marginal yet effective terrorist fighting squads, and consequently all were fighting against each other. The extremist groups were also fighting against their own people. In 1944 the tragic aftermath of the war was already known in Palestine. Jewish institutions in Palestine, including the Hebrew University, prepared for the absorption of multitudes of refugees and Holocaust survivors when the war was over. Along with the effects of the international crisis, a crisis in the concept of Zionism had developed. It was in part a result of the consolidation of an Arab nationalist movement, which regarded Zionism its chief enemy. This development had almost completely eliminated whatever tendency of Zionists to idealize the indigenous Arab had remained. In art and architecture western modernism took over to a great extent and the Orient as a source of inspiration for artists had been quite irrevocably rejected.

In a devious way one outcome of the situation described above was a yet further emphasis on the myth of the "New Hebrew" with added weight on the virtue of being a native – namely, being capable of maintaining a direct and intimate relationship with the land. This time the indigenous Arab was eliminated from the scene. One extreme and eccentric response to this requirement was the emergence of "Canaanites" who evoked the ancient past again in a new, pagan variant associated to the former attempts, namely the facade of the Herzlia Gymnasia and "The Roaring Lion" monument. The "Canaanite" group appeared in the early 1940s on the intellectual and artistic scene as a consequence of the wish for a "native", "authentic" New Hebrew. It consisted of poets, writers, painters and sculptors who believed that the Israelites had been part of the Canaanites in ancient times. They claimed that Judaism is a later form of religion, and that their Canaanite

forefathers were not strict monotheists. They preached for a revival of the Canaanite experience and a rejection of the Diaspora religious rites and culture. Yitzhak Danziger's *Nimrod* (plate 23) was completed in 1939 and immediately became a model for the "Canaanite" group, for its combination of primitivism, biblical connotation (Nimrod, the pagan hunter, is mentioned in the Bible) and pagan mythology. The figure of Nimrod presents a young naked male, his face not quite human neither quite animal, and on his left shoulder rests a hawk. Man and bird seem to coexist in perfect harmony. There is no indication that the figure is Nimrod. All aspects of the sculpture – its content, the presentation of the male figure and the artistic style suggest that "primitivism" has taken the place of orientalism, and that in fact European modern trends were behind the search for artistic inspiration in ancient cults. In a sense this was a return to the values of the beginning of the century, only now the image of the indigenous Arab no longer served as a model. The main cause for this development was the growing nationalistic feelings among the Jewish population of Palestine, which were increased when the extent of the Holocaust was known. There was a growing need to defend the right of the Jews for a national home in Palestine and to reassert their ancient roots in Eretz-Israel. The myth of Canaan closed a circle. The rejection of the Diaspora at the dawn of the Zionist movement created the image of the Hebrew, the "new-old" biblical figure in the form of a Jew in Arab dress. On the verge of the fulfillment of the Zionist dream there emerged again a wish for a new identity created by a myth; the new Israeli, whose attachment to the land is devoid of religious beliefs and originates from a mythical primeval source. All along the circle the wish for a national and cultural revival expressed a strong desire for close identification with local surrounding in Eretz-Israel.

Growing hostility and Arab and Jewish terrorist attacks led to a British Government decision to end the Mandate rule over Palestine and to a UN resolution, on November 29, 1947 stating that Palestine will be divided into two states - an Arab state and a Jewish state. Borders of the division were drawn, yet while the Arabs proclaimed that they could not accept what they regarded an unjust resolution, the temporary Jewish government declared that it agreed to implement it. Shortly after the British vacated Palestine Israel announced its independence, in May 1948, and immediately a war broke between Jews and Arabs (in Israel Jews call it "The War of Independence"), the neighbouring Arab countries participating. The war, which was the climax of a succession of dramatic events

evolving from the escalating political situation, led toward an altogether new Palestinian scene. It ended in a cease-fire agreement, which gave Israel what are known as the 1948 borders, not quite similar to those suggested by the UN in the November 1947 resolution (plate 1). Those borders divided Jerusalem into an eastern part under Jordanian rule, and a western part under Israeli rule (plate 3).

The consequences of the 1948-1949 war and the declaration of independence brought about a drastic change of circumstances not only for the country and its inhabitants but also for world Jewry. Those changes created a significant watershed in Jewish history in Eretz-Israel and in the Diaspora. The new border placed the Old City, the Mount of Olives and the eastern neighbourhoods under Jordanian rule, and the relatively new western neighbourhoods under Israeli rule. There was no free passage between the two sides and neither Israelis nor Jordanians were allowed any passage at all. As mentioned before, Mount Scopus was declared an Israeli enclave, but no university staff or students were allowed to enter it; only a certain number of policemen were permitted to stay on the campus premises, and they travelled to Mount Scopus and back in special convoys.

Strong nationalistic feelings and trends that prevailed in Jewish society in Eretz-Israel (and among Jews in the Diaspora) before the establishment of the State were strengthened during the 1948-1949 war and immediately after the announcement of the State. All through the war and during the early 1950s the new state faced major economic and social difficulties, caused by the need to care for multitudes of Jewish immigrants, refugees and Holocaust survivors. The Jewish population increased from eight hundred thousand in 1949 to one million and eight thousand in 1956. The enormous number of immigrants, who arrived with no means for building a new life, created an urgent need for immediate mass housing. Modern architecture remained the answer for quick and cheap housing projects, and also to present a progressive image of the state. Actually it has continued to fulfil this function to the present. Yet the quality of design and construction gave way to improvisation and low cost,¹¹¹ whether the extent of it was justified or not is recently debated. The ideology of the collective, which still prevailed was even more emphasized since Israeli society was perceived as a melting pot. As the massive immigration wave gathered people from diverse countries, ethnic backgrounds, religious orientations and historical or cultural connections, it has been regarded a national mission

to blend them all in the national and cultural collective melting pot. The integration of these diverse groups of people was part of the quest for a Jewish/Israeli society and for a uniform Israeli identity. One was expected to serve the state in many ways, but first and foremost through military service. Therefore, university students and staff for instance, had to serve in the army like everybody else, but they were also "recruited" through their attachment to the university, for only the good of the state could justify their occupations. In an atmosphere of devoting oneself to the good of the State, simply studying in the University for personal motives was generally regarded as bourgeois luxury.¹¹² No wonder University officials constantly found it necessary to emphasize the role of the University, its staff and its students in serving the state. A uniform housing policy was one device towards the fulfilment of the "melting pot" policy, and the architect and town planner Arie Sharon was assigned for the task.¹¹³ Sharon was head of the governmental Planning Department that had been established during the 1948-1949 war. In order to perform the task, Sharon recruited a number of fellow architects, among them Heinz Rau (later one of the planners of the Hebrew University in Giv'at Ram). Israel has always been a small country, and especially so after the 1948-1949 war, but facing the complexity of the numerous problems generated by the situation, the mere acceptance of the task and its conclusions had been pretentious, megalomaniac and somewhat utopic. The programme for the plan was prepared in collaboration with Government officials and included, among other propositions a forecast for a dense population in the Negev Desert, which has never been realized. It is quite obvious the utopic scheme had been dictated by Ben Gurion's notorious vision of inhabiting the Negev. Hence architects and politicians collaborated to mould the lives of Israelis in accordance with a political wish to manifest Israeli dominance over the land rather than to provide for the welfare of the citizens. Interference of the State in the lives of its citizens coalesces with a quest for a collective identity, hence the State continued, and even improved the Zionist quest for a national identity. After the state was declared International Style traits such as minimalism, functionalism and most of all standardization, were perhaps found more appropriate than ever before for building a collective national identity, for they too served the national mission of creating a collective identity.

For the state's first two decades, there has been constant tension between Israel and the surrounding Arab countries. Deadly attacks on military targets and on civilians were daily occurrences on both sides along the borders. The continuing security threat served as a means for the enhancement of the mission to present Israeli society as a collective entity. The real existence of a multi ethnic Jewish society has been blurred, and non-Jewish minorities were maltreated. As military service in the Israeli Defense Forces had become a sanctified national service, those who did not participate (non Jewish minorities and orthodox Jews, as well as a minute number of conscientious objectors) were perceived as unworthy of their citizenship. The Israeli state developed characteristics of a "control system"¹¹⁴, although it is constructed as a democracy.

On June 5, 1967 Egypt, Syria and Jordan, launched a military attack on Israel in what was known as the Six Days War, for in six days the Israeli army forced its enemy armies to retreat, and occupied the Sinai (including the Gaza Strip) from Egypt, the West Bank (including east Jerusalem) from Jordan and the Golan Heights from Syria. This outstanding military achievement caused an atmosphere of euphoria among Jewish citizens of Israel for a couple of reasons. The peril of war against two large armies on two fronts (Egypt and Syria) put the entire population of Israel into a state of extreme anxiety, accordingly the swift victory brought about an enormous relief. Secondly, after the Jordanian army joined forces with Egypt and Syria and entered the war, it lost the entire West Bank to the Israeli armed forces. Consequently Jewish historical and sacred sites, including East Jerusalem and Mount Scopus, came under Israeli rule and were accessible to Israelis. Expressions of euphoric emotions swept the majority of Jewish population in Israel and abroad at the swift victory; it was for many an amazing, almost miraculous rescue.

The drastic change of geographic boundaries that followed the 1967 war created a watershed in every aspect of public life. The opening up of the boundaries did not bring Israel any closer to the East in which it is placed. Quite the contrary, from a system that controlled its citizens, the state became an occupier of about a million and a half Palestinians that have no citizens' rights. Military forces and civil administrators are spread out in the occupied (freed, according to Israeli right wing and consensus opinion) territories to preserve Israeli control and the security of its Jewish inhabitants. The self-glorification that had been intensified with the military victory discarded the former

need for an authentic identity. Of the image of the Zionist New Man, only the warrior has remained, the image of the settler who works the land and aspires to be rooted in it, has gradually disappeared. Instead the image of the new settler has emerged; the right wing orthodox person that settles in fenced and guarded settlements in the occupied territories in order to capture it forever.

The Hebrew University campus on Mount Scopus was designed shortly after the war was over, as an essential contributor to the occupying policy. The story of its construction, its design and most of all - the significance of its presence on the Mount Scopus hilltop, facing the Old City, and the interrelations between its functions and its forms have actually been the incentive for this research.

Notes:

¹ Bialik 1925: 30.

² Even-Zohar 1981: 170. To the best of my knowledge, the first time this term was used in this context, was by Even-Zohar in this article.

³ Gorny 1985: 12, 13.

⁴ See Adrian Hastings, *The construction of Nationhood; Ethnicity, Religion, and Nationalism* (London, 1997) Eric Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality* (Cambridge, 1990), Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and the Spread of Nationalism* (London, 1983), Ernest Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism* (Ithaca, New York, 1983), Homi K. Bhabha (ed.), *Nation and Narration* (London, 1990).

⁵ Myers 1995: 3.

⁶ See Berlovitz 1996.

⁷ Consequently, perhaps, research of architecture in Israel is also not advanced. The architect Elhanani (1998), wrote the only comprehensive publication on architecture in Israel, yet his book is not in accord with academic requirements; it suffers from frequent errors, poor editing, lack of basic data and references.

⁸ See Whitelam 1996.

⁹ Myers 1995: 3.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 171.

¹¹ Gorny 1985: 52, quotes Joseph Lurie who said that Zionists who came to Palestine with the first immigration waves had completely ignored the existence of an Arab population.

¹² Gorny 1987: 18, suggests that "old" and "new" in this context could have a number of meanings: one is a historical interpretation, placing the "old *Yishuv*" earlier in time; the second is of an evaluating character, suggesting that the "old *Yishuv*" was more traditional and conservative while the "new *Yishuv*" aspired to bring about a spirit of renovation.

¹³ *Ibid.*: 24, 25.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*: 35.

¹⁵ Between the founding of the first colony, Petah-Tikva, and the British conquest of Palestine in 1917, more than thirty *moshavot* were founded, and they served as the principal form of settlement. A *moshava* is actually a pre-planned village. To differentiate between Arab and Jewish villages in

Palestine, the word *kfar* (village in Hebrew) has always been used to indicate an Arab village, never a Jewish settlement, although it appears in names of *moshavot* and *kibbutzim* (Kfar Warburg, Kfar Yehoshua).

¹⁶ Ben-Arzi 1997: 294, 295.

¹⁷ The Templers were members of a German sect whose prime religious aim was to settle in the Holy Land. After they were expelled from the Lutheran Church in 1859 they settled in twenty colonies in Palestine, in the country and in towns.

¹⁸ Ben-Arzi 1997: 319.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*: 296.

²⁰ *Ibid.*: 137.

²¹ Smith 1998: 92.

²² *Ibid.*: 92.

²³ Kimmerling, 1993, p. 339.

²⁴ This quest for the emergence a new person was well-rooted in contemporary European trends of the late 19th century, as expressed mainly by the influential philosopher of the time, Fridrich Nietzsche. See Ohana 1997.

²⁵ Shavit 1996: 142.

²⁶ Berkowitz 1993: 1.

²⁷ See M. Berkowitz 1993, Y. Berlovitz 1996, Even-Zohar 1981, D. N. Myers 1995, Y. Zalmona 1981, Y. Zerubavel 1995.

²⁸ Smith 1998: 112.

²⁹ Berkowitz 1993: 6, 7.

³⁰ *Ibid.*: 1.

³¹ At the First Zionist Congress, assembled in Basle, Theodor Herzl founded the World Zionist Organization. The resolution adopted at that congress (the Basle Program) defined the Zionist objectives: "The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by Public law. The Congress contemplates the following means to the attainment of this end: 1. The promotion, on suitable lines, of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers. 2. The organization and binding together of the whole of Jewry by means of appropriate institutions, local and international, in accordance with the laws of each country. 3. The strengthening and fostering of Jewish National sentiment and national consciousness. 4. Preparatory steps towards obtaining government consent, where necessary, to the attainment of the aim of Zionism".

The Zionist Congress became the supreme institute of the Zionist Organization and consisted of delegates elected by members of Organization. The delegates came from all over Europe and the USA. The Congress was held annually from 1897 to 1901, biennially from 1903 to 1913, 1921 to 1939, renewed in 1946 and since the establishment of the state of Israel, had assembled in Jerusalem once in four to five years.

³² Berkowitz 1993: 4, 5.

³³ *Ibid.*: 2, 3.

³⁴ Shavit 1996: 149.

³⁵ According to Even-Zohar: 1981, those ideas were conceived in the mode of romantic stereotypes of contemporary literature, exalting the primordial folk nation. Even-Zohar also notes that it is interesting that assimilationists and Zionists accepted many of the negative stereotypes affiliated with Jews (such as rootlessness, physical weakness, deviousness, aversness to pleasure and to physical labour, alienation from nature etc.) and adapted them to their own purposes.

³⁶ Shavit 1996: 146.

³⁷ Berkowitz 1993: 144, 145.

³⁸ *Ibid.*: 171.

³⁹ A cinematographic evidence of life in Jewish settlements in Palestine was filmed in 1913 to present to the delegates of the eleventh Zionist Congress (it has been recovered in 1997 in Paris, and recently restored as a video cassette by the Jerusalem Cinematheque). The men appear dressed up for the occasion in their Russian folk shirts hanging over the trousers, and wide leather belts around their waists following Russian style.

⁴⁰ Even Zohar 1981. Also, the writer Moshe Stavy (Stavsky), born in Russia, wrote short stories on rural life in Russia, and after he immigrated to Palestine in 1910, wrote *העיר החדשה*, *The Arab Village* (1946, Tel-Aviv) from a romantic and stereotyped point of view, although he was acquainted with Arabs and visited their villages.

⁴¹ Gorny 1985: 45, 46.

⁴² Berkowitz 1993: 147-150.

⁴³ Not all schools were part of this category. The religious schools of the "old *Yishuv*" were condemned by Zionists for being worse than those in the Diaspora, which did not participate in the national and cultural revival. The schools of the *Alliance Israelite Universelle* and the Evelina de Rothschild school were also perceived as stagnating a traditional European refined education which would not meet the requirements of creating a new person shaped to meet the demands of the Hebrew renaissance. *Ibid.*: 159.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*: 159.

⁴⁵ Bezalel was founded as an arts and crafts school. It produced what is known as the "Bezalel Style" which is a combination of Art Nouveau and orientalism, depicting biblical themes and scenes of Jewish life in Palestine.

⁴⁶ Kampf 1984: 15.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*: 15, cites Martin Buber, 1902, in "Lesser Ury", *Ost und West*, 2, Berlin.

⁴⁸ Bezalel was the name of the builder of the shrine, as described in the Old Testament, Exodus 36.

⁴⁹ The biographical information on Schatz is based on Y. Zalmona (1985), *בזלל, י. צלמונה*, *Boris Schatz*, Jerusalem.

⁵⁰ Zalmona 1985: 18 (n. 17).

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Ofrat-Friedlander 1983: 34. In this respect Schatz had failed; the Bezalel School was dependent on contributions from abroad.

⁵³ *Ibid.*: 49.

⁵⁴ Zalmona 1981: 28.

⁵⁵ Yosef Gomi, "Romantic Elements in the Ideology of the Second Aliya", *Jerusalem Quarterly* 13, pp. 73-78.

⁵⁶ Berkowitz 1993: 154, 157. Tel-Aviv was founded by a group of Jewish immigrants who lived in Jaffa (an Arab port town on the Mediterranean coast) and wished to create a "Hebrew" suburb that would enable them to fulfil to the utmost their aspiration for a new Hebrew society and a Hebrew culture. In 1906 they founded "Achuzat Bayit" north to Jaffa, which would become Tel-Aviv. Tel Aviv was the Hebrew title given to Herzl's novel *Altneuland*, although it was not a literal translation. The translator (Nachum Sokolow) declared that Tel Aviv was a biblical place name, expressing a connection between the old and the new, since *tel* signifies ruins and *aviv* means spring. Essentially this was another way of integrating European Zionism into the realm of Jewish Palestine.

⁵⁷ Ben-Yehuda 1970: 15.

⁵⁸ A "Jerusalem Hebrew Gymnasium" was established in 1909.

⁵⁹ Ben-Yehuda 1970: 54.

⁶⁰ Berkowitz 1993: 155.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*: 55.

⁶² Manor-Friedman 1998: 119 (nos. 3, 5).

⁶³ *Ibid.*: 98.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ Ben-Yehuda 1970: 15.

⁶⁷ Adolf Friedmann "Judische Kunst in Palaestina", *Ost und West*, May 1911, p. 451.

⁶⁸ Herbert & Sosnovsky 1993: 17.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*: 27, 28.

⁷⁰ Richter 1989: 9.

⁷¹ Herbert and Sosnovsky 1993: 217-219.

⁷² *Ibid.*: 15.

⁷³ *Ibid.*: p. 28.

⁷⁴ Richter 1989: 13, 14. To the best of my knowledge Baerwald's designs specifically for immigrants from Yemen is one of its kind. It raises queries such as why was Baerwald's consideration of Yemenite Jews so rare? Furthermore, why did Baerwald design houses for Yemenites? Had he been assigned for the task, or was it a personal enterprise? In order to remove doubts, Baerwald designed oriental style houses for clients who did not originally come from the Orient (Herman Struck's residence in Haifa).

⁷⁵ Herbert & Sosnovsky 1993: 220.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ The institute has moved since to a new complex of buildings in another section of Haifa. The Baerwald building has been renovated, and serves as a science and technology museum. However, it is customary to refer to it as the Old Technion building.

⁷⁸ Berkowitz 1993: 158.

⁷⁹ Y. Ch. Brener (1882-1921) was born in Russia. At an early age he began writing short stories and articles in Hebrew. He served in the Russian army until the war between Russia and Japan broke out, when he defected and fled to London. There he published a Hebrew literary magazine. In 1909 Brener moved to Jerusalem. Between 1914 and 1918 he worked as a teacher at the Herzlia Gymnasia. He preached a separation from the Diaspora way of life and a devotion to the land. He also believed that an animosity between Arabs and Jews would always prevail in Palestine.

⁸⁰ Kimmerling 1993: 331.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*: 333.

⁸² *Ibid.*: 335. The issue of the image of the Sabra has been most comprehensively researched by O. Almog 1997: עוז אלמוג, *ד"ר קוק-קוק, The Sabra – A Profile*, Tel Aviv.

⁸³ Zalmona 1981: 30.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*: 32.

⁸⁵ Cited by N. Zach, in *Melnikoff*, a catalogue for an exhibition in Haifa University, 1982.

⁸⁶ Zerubavel 1995: 91-91.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*: 45.

⁸⁸ See Zerubavel 1995, who provides a thorough investigation of the myth of Tel-Hai and its central place in Zionist ethos.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*: 44.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*: 92.

⁹¹ Zalmona 1981: 32.

⁹² *Ibid.*: 35.

⁹³ Levin 1984: 18, 19.

⁹⁴ Zerubavel 1995: 28.

⁹⁵ Herbert and Sosnovsky 1993: 168.

⁹⁶ Elhanani 1998: 18.

⁹⁷ Biger 1989: 184, 185.

⁹⁸ Segev 1999: 265.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*: 266.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*: 266, 267.

¹⁰¹ Goren 1997: 383.

¹⁰² Segev 1999: 337.

¹⁰³ In the 1930s the larger part of Haifa consisted of modern style architecture, built by Jewish immigrants. It is a mixed town to this day. Yet unlike Jerusalem it is not of religious and historical importance to Jews, Christians or Moslems.

¹⁰⁴ Harlap 1982: 46, 47.

¹⁰⁵ The "Chug" published a magazine – הבנייה במזרח הקרוב, "Building in the Near East".

¹⁰⁶ See A. Nitzan-Shifan, "Contested Zionism – Alternative Modernism: Erich Mendelsohn and the Tel Aviv Chug in Mandate Palestine", *Architectural History*, 39: 1996, pp. 147-180; J. Fiedler (ed.), *Social Utopias of the Twenties: Bauhaus, Kibbutz and the Dream of the New Man* (Germany 1995); R. Ingersoll, *Munio Gitai Weintraub: Bauhaus Architects in Eretz Israel*, (Milan 1994); I. Kamp-Bandau *et al.*, *Tel Aviv Modern Architecture 1930-1939*, (Berlin 1994); G. Herbert and S. Sosnovsky, *Bauhaus on the Carmel, and the Crossroads of Empire* (Jerusalem 1993).

¹⁰⁷ Shifan-Nitzan 1996: 151.

¹⁰⁸ Gropius 1965: 38.

¹⁰⁹ Celebrations of the "Bauhaus in Tel Aviv" took place in 1994; the renovated buildings were painted white and visitors participated in conferences and special architectural tours.

¹¹⁰ Levine 1984: 47.

¹¹¹ Harlap 1982: 49.

¹¹² Cohen, Uri, *The Hebrew University 1918-1948: Island of Autonomy Confronted by an Elite of Power*, (Hebrew) seminar paper for Prof. J. Shapira's Political Sociology course, Tel-Aviv University, 1991, p. 27.

¹¹³ See Arie Sharon 1951, אריה שרון, תכנון פיסי בישראל, *Physical Planning in Israel*, Jerusalem.

¹¹⁴ Kimmerling 1988.

CHAPTER 2
**THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEA OF
A HEBREW UNIVERSITY IN ZIONIST IDEOLOGY.**

The concept of the Hebrew University, as its founders had conceived it, is an important factor in the attempts to reveal and assess the architectural thought that guided the architects and planners. A central issue that connects the idea of the University with its architecture is the essential question whether the proposed University should be a Jewish University or a Hebrew University. Another is the problem of its status – should it be a University of world Jewry or of the Jews in Palestine? If it is the latter, who is responsible for its academic schedule? It is also a fascinating and revealing testimony of the different interpretations applied to an idea (that for a long period of time had been an abstract one) of a proposed institution that never existed before, and the variety of implications attributed to it. Those shift from an ordinary university that would provide a wide range of fields of knowledge to an institute that would specify only in Jewish and Hebraic subjects. Whereas universities have been established when and where a need emerged, a Hebrew University could obviously be contrived only through unusual circumstances. As its name suggests, its orientation should have been either religious or nationalistic. What, then was the image of the Jewish/Hebrew University its founders had in mind and how was the idea of a University connected to the national revival? Prior to the emergence of the Jewish national revival movements there were only a few known attempts to establish a Jewish University in various European Jewish communities.¹ A number of marginal attempts to establish a Jewish university have been recorded along the history of Jewish communities in the European Diaspora. This chapter will concentrate only on those that occurred from mid nineteenth century onwards and had some connection to the process that brought about the establishment of the Hebrew University. This process can be roughly divided into two main periods – up to 1913 the different university concepts centered mainly on the need for an academic institute and were brought up by individuals, while after 1913 the Jewish/Hebrew University was mainly considered as a means for the fulfillment of Zionist goals and gradually became a central enterprise of the World Zionist Organization. Along the years of the establishment of the national revival and the Jewish settlement in Eretz-Israel the significance of the idea of a

university went through transformations connected to shifts of emphasis in national ideology and changing political needs.

The forceful emergence of the idea in the mid-nineteenth century was connected to changes in the concept of universities in general. It may seem a paradox that since universities in general were (and many still are) connected to the Church, the idea of a Jewish University could appear only after the Enlightenment period had introduced advanced values of freedom of research, criticism of dogma and the autonomy of science. It seems that only when the idea came up again in the 1870s, at a period of relative tolerance and separation of University and the Church, could the idea of a Jewish University become more substantial. Indeed this development coincides with the more intensive engagement with the university issue.

A definition of a University proposed in 1852 by John Henry Cardinal Newman² demonstrates the spirit of the epoch: "...it is a place of teaching universal knowledge. This implies that its object is, on the one hand, intellectual, not moral; and, on the other, that it is the diffusion and extension of knowledge rather than the advancement. If its object were scientific and philosophical discovery, I do not see why a University should have students; if religious training, I do not see how it can be the seat of literature and science. Such is a University in its essence, and independently of its relation to the Church...But...it cannot fulfil its object duly...without the Church's assistance; or, to use the theological term, the Church is necessary for its integrity". Newman's definition presents both the traditional basis on which Universities have been established and the change that was about to take place: the commitment to free accumulation of knowledge on one hand and on the other a dynamic aspect of the contemporary University, that enabled it to respond to social changes. Indeed, from the 1850s on, urbanization and secularization of Western society brought about a change in universities. Generally universities went through a process of detachment from the Church and of revitalization due to a number of factors: industrialisation produced a need for technology and the shift towards a more empirical thought provided new methods of studying natural and social phenomena. Consequently a limitless opportunity to expand knowledge emerged and an increasing rejection of the religious-oriented colleges for overlooking those changes. These forces led to the formation of the modern university with its emphasis on research, expanding enrollments and public service³ (the universities in the United States, though, were more responsive to contemporary social needs, while English universities remained relatively conservative and elitist⁴). It is significant, then, that

the emergence of the idea of a Jewish/Hebrew University gathered momentum at a period of an expansion of the role of the University in society.

The wave of growing Jewish nationalist aspirations certainly endowed momentum and significance to the idea of the University⁵ as it was part of a larger European phenomenon. A new nationalistic trend in scholarly thinking in European universities propagated nationalist ideology, hence European universities have served as a source of validation and power for the development of nationalism. Therefore, although there had been earlier thoughts of a Jewish University, only when the modern Jewish national movement emerged, the idea of a Jewish/Hebrew University became also a source of social and intellectual validation for Jewish scholars even though this situation could have symbolically delineated the boundaries of their integration. For as in Eastern Europe quotas had been placed on Jewish attendance, educated Jews were pushed to embrace Zionism. As Zionist activists they had been among the promoters of the idea of the University as the most important mission of the Zionist movement, which would contribute to the creation of a new national culture far removed from the Diaspora.⁶ Together with the different theories, concepts and ideas associated with the national revival, the idea of a Jewish/Hebrew University spread first in Eastern Europe, then throughout the West and to many Jewish communities around the world.⁷

The objectives of the promoters of a Jewish/Hebrew University at this stage varied. One was the practical need to satisfy the wish of Jewish youngsters for university education from which they were rejected. Another was a growing wish to extend and renew Jewish heritage through modern scientific methods. Finally, like in other national revival movements, the University served to nurture national ideas through the study and research of history, literature, language, folklore etc.⁸

Prior to the establishment of the Zionist Organization there were a few individuals who had brought up the idea of a Jewish/Hebrew University as part of a larger plan for the national revival of the Jews in Eretz-Israel. One such initiative was by Edward Kazalet, a British industrialist and liberal politician, and a leading member of the Restoration for the Jews movement in England. Kazalet spoke of a Jewish college in Eretz-Israel as part of his plan for the colonization in Eretz-Israel of the oppressed Russian Jewish community. These ideas were presented approvingly in the *Jewish Chronicle*, thus gaining popularity among the Jewish community in England (especially as those ideas were part of a more

comprehensive plan of rescuing the entire area from Ottoman rule and allowing a British government that would improve and develop the land).⁹

The growing interest among Jewish religious leaders in Jerusalem's position as a religious centre in the 1870s was another source for individual initiatives to establish a Jewish University. Since there were emancipated Jews who had wished to put an end to the hegemony of Orthodox Jews in the Jewish community in Jerusalem, and to advance a more tolerant and modern attitude toward Jewish heritage, the idea of a secular Jewish higher learning institute came up.¹⁰ In 1874 a committee of Jewish leaders in England gathered to decide on a proper way to commemorate the actions of Moshe Montefiori¹¹ (who turned ninety years old and resigned his post as leading member of the Jewish community in England). Their appeal to the public for suggestions brought up a proposal to build a University in Jerusalem and name it after Montefiori. The proposal came from Abraham Benisch, the *Jewish Chronicle* editor (formerly one of the founders of the Jewish Students' Associations in the universities of Prague and Vienna). Benisch held that the whole Jewish world as well as the Jewish community in Jerusalem would benefit from a University, as is befitting an institution that would bear Montefiori's name.¹² In his vision he saw a University where the professors would be religiously tolerant, and contribute to change a city stricken by zealotry into a centre of study and learning. He ended his proposal with the words of the prophet Isaiah (2:3) "...for out of Zion shall go forth the law and word of the Lord from Jerusalem". These words have been familiar to almost every Jewish person, religious or secular, for centuries, since they have become part of Jewish cultural heritage. In applying the biblical prophecy to the vision of a University Benisch gave actuality to the sacred message. However, the Montefiori Foundation used its funds to establish a Jewish neighborhood outside the walls of the Old City (named Yemin Moshe, after Moshe Montefiori).

There were others who expressed their wish for a Jewish high education institution in various ways, for instance the Russian poet L. I. Mandelstamm, who published a book of his poems in 1880, stating on the cover page that all profits go to the establishment of an academic institution in Jerusalem.¹³ Yet unlike Benisch, Mandelstamm and others did not display a unique vision of an academic plan or specific characteristics. However, Mandelstamm's initiative does point at a yearning for a Jewish spiritual undertaking that is not affiliated with religion.

No doubt the aspirations of these pre-Zionist individuals for a Jewish University emerged from the traditional Jewish quest for learning and from the wish to give new content to the ancestral spiritual image of Jerusalem. Paradoxically these aspirations later merged with the developing national revival ideas, although the Jewish colonization of Eretz-Israel attached more value to “working the land”, and a rejection of everything the Diaspora represented (including the desire for learning). Apparently there must have been a contradiction in the ideology of the national revival movement. Indeed there was a minority of people among the founders of the national revival movement who were convinced that the rebellion against the Diaspora in its entirety was erroneous, since it was actually a way of complying with the anti-Semitic image of the Jew. For instance, Perez Smolenskin, a Hibat-Zion leader, explicitly expressed his opinion that the ideology of “working the land” will turn all Jewish pioneers into illiterates.¹⁴ In fact, despite the dominant ideology of “working the land”, Bilu members who followed the principle of “working the land” in their *moshavot* consisted of well-educated people who never gave up their aspirations for the prospective construction of an educational system, including high schools and eventually even a university.¹⁵

The first appearance of the idea of a University as part of the organized national revival program occurred in Russia, by individuals associated with the Hibat-Zion movement. Among other incentives, Hibat-Zion sprung from a growing awareness of the loss of identity within the Jewish community in European countries. Members of the movement discussed ways to preserve a unique identity and yet maintain a link with contemporary universal values. The question of learning and education was one issue on their agenda, and they debated whether in order to achieve the goals of the national revival movement Jews should remain in Russia despite the pogroms, or emigrate to Palestine or some other destination. Y.L. Gordon, a poet and a central national leader wrote in *Ha'melitz* (an important Jewish magazine published in Russia) in 1882 that education was a precondition for a Jewish independent society. Hence the preservation of the right for education and illuminism, was a condition and a requirement for the revival of the Jewish people. Therefore, Gordon wrote, the Jews must seek their spiritual redemption by obtaining education wherever it is possible, even outside Russia, but not in Palestine (since there were no sufficient education institutes there). In Gordon's opinion at

that time, the colonization of Eretz-Israel should wait until Jewish society became illumined and independent.¹⁶ Yet this approach did not meet with an acceptance of many other revivalists. M. L. Lilienblum, the speaker of Hibat-Zion, rejected Gordon's view of the education issue. He represented many other Hovevei-Zion who held quite the opposite conception - that the creation of an independent Jewish community in Palestine would eventually develop an appropriate educational system.¹⁷

As the First Zionist Congress was approaching, a number of persons discussed their ardent beliefs in the need for a Jewish University. Professor Herman Shapiro, a rabbi and a mathematician as well as a Zionist leader, joined the debate in *Ha'melitz* (in 1882) by offering the idea of a University as a way to solve the national identity problem through education. Following Gordon, he believed that in order to achieve a national revival, education of the people was more effective than a massive colonization of Palestine. Shapiro was the first to conceive the idea of a University (or a *hochschule*¹⁸, as he occasionally named the proposed institution) as a central component in the efforts for a national revival. Shapiro wrote that a University could provide a spiritual and cultural academic centre for Jews and presented a highly detailed and comprehensive proposal for its academic structure. His vision of a University was merged with an image of the future Eretz-Israel settlers he had in mind. He anticipated a religiously orientated population that would be inclined to constantly modernize their religion (in contrast to the Diaspora orthodoxy) and to develop their scientific capacities. Shapiro envisaged a situation where the knowledge acquired in the University would assist the Jewish settlers and set an example for the Arab indigenous inhabitants.¹⁹ He suggested that the University would consist of three departments: a theology department that would eventually become a Jewish spiritual centre; a "theoretic" sciences department for both humanities and natural sciences and a "practical" department for applied sciences. Shapiro expressed a definite opinion that the University should not be located in Jerusalem, because of the religious fundamentalism that prevailed there. In his opinion, the appropriate location would be at the centre of an assembly of *moshavot* because the University would serve their population. As to the language problem, Shapiro suggested that at the beginning teaching would be conducted in German. French and Russian would be taught as modern languages and Arabic as a classical language. Hebrew would be used as much as possible, thus gradually it would become a colloquial language.

Reuven Brainin, another Jewish scholar and supporter of Hibat-Zion, brought up his idea of a Hebrew University shortly before the opening of the first Zionist Congress in 1897. At that time there already had been a number of new colonies in Palestine, where Hovevei-Zion settlers dwelled. Brainin published in *Ha'melitz* and in *Zion* (a monthly periodical published in Berlin) an article titled "About the establishment of a Hebrew University in Jerusalem". Brainin described his vision of a cultured Jewish nation, as a fulfilment of the Jewish biblical destination to become a "spiritual people". In contrast to those who believed that the settlers should concentrate on studying agriculture, Brainin thought that they would be denying their unique national heritage if they turned their backs on learning.

The idea of a University had come up also in the utopic writings of A. L. Lewinski, a Russian Zionist. In 1892 he wrote a book by the name of *A Journey to Eretz-Israel in the Year 2040*.²⁰ A University is part of an educational system described in the book, and like the Shapiro proposal it also consisted of a variety of schools. The different schools would be dispersed in different places to serve the needs of the local population: a theological school in Jerusalem; an academy for naval studies in Jaffa, on the Mediterranean shore; an agricultural school in Rishon-Le'zion (one of the first colonies founded in Eretz-Israel), located in the midst of orchards and vineyards. The latter actually materialized when the Hebrew University opened an agriculture department in Rehovot, a colony next to Rishon Le'zion.

The Zionist Organization, then, at the earliest stages of its activity already recognized the idea of the University as being central on its agenda. Shapiro even brought it up at the first Zionist Congress in Basle in 1897, yet in his presentation to the congress delegates his former proposal was changed into a centre for Jewish culture. The term *Juedische Hochschule* was mostly used then.²¹ Since then the idea of a Hebrew University had become an interest of the Zionist Organization and had been almost constantly on its agenda. Furthermore, no other public institution was granted as much regard and importance by the different branches of the Zionist Organization. The idea of the University was spread out by Zionist propaganda in communities around the world, discussions were held among Zionists everywhere on different issues concerning it. The question of the Jewish/Hebrew University rises almost at every crossroad of the history of Zionist activity, notwithstanding the matter concerned, whether it is ideological debates,

international politics or even internal power struggles. Among other things, the importance of the University is indicated by the line of central Zionist leaders who promoted it; Chaim Weizmann, Nachum Sokolow, Menachem Ussishkin, Menachem Sheinkin and others. Their actions for the founding of the University involved political manipulations as well as attempts to define the University as an academic institution of the Jewish people. Those were often intertwined - as will be clear from the following delineation of the history of the Zionist struggle for the erection of the University. The proposed image of the University had been a major factor in this struggle.

There is no doubt that Weizmann was, even in those early days, the most influential, as well as most devoted among Zionist promoters of the University. Since 1901 he stood at the head of the "Democratic Fraction", an opposition party within the Zionist Organization that believed the national revival should evolve from a cultural revival (following Ahad Ha'Am). Weizmann's letters between 1901-1903 show not only an enthusiasm for the idea of the University, but also that much work was done to advance the idea (surveys of several universities, data, questionnaires were distributed among Jewish students and correspondences were held with Herzl and other Zionist leaders).²² The "Democratic Fraction" members wished to recruit as many intellectual youth to the Zionist Organization as a means of modernization and initiative toward a creation of a new Jewish nation.²³ Hence the emphasis at that stage on the difficult position of Jewish students, as an incentive for the establishment of the University. As early as 1901 Weizmann wrote that since there were "new restrictions on the admission of Jews to universities and secondary schools ... I am certain that Jewry will now adopt a different attitude to the question of establishing a Jewish University...".²⁴ The members of the "Democratic Fraction" were not sure the University should be erected in Palestine, as Shapiro had suggested. In their debates on the issue it appears that since they were more concerned with the Jewish students' issue than with Jewish colonization of Eretz-Israel, there were members who rather favoured the idea of erecting the University in Europe, while others insisted on Eretz-Israel as the only possible location.²⁵ Cultural issues were discussed extensively in the Fifth Zionist Congress in October 1901 chiefly owing to the activity of the "Democratic Fraction" members. Martin Buber presented the idea of the Hebrew University on behalf of the "Democratic Fraction" to a non-sympathetic audience who on the whole considered higher education as the refuge of those detached from reality.

Detachment was regarded a malady of the Jewish people of the Diaspora, that must be cured by the national revival.

Weizmann was not discouraged by the lack of enthusiasm of the Fifth Congress delegates. He was willing to gain the support of Ahad Ha'Am, who was generally considered the leading mentor of his generation, therefore he presented to him another variant of the University concept that would form a synthesis between Jewish tradition and modern western technology. The new presentation included two universities that would be established simultaneously; one in Eretz-Israel that would concentrate on Jewish Studies and another in Europe that would consist of a technical department and a Jewish Studies department as well.²⁶ Ahad Ha'Am was not convinced; he held that since the Jews actually lacked genuine inner liberty, a Jewish higher education institute in Europe would accentuate their tendency to imitate the Gentiles.²⁷

Paradoxically it was Herzl who supported his opponents' idea, for he had come to believe a University would advance his political strategy to achieve his Zionist goals. In May 1902 Herzl applied to the Ottoman Sultan and among other requests (mainly for a general admission for Jews to immigrate to Palestine and settle there) he appealed for a permission to establish a University for Jews in Jerusalem. Permission for all requests was not granted.²⁸ That same year Herzl published his utopic book *Altneueland*, where he described his vision of Eretz-Israel after the Zionist goals would be achieved, and the ideal society that would live in it. A university appears in the book as an institute that would serve universal needs, for all human beings.

In the summer of 1902 Weizmann opened an office in Geneva, together with Bertold Feiwel (an Austrian writer and Zionist leader) and Buber, that served as headquarters for their University promotion activities. One important action was a publication of a pamphlet, "*Das Projekt einer Juedischen Hochschule*", which stated a detailed and ambitious plan for the University (it was published only in German). The proposed plan, that did not propose any specific characteristics that would distinguish the proposed University, merged two existing models, the German and Swiss University and the polytechnic (similar to the University of Brussels). Three departments were planned for the institute, a general studies department (Humanities and Jewish Studies), a Mathematics and Natural Sciences department and a Technology Department (electronics, construction engineering, chemistry and agriculture). A medical school was

not included for financial reasons, but the natural sciences students could eventually become candidates for medical studies. Palestine was only one possible location they pointed out for the University, together with Switzerland and England. Consequently it appears that this proposed idea of a Jewish University was presented rather from the point of view of the Jewish intelligentsia in Europe, not of Zionist interests in Eretz-Israel. Perhaps that explains why the publication had not been widely circulated, and yet its proposal is surprisingly similar to the eventual Hebrew University. In the autumn of 1902 Weizmann went on a tour of Jewish communities in Russia to raise money and support for the future University. His discussions with Jewish leaders bore three important operations; a comprehensive research of the conditions and needs of Jewish students in Russia, Switzerland, France and Germany, the establishment of University committees consisting of Jewish scholars in various places in Europe and the founding of promoters' groups. The conclusive report confirmed that Jewish students were discriminated against, and that in universities that accepted them, they formed separate groups. The research also showed that fifty per-cent of the Jewish students identified their nationality as Jewish, and twenty-five per-cent identified themselves as Zionists.²⁹ Those were indeed encouraging results for the University promoters.

Yet an unexpected criticism of the idea of the University, as presented by Feiwel, Weizmann and Buber came from the Ivria Jewish student associations, established in 1903 (*Ivri* is "a Hebrew" in Hebrew). The Ivria members insisted that the young Jewish intelligentsia would use the Hebrew language as a basis for their national identity. They demanded that the University be erected in Eretz-Israel and that all studies and research would take place in Hebrew and that it would include an Institute of Jewish Studies. Weizmann wrote to them in Hebrew and promised that all their demands would be fulfilled.³⁰

In the spring of 1903 Weizmann was again on an expedition to Russia on behalf of the University. But shortly afterwards all actions were interrupted due to two tragic events. The first was the 1903 pogrom in Kishinev (Russia), the severest pogrom the Jewish community had ever suffered, and the other was the Uganda crisis³¹ (the question of the University's location had become quite acute by the Uganda crisis). The effect of the pogrom was so devastating, that Weizmann immediately returned home and the office in Geneva had closed down.

After Herzl's death in July 1904 the prospect of establishing a Hebrew University seemed hopeless. Hence all political efforts for the University had ceased. Yet different individuals kept the idea alive for diverse motives. One quite special approach came from Israel Abrams, an English scholar from Cambridge, who had published his idea of a Jewish University in Jerusalem in an article in the *Jewish Chronicle* in February 28, 1908.³² Abrams had no Zionist inclinations and his idea of a University was completely detached from Zionist motives. He was a professor of Jewish Studies who believed that this area of study was deteriorating and a Jewish University would provide better facilities for its advancement. Abrams believed that the decentralization of Jewish Studies, mainly due to the dispersed condition of the Jewish people, was the explanation for the decline. Therefore there was a need for one institute, placed in Jerusalem, that would provide an appropriate and appealing centre for the best Jewish scholars and experts from around the world. The use of Hebrew as the language of research and study would create the desired merging of cultures, and the tolerance Abrams believed to be part of Islamic mentality (Jerusalem was under Ottoman rule), would overcome the different national loyalties. Jerusalem's unique atmosphere and the spirit of the ancient forefathers who lived and operated there would provide direction and inspiration to scholars and students. The Jewish University, in Abrams' proposal did not cancel the need for a regular university for the inhabitants of Palestine, Jews and others. The graduates of the regular university as well as students from other parts of the world would be allowed to register in the Jewish University. Abrams' idea of a Jewish University was actually an expression of a wish to advance an image of the scholarly Jew. It was more in the spirit of *Ahad-Ha'am* than of Weizmann. He was not interested in the nationalist significance of a university in Jerusalem, and therefore his proposal never gained repute. His idea of a University is interesting and enlightening especially because it suggests a reasoned offer for its uniqueness.

Between 1905 and 1911 the Zionist Organization, under the leadership of the "political" Zionists (led by David Wolfsohn), was not interested in cultural and educational activities, including the promotion of the idea of the University. But Hibat-Zion members, mainly in the chief office in Odessa (The Odessa Committee), had put the materialization of the idea of the University at the centre of their agenda. In their February 1909 meeting the University was mentioned in association with the discussion of the prospective of the

future Gymnasia Herzlia graduates. A university in Palestine, they maintained, would prevent the graduates from leaving the Jewish colonies for universities abroad.³³ But the idea was not developed any further until in 1911 Joseph Klausner (a historian of the Jewish people and a Hibat-Zion member) wrote an article on the necessity for a Hebrew University in Palestine as a means to make the Zionist movement more appealing to young educated Jews.³⁴ The same year he presented his idea to the 10th Zionist Congress where he argued that a University was necessary since the condition of Jewish students in Russia had worsened due to new enrollment restrictions. In his opinion the "democratic fraction" in the Zionist Organization had failed in its efforts to establish a university, for it insisted on a large university with a variety of intellectual fields. There were not enough resources for a large University, he insisted, and not enough Hebrew speaking science experts capable of teaching in Hebrew. Therefore he proposed a University for Humanities only, that would combine Judaism with general humanist values. The Humanities faculty he proposed consisted of philosophy, philology, history, literature and theology.³⁵ The following year, in 1912, Klausner brought up the idea of the Hebrew University in a Hovevei Zion assembly.³⁶ Shortly afterwards, in the spring of 1912 Weizmann resumed his activity for the promotion of the establishment of the University. Among other motives³⁷, he was encouraged by a new spirit of nationalism that swept through Jewish students in Europe in those years.³⁸

In March 1913 Weizmann had called a closed meeting of the EAC in Berlin to discuss the University issue.³⁹ In the GAC meeting that followed a few days later, Ussishkin (one of the founders of Hibat-Zion, and the head of the "Odessa Committee" at that time) introduced a resolution that the proposed University would be erected in Jerusalem.⁴⁰ Since Ussishkin had visited the Jewish colonies in Palestine a few times, he had presumed that a University would be necessary for the development of a new Hebrew society in Eretz-Israel. This new society, in his opinion, would build a bridge between West and East and benefit from both, and a University would be an important component of European culture imported by the Jews.⁴¹ Ahad-Ha'Am wished to interpret Ussishkin's idea as an establishment of a Jewish spiritual centre in Jerusalem. Yet Ussishkin objected and declared that the Hebrew University should be a political centre and not a spiritual one, because a spiritual centre without a political one is like a headless body, and so would Eretz-Israel become without Jerusalem as its centre.⁴²

The GAC nominated Weizmann, Feiwel (both, together with Buber, were involved with the University issue in 1901-1903, as mentioned above) and Leo Motzkin (a central leader of the Zionist movement) as members of a new committee assigned to prepare a report on the pragmatic prospect of establishing a University in Jerusalem.⁴³ The report was to be presented to the 11th Zionist Congress in September 1913 in Vienna. New political circumstances in the Middle East had to be taken into consideration by the University committee. First, the weakening state of the Ottoman Empire and hence the lesser weight of its objection to Jewish immigration in general and the University plan in particular. Secondly, there had been a growth in the Jewish population in Palestine, many new Jewish settlements had been established, among them the first Hebrew town of Tel-Aviv. The "Hebrew Gymnasia Herzlia" had become a prestigious educational institution, and on the whole, the Hebrew cultural and national revival had gathered momentum. The Balkan War of 1913 had been perceived by the Ottomans as a western attempt to conquer the East, hence a Hebrew University in Jerusalem could contribute to the Zionist efforts to overcome Ottoman suspicions, for it would indicate a tendency towards a joint East-West cultural undertaking. It was also believed that in order to increase the colonization in Eretz-Israel, a Hebrew University would help persuade Jewish objectors to Zionism in the Diaspora.⁴⁴

Developments inside the national revival movement also had their impact on the work of the new committee. The most influential were the Odessa Hovevi-Zion directed by Ussishkin. They brought about a change of attitude towards Jerusalem that was especially influential on the line of events leading to the discussions of the University in the 11th Congress.⁴⁵ At the turn of the century Jerusalem was a deteriorating town, filthy and stricken with unemployment.⁴⁶ For Zionists it was identified with the "Old *Yishuv*" (Weizmann described it as a ghetto⁴⁷) and not regarded as part of the Zionist settlement project in Palestine. Following Ussishkin's visit to Jerusalem at the end of 1912 and the beginning of 1913, the Odessa Hovevei-Zion changed their formerly negative approach towards Jerusalem and made it the focus of urban settlement activity.⁴⁸ In his Palestine tour, Ussishkin was impressed with the new generation of Jews in Jerusalem, who had become interested in the national and cultural revival and established Hebrew kindergartens, a Hebrew culture centre, the "Jerusalem Hebrew Gymnasia", Hebrew newspapers and above all the Bezalel School of Art.⁴⁹ Ussishkin believed that these

developments in Jerusalem indicated a change towards a productive way of life, more in line with Zionist ideology.

Another meaningful issue came up in Ussishkin's impressions of Jerusalem, which was formerly absent in Zionist ideology - he referred to the holy places in Jerusalem as being significant to Zionism.⁵⁰ Until then, the sacred places in Eretz-Israel were regarded as part of Jewish religious liturgy and therefore were excluded from Zionist propaganda. Zionist ideology, which replaced religious rites with a new national and socially oriented ideology, ignored the holy places in its Jewish settlement project in Palestine. Ussishkin and the Odessa members of Hibbat-Zion had changed this approach by embracing the holy places as part of Zionist ideology, and as a justification for the return to Eretz-Israel. Jerusalem has always been sacred to Jews everywhere, hence the decision to include it in the Zionist project made Zionism more attractive to a greater number of Diaspora Jews, and turned it into a more widely accepted movement. When he returned to Odessa, Ussishkin published a pamphlet, dedicated to the Hovevei-Zion plans for the future of Jerusalem.⁵¹ The focus of the cultural part of the plan was the erection of the Hebrew University. It was Ussishkin's opinion that a Hebrew University had become a necessity not only for students in the Diaspora, but for the young graduates of the educational system in Palestine. Apparently, Ussishkin convinced his fellow Zionists that the housing of the University in Jerusalem had an essential role in the future of Zionist actions in Palestine. From that point onwards, no other location except Jerusalem was brought up for the Hebrew University (see part 1 chapter 3).⁵² Following the new policy, Ussishkin and other Odessa Hovevei-Zion searched for land in Jerusalem, suitable for new residential neighbourhoods, which were to be planned in Garden City fashion. One of the sites that come up in the 1913 correspondence is Mount Scopus.⁵³

This account of the formation of the image of the Hebrew University is not complete without mentioning the role of the Baron Edmond Benjamin Rothschild. As mentioned in the previous chapter, Rothschild had sponsored Jewish colonization in Palestine since 1881 and erected a number of *moshavot*, but he did not support the Zionist Organization until 1913. Rothschild's new interest at that time in purchasing land in Palestine for the Zionist settlements aroused hopes in the minds of the promoters of the Hebrew University.⁵⁴ They expected that Rothschild would be prepared to assist the University project as well. Such assistance would have been valuable for the financial

aspect and no less important, for the enormous prestige and respect Rothschild would have endowed on the project.

The first draft of the University proposal was ready at the end of March 1913, and was not much different from the 1902 proposal. It suggested that the University would comprise a Medical School, an Oriental Studies Department, a Hebraic Studies Department, and a Law and Civic Studies Faculty.⁵⁵ Weizmann insisted upon setting up an international committee of leading Jewish scholars, which would guarantee a satisfactory academic level for the University. He also suggested that different models of universities would be examined to serve as a basis for the proposed University.⁵⁶ Yehuda Leib Magnes, who would become the University's first chancellor, was one of the persons Weizmann applied to. Magnes was an American Zionist leader and a reform rabbi, who represented the Jewish social elite in the United States. Yet Magnes, even though he offered his support, did not completely agree with the proposed plan. His idea was that first an Archaeology School should open, which would then develop into a Humanities Faculty with a special emphasis on a Jewish point of view.⁵⁷ He won Weizmann's approval, but perhaps they would not have agreed on the reasons; following the trend at that time, Weizmann shared the opinion that archaeology was a means to relate to the "Hebrew" past of the Jews and to validate their bonding with their roots in Eretz-Israel.⁵⁸

During the preparations for the 11th Congress, an unexpected obstacle appeared. Max Nordau, who was an important member of the "Democratic Fraction" and an enthusiastic supporter of the cultural revival, declared that he opposed the idea of the University for financial reasons (he believed that Weizmann's handling of the money collected for the University in 1903 was too extravagant).⁵⁹ There were other reservations as well - Ahad Ha'Am was anxious the idea of the University might cause suspicion among those states that were eager to take Palestine over from the Ottomans. Arthur Rupin was of the opinion that the agricultural settlements in Palestine were more essential to the Zionist cause than a university, and therefore funds should not be spent on it.⁶⁰ Nachum Sokolow (a Zionist leader, writer and publicist) and Magnes advised Weizmann that the time was not ripe for a promotion expedition for the University and even Feiwel thought that it was too soon for the idea of the University to materialize.⁶¹ Weizmann had to agree that at that time, too much publicity for the Hebrew University might dissuade the Turks and even Rothschild from supporting the plan.⁶² On the other hand, Weizmann was

afraid that the opportunity offered by the existing political constellation would be missed. He passionately believed that the University had a central role in the spiritual and cultural revival. As such, he assumed that the University was an important founding element for the Jewish settlement in Eretz-Israel, for it had become a political proclamation that accentuated the Zionist goal to settle in Eretz-Israel.⁶³ As a compromise it was decided that when Weizmann would present the University plan at the Congress, he would cautiously also explain that it was too early yet to implement the plan.⁶⁴

The nearing debate in the 11th Zionist Congress on the University issue aroused a public controversy among the settlers in Palestine as well. Arthur Rupin, then head of the "Zionist Organization Eretz-Israel Office" in Jaffa, expressed his fear that the establishment of a University contradicted the vocation of "working the land" that was of utmost importance for Jewish colonization.⁶⁵ The purchase of land, he said, was of more importance than spending the large funds a university would require. Speakers of the Hebrew Labour movement expressed the conviction that the future of the Jewish nation in Eretz-Israel depended on physical and material existence, not on a spiritual one, therefore they did not approve of a Hebrew University. They demanded of the Congress delegates to protect what in their opinion was the basis of the Zionist movement - to purchase land in Eretz-Israel and to educate the settlers to lead a productive life on the land.⁶⁶ The influential writer Yoseph Chaim Brenner was known for his zealous ideas in favour of "working the land" as a means for a healthy Jewish society in Eretz-Israel. He understood well the need for education to improve society; therefore he thought that a teachers' seminary was more necessary. Yet facing the poor situation of the Jewish nation, he said, it was not appropriate to even consider the establishment of a university.⁶⁷ But there were also those who approved of a University. A reporter in *Ha'poel Ha'za'ir* (Hebrew for "the young worker") by the name of Y. Rabinovitz, wrote that in most national revival movements in the world the intelligentsia held leading roles, and that higher education was a declaration of independence and national rights.⁶⁸ Aharon David Gordon, a most influential ideologist of the Jewish Labour movement in Eretz-Israel (emigrated from Russia in 1904) was less unequivocal. Although he was the most zealous among the idealists of "working the land", he was of the opinion that it was not possible to divide a national revival between material and spiritual issues. Therefore he supported the idea of

the Hebrew University, but added a warning that the promoters of the University are forgetting important values of manual work.

Weizmann proceeded with the preparations for the 11th Zionist Congress. One important step was nominating the British branch of the Zionist Organization to be responsible for establishing the Hebrew University once the Congress approved. He agreed with the request of the German "Organization of Jewish Doctors and Scientists for the Improvement of Sanitation in Palestine" (founded in 1912) to join the special British Committee.⁶⁹

The 11th Zionist Congress opened in Vienna on September 2, 1913.⁷⁰ On the 8th of September Ussishkin and Weizmann presented the Hebrew University issue. Ussishkin, who opened the discussion, spoke about the injustice of the neglect of Jerusalem "our spiritual metropolis"⁷¹ and positioned the Hebrew University as part of a chain of educational institutions that would serve the Jewish settlers in Eretz-Israel. Thus he placed the future University as part of the colonization plan and of national identity, and required the Congress's resolution that the Hebrew University was of first rate political and national importance.⁷² Weizmann then presented the Hebrew University proposal in a manner that was actually a hymn in praise of the numerous and comprehensive merits of the institution. As in 1902, he again spoke of the exclusion of Jewish students from university education due to anti-Semitic policies, mainly in Russia. But in 1913 it was not the central argument any more; he devoted most of his speech to the advantageous value a Hebrew University would have for world Jewry. He spoke of his vision of the Hebrew University as comprising of a wide range of effects on Jewish life. The establishment of the Hebrew University, he said, was necessary first of all for the possibility it would offer to achieve free study and research. Those would create a basis for a synthesis between general culture and Jewish heritage. From this synthesis, Weizmann said, a genuine Jewish education would emerge, and hence the whole Jewish nation would benefit. Such a centre for higher education would cultivate the self-esteem of Jewish intellectuals everywhere. The University would nurture a colloquial Hebrew language, and would provide a meeting place for creators in all fields of Jewish culture - literature, art and science. As a result, enormous wealth of spiritual vigour would free itself. Turkish and Arab students, as well as Jews, would study in the University, thus contributing to a peaceful relationship between Jews and the indigenous population. Even though it was

beyond the power of the Zionist Movement for the time being to establish a complete University, Weizmann said, it was possible to begin with a small unit which would grow and create a larger organism later on. As to the use of language - it was possible that for the first few years different languages would be in use, besides Hebrew, but the University would strive to make Hebrew its sole language.⁷³ One approving delegate was Heinrich Loewe, who said that "Universities are the birthplace of culture and *Bildung*: the European states have understood their value. Now Central Europe is celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the War of Liberation, in which the universities played such an important role. From where was the liberation of Prussia led? From the founding of the University of Berlin!"⁷⁴ His words emphasize the Zionist conception of the Hebrew University as leading the way towards the creation of a separate Jewish national entity and the New Jewish Person. The term *Bildung* has been often used in this context by Zionist ideologists (see part 1, chapter 1). The comparison with Prussia and the University of Berlin provided a familiar historical and cultural foundation for the idea as it was presented to the delegates in the Congress.

The Congress, in order to arouse objections among governments interested in the area, endorsed Ussishkin's and Weizmann's University suggestions in a general statement: "The Congress decides to authorize the Executive Committee to appoint a committee to prepare the establishment of the Hebrew University". Nevertheless, the list of leading persons nominated to participate in the committee demonstrates the importance the Congress bestowed on the issue. The committee was divided into an organizing section, headed by Otto Warburg (chairman of the Zionist Organization at that time), a scientific section headed by Weizmann, a legal section headed by the SAC members and an Eretz-Israel section headed by Ussishkin. This last section was responsible for purchasing land in Palestine for the University.⁷⁵

For further understanding of the historic significance of the 11th Zionist Congress resolution concerning the Hebrew University, it is imperative to mention that it appended to the "Language Conflict" (mentioned in the previous chapter in relation to the construction of the Technion), the debate over the use of language in educational institutions in Palestine. The Zionists and the "New *Yishuv*" people insisted on an exclusive use of Hebrew. Their opponents were the Berlin "Ezra Association"⁷⁶ members, whose most well known project in Palestine was the establishment of the Technion in Haifa. They insisted that German would be used in all Jewish educational institutions that

they set up in Palestine, because they suspected Hebrew was too restricted a language and lacked technical and scientific terms. This struggle, known as "The Language Conflict", ended with the triumph of the "Hebrews", yet until this struggle ended the Zionist Organization's work for educational institutions in Palestine suffered a delay. Furthermore, the "Language Conflict" added to the bitter argument between Zionists and anti-Zionists in Germany who supported the idea of the University in spite of their political differences. In all this turmoil Weizmann was engaged only in protecting the interests of the University. He did his best to separate the University from the debate, since he was interested in a wide support; indeed, the 11th Zionist Congress resolution accumulated a wide range of support for the University plans⁷⁷, and Weizmann did not wish to lose it. The promoters of the University were mainly Hebrew supporters, and the project could have suffered severely had the opponents won the conflict. As a result of the defeat of the "Ezra Association" in the "Language Conflict", many of its members joined the anti-Zionists. Yet on the other hand, this development strengthened the Zionist Organization's hold on educational institutions in Palestine.⁷⁸ Encouraged by the wide support, Weizmann decided it was time to enlist the assistance of the anti-Zionist Baron Rothschild. The meeting with Rothschild took place in January 3, 1914. Rothschild's considerations were not purely for the good of the University. He was a French patriot, and detested the German "Ezra Association" members, hence in the "Language Conflict" he supported the use of Hebrew in the Eretz-Israel Jewish schools. The time was ripe, then, to secure his support for the Hebrew University issue. Eventually he promised to donate money on the condition that the University would take the form of a research institute, for he believed that it was not wise to start right away with a large University plan, which might cause suspicion among the Ottomans. He also believed that a successful research institute could develop later into a University.⁷⁹ Weizmann, on the other hand, believed that in time, Rothschild would be persuaded to replace the institute with a University.⁸⁰ Following the meeting, the University Executive Committee met in Berlin on January 6, and decided to purchase land for the proposed University on Mount Scopus in Jerusalem.

Weizmann, being a practical man, knew that Rothschild's influence and resources were, therefore imperative for the materialization of the Hebrew University. He therefore tended to follow Rothschild's suggestion to erect a research institute as a starting point for the University - if they succeeded in erecting an excellent scientific

institute, which would gain international fame, it would be the most natural and practical procedure towards a University.⁸¹ From that point on the concept of the University as a Science Research Institute, quite contrary to Weizmann's enthusiastic declaration at the 11th Congress, gained dominance. Magnes went along with Weizmann's convenient change of plan and it was confirmed by the GAC (in February 1914). Weizmann was then nominated by the EAC to represent the Zionist Organization in negotiations with different organizations involved with the erection of the research institute.⁸² Shortly after he picked those first fruits of his success, Weizmann became even more out-going in his expression of approval to Rothschild's idea; he declared (April 1914) that the idea of a teaching institute was a dangerous and destructive one, and only a research institute will lead towards the erection of a University.⁸³ However, Weizmann and his supporters proved right, for Rothschild's involvement was to become an indispensable asset. After a tour of Palestine (January until March 1914) Rothschild told Weizmann that without his assistance the Zionists were helpless, but without the Zionists his own enterprise in Palestine would have been lost.⁸⁴ This expression of commitment to the Zionist project encouraged Weizmann and he presented to Rothschild letters of support from many Jewish scientists for the new research institute plan and a proposition for a Chemistry, Physics and Experimental Medicine research institute. Rothschild was prepared to donate money for the proposed institute, but would not listen to the idea that in the future it would grow into a University.⁸⁵ The disagreement led to a severe conflict (at their meeting in April 9, 1914), for Rothschild was convinced that a University would sabotage the Zionist project in Palestine. Weizmann's reply indicates that his responsibility was towards the Jewish communities in the Diaspora, not the settlers in Palestine. He said that he had no right to prevent Jewish students from their right to University education and that if he would do that, thousands of Jews might despair and convert to Christianity. It seems that at that point Rothschild gave in, to the extent that when Weizmann suggested that a University could be constructed in ten years, Rothschild said it was too long.⁸⁶ At Rothschild's request, Weizmann met his son James and discussed the proposed University with him (Rothschild wanted to draw his son closer to the Zionist cause). Consequently James Rothschild became very much involved with the Hebrew University, and assisted Weizmann in this project for many years.

The outbreak of the First World War had caused a delay in all University proceedings, but while the land acquisition on Mount Scopus was under way, and the British conquest of Palestine completed Weizmann still held that the University should be founded on a limited number of scientific research institutes.⁸⁷ He repeated his suggestion that the institutes would later develop into a proper university and based his plan on precedents such as the University of Frankfurt and Johns Hopkins University in the United States.⁸⁸ Whatever the concept of the University, the question of Jewish (or Hebraic) Studies was a central one, for what could be Jewish or Hebrew about a scientific research institute? The Jewish Studies issue was a major problem; Weizmann foresaw severe difficulties that could emanate as a result of the inclusion of Jewish Studies in the University's curriculum. The source of the problem was the variety of approaches to Jewish studies within Judaism, which reflected on the foundation of a Hebrew University that would have to find a unifying solution. The problem evolved around a number of questions – should Jewish Studies be affiliated to Humanistic Studies in general or treated as a separate field of knowledge? Or should Jewish Studies be associated with religious rabbinical studies, or rather kept completely separate from religious doctrine?⁸⁹ On the other hand Magnes supported an Archaeology Institute which would develop into a full Humanities Faculty and include a Jewish Studies Institute.⁹⁰ The argument between Weizmann and Magnes became the core of the larger debate between two doctrines on the question of the academic nature of the Hebrew University. Should it be a massive academic institution, a shelter for victims of university discrimination in the West and a national culture building device? Or should it become an elitist institution, with top Jewish scientists from all over the world? Basically Magnes supported the first approach while Weizmann was striving to achieve the latter.⁹¹ Those were the first signs of a growing fissure between Weizmann and Magnes.

The Weizmann-Magnes dispute developed into a widening gap, each representing a polar extreme. The sources of the dispute concerned a completely different conflict not directly associated with the idea of the Hebrew University, but it reflected on the University issue, and furthermore it sheds light on the general approaches to central Zionist issues and general viewpoints that touched the Hebrew University concept. During the First World War Weizmann understood the new chances it created for the Zionist cause (it is questionable, though, to what degree his access to British ministers was

facilitated in 1916 by his successful establishment of a process that would yield acetone, a solvent needed for the production of munitions). However, he achieved a commitment to permit an establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine and eventually the Balfour Declaration of 1917 (see part 1, chapter 1), which promised the Jews a national home in Palestine. Magnes, being a pacifist, resented the manipulation of the war for Zionist interests, resigned in protest from the Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs,⁹² and consequently was criticized as a dissenter. In an article in the *Jewish Chronicle* in 1921 he explained that his principles were not devoid of practical significance: "War-time diplomatic Zionism achieved amazing triumphs, but it also aroused expectations. Palestine was to be presented to the Jews as a political gift, and the Jewish people was to be delivered to a single Imperialist Government in return for a political Declaration [the Balfour Declaration, D.D.]...the political gifts of the iniquitous war and the iniquitous peace are a snare and delusion to almost all the recipients. Why not also to the Jewish people?...The Jews can achieve Palestine as the spiritual centre of the Jewish people. But they cannot achieve Palestine through war or political privilege, through oppression of their neighbours or ...dancing before even the greatest and noblest of Christian Imperialist Powers...I want equal rights for the Jews, no more and no less, in all parts of the world, including Palestine...Equal rights for the Jewish people in Palestine must mean that the Jews have the same rights as the other peoples of the Ottoman Empire".⁹³ It is obvious that Magnes and Weizmann represented opposing opinions as a result of a completely different set of values, although both were struggling towards mutual aims. Yet those substantial differences would cause disputes and competition also over University matters, as explained later.

After the war was over two major developments took place. The first was that London conveniently became the centre of Zionist activities, including markedly accelerated and intensified actions to promote the establishment of the University. The first post-war Zionist Convention was later assembled there (in February and March 1919). The second was that the term "Jewish" in the University's title was entirely avoided in favour of "Hebrew" indicating that the University promoters were quite aware of the problematic aspect of a religiously restricted higher education institute. On July 24 1918 the foundation stones for the Hebrew University were laid on the eastern slope of the Gray Hill estate (see part 1, chapter 3) while Weizmann was in Palestine with the Palestine Commission. The ceremony was not significant for the University, for as there was no academic university activity in existence it had no need for a dwelling, yet the ceremony

was successfully planned as a central political event.⁹⁴ It required a special permit from the British Home office, which had been obtained after lengthy negotiations and the intervention of Weizmann. At the ceremony, Weizmann, who was the only speaker⁹⁵ declared that the University would be a Hebrew University, and that the teaching language would be Hebrew. He also mentioned the beginnings of scientific research that already took place in Palestine in other institutions (two medical research institutes to control malaria and trachoma and an agricultural experimental station).⁹⁶ Zionists around the world praised the ceremony declaring that it was the most important achievement of the Palestine Commission. In September 1918 Weizmann formed an Advisory Committee (of Jewish and British statesmen, businessmen and intellectuals) to assist the Zionist Organization with the planning of its future activities in Palestine under the new British rule. In fact the following account of the amount of work invested in preparing an academic programme illustrates an absurdity, for Weizmann's plans to set up a Science Research Institute had not changed. It well may be that the activity concerning the content of the University had been set up for propaganda and policy interests rather than for the fulfilment of University needs. The activity referred to was performed mostly by the Educational Department in the Zionist Office, directed by S. H. Bergman (who would become professor of philosophy in the Hebrew University and its chief librarian), that was responsible for the advancement of the Hebrew University matters.⁹⁷ The Department undertook the preparation of an academic plan for the University (Albert Einstein was one of its advisors).⁹⁸ As a means of connecting the future curriculum to requirement in Palestine a group of education promoters in there, led by Dr. David Eder (of the Palestine Commission), presented the Department with educational demands they found necessary for the expansion of higher education among the Jewish settlers. They considered Jewish Studies, which in their opinion should be merged with Humanist Studies, essential for the first and only Jewish University in the whole world.⁹⁹ This demand was considered too pretentious and therefore was denied. But the display of special needs of the new Jewish community of settlers and their ambition to create a Hebrew culture, gained the attention of the Department. Hence its proposed plan comprised of a variety of research institutes, among them a Law School and a "Hebrew and Semite Civilization Institute" as part of a prospective Humanities Faculty. For the Sciences the proposal included Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Geology, Mineralogy and Agriculture institutes. When the proposed

plan was presented in the 1919 Zionist Convention in London (mentioned above), a special "University Committee" was nominated comprising of Weizmann, Otto Warburg (a German born Botanist, who was involved in various Zionist undertakings such as the establishment of the Bezalel School of Art), Feiwel and others. The "University Committee" members intended to use the proposed plan as a basis for their actions and to recruit leading Jewish scholars from all over the world, to discuss the University academic plan and the means to implement it. Therefore they initiated a convention in Basle for that purpose at the beginning of 1920. Toward the planned convention Bergman analyzed the central issues encompassed in the idea of the Hebrew University in an article in *Ha'Olam* (Hebrew for "The World", December 26, 1919). He wrote that it is important to bear in mind that the University would serve both the population of a small country and the whole of the Jewish nation in the many countries of the Diaspora. Another significant point in the article was that it must be a Hebrew University (the words Hebrew University were emphasized) or there should not be a university at all, for it should promote the developing Hebrew culture in Eretz-Israel. But he also warned the University might become a provincial, lowly institute that would not contribute to the cultural wealth of Jewish heritage. Bergman expressed a prevalent anxiety of his time the University might serve only as a national symbol and fail to function as a first rate academic institute. However, the effort to recruit Jewish scholars around the world to prevent the proposed University from the anticipated hazard of being an inferior institution had failed. The convention was cancelled since very few accepted the invitation. Hence a number of Zionist organizations were requested to offer suggestions for the Hebrew University academic plan toward the February 1920 GAC meeting in London. The GAC agreed upon Weizmann's earlier suggestion of a Chemistry, Physics and Microbiology Research Institutes and a Hebrew Research Institute (expressly not Jewish Studies). Magnes's suggestion to include Archaeology and Oriental Studies Institutes was rejected for what was explained as anticipated financing difficulties.¹⁰⁰ S. Ginzberg (son of Ahad Ha'Am), who was nominated director of the proposed University activities, established advisory committees in London, Paris, Berlin and Eretz-Israel. The plan that was endorsed in the July 1920 Zionist Convention in London included a funding proposition for three science institutes, a Jewish Studies department, a Hebrew Institute and a library.¹⁰¹ It was also decided that conditions in Eretz-Israel demanded a blend of the continental system of

state universities with the English system of independent universities.¹⁰² Ironically, the Zionist Organization thus assured its control over the University, and a first step toward this control was the establishment of a "University Fund" subordinated to the Zionist Organization "Foundation Fund".¹⁰³ Zionist Organization members hoped that control over the University Fund would provide them independence from donors' pressures and demands, yet the plan failed and the establishment of the University soon depended entirely on donors.¹⁰⁴ In 1923, Weizmann exercised his powerful position and appointed Andor Fodor (professor of physiological chemistry in the Halle University) to supervise the establishment of the proposed Chemistry Institute and to become its first director. It had been Weizmann's abiding intention that the Chemistry Institute would be first among other future science institutes of the Hebrew University, and would eventually develop into a Medical Centre.¹⁰⁵

At this stage Zionist leaders were prepared to take extravagant measures to turn the establishment of the University into a major Zionist propaganda tool. Perhaps the most powerful was associating the proposed University with the rebuilding of the Temple, an association that had an enormous impact on the University's image. Zionist leaders thus created an unexpected discrepancy, by applying a sacred and religious significance to the proposed University in order to achieve a secular and anti-orthodox goal. While they rejected former attempts to establish the University as an extended Jewish Studies Institute for fear that it would become a religious centre, they were willing at that stage to associate the University with the Holy Temple. The ancient Temple in Jerusalem has always been the most sacred site and the most important symbol for Jewish people, religious and secular. The longing for a rebuilt Temple appears in Jewish prayers and has become a symbolic wish for salvation or a revival of the nation through the ages. This increased the image of the Hebrew University as a renewed Temple and the trend of associating Jewish educational institutions in Eretz Israel with the Third Temple as in the case of the Gymnasia Herzlia in Tel Aviv (see part 1 chapter 1). The theme appeared already in Shapiro's early 1880s articles but has since been magnified. Ahad Ha'Am referred to the proposed Hebrew University as the Third Temple (the first Temple being Solomon's, the second Herod's, and by the third Temple one means the renewed Temple to come).¹⁰⁶ While preparing for the 11th Zionist Congress Weizmann wrote to his wife of his determination to achieve a significant progress for establishing the University. He

enthusiastically referred to the University as “The Hebrew University on Mount Zion – the Third Temple!,” and he added: “To my way of thinking this is the one slogan that can evoke a response just now”.¹⁰⁷ Weizmann had often used the traditional attitude towards the idea of the renewal of the Temple, which he was obviously familiar with, to promote the interests of the Hebrew University. Ussishkin too, in his address to the 11th Congress Ussishkin said that building the University would be a compensation for the desolation of the Temple.¹⁰⁸ At the laying of the cornerstones ceremony on Mount Scopus, in the conclusion of his speech Weizmann referred to the University as “our sanctuary”.¹⁰⁹ The image was taken up abundantly later, at the different convocations that took place at opening ceremonies at the Hebrew University. On the 7th of February 1923, while the University was not functioning yet, Weizmann managed to arrange a lecture by Albert Einstein in the Gray Hill residence. A large number of dignitaries attended, among them Zionist leaders, heads of Christian and Moslem religious institutions, Herbert Samuel, the High Commissioner and the Governor General Ronald Storrs. The occasion was organized not so much to satisfy the audiences’ desire to understand Einstein’s scientific theories, as much as to promote the interests of the University.¹¹⁰ Introducing Einstein, Ussishkin said: “...three thousand years ago on Mount Moriah opposite this site one of our great sons, King Solomon, built a temple to the Universal God and dedicated it as a house of prayer for all nations. We pray that this temple, the home of the Hebrew University, will be a temple of science to all nations”. Ussishkin then turned to Einstein and invited him to “mount the platform which has been waiting for you two thousand years”.¹¹¹ Hence, by using the metaphor of the Temple, the Hebrew University had been sanctified before it commenced its academic vocation.

The entrance of Magnes on the foreground of the University scene in Jerusalem was most instrumental for a certain shift in the development of the University’s image and function and to reduce its role as a Zionist propaganda tool. In spite of his opposition to British imperialism Magnes immigrated to Palestine in 1922 and settled in Jerusalem. In 1923 he joined the Jerusalem University committee and later he became its director. He thus attained equal power to Weizmann’s in the debate over the academic content of the University.¹¹² Apart from the growing tension between University officials and the Zionist Organization, Magnes and the Committee members (among them Ussishkin and Ahad Ha’Am) had struggled also to maintain an equal status for the Jewish settlement in Palestine on Zionist matters in general and University issues in particular. In fact the

arguments between the London and the Jerusalem Committees reflected a rivalry between Zionist leaders of the *Yishuv* and World Zionism leaders. University issues had actually been only a fraction of a larger problem; the *Yishuv* felt that leaders of World Zionism did not trust them to know how to deal with different matters concerning their lives and therefore they should be instructed by those who knew best.¹¹³ The Jerusalem Committee advocated a “real” university that would not consist solely of research institutes, because otherwise local youngsters would have to seek education elsewhere. They also presented the London University Committee with a detailed plan for the establishment of a Humanities Department for the University, which included a Jewish Studies Institute that would grant the University a unique character, thus differentiating it from the rabbinical higher education institutes in the Diaspora.¹¹⁴ Actually it was a power struggle between the Jerusalem and the London committees as well as a reflection of the old Magnes-Weizmann conflict. Magnes thought that the Board of Trustees could be international but the headquarters of the University must be located in Jerusalem, not in London.

As Magnes had powerful connections in the United States, he was an important asset for the Jerusalem committee.¹¹⁵ Since he had resigned from the Zionist Organization for ideological reasons, he also wished to create a University that would fulfill his Jewish and universal aspirations rather than the political national needs of Zionism.¹¹⁶ His active role in the efforts to establish a Jewish Studies Institute contributed to its eventual materialisation. For paradoxically the question whether an Institute of Jewish Studies should be part of the Hebrew University had been a source of constant debate all along. However, since many Zionists shared the conviction that Jewish Studies were rudiment for a Hebrew University, uncompromising measures were taken in order to convince the different persons and organizations to materialize it. It was Magnes’s connections with donors as well as his long and persistent involvement that provided him with the power to implement his vision of a Jewish Studies Institute. Felix Warburg of the United States was willing to donate a hundred thousand dollars for a Jewish Studies Institute, on the condition that Magnes would be nominated for a central position in the University.¹¹⁷ Magnes actually persuaded Warburg to give up his condition, however in July 1924 he was nominated to employ scholars to teach at the Jewish Studies Institute and in November it began functioning.¹¹⁸ Another donor requested influence in

determining the direction the Institute would take; Solomon Rosenbloom, also of the United States, rather hoped that the Institute would become a new *Sanhedrin* (the ancient assembly of seventy one scholars, which was both supreme court and legislature).¹¹⁹ But Rosenbloom also believed that it was imperative that the Institute of Jewish Studies should not be separate from the Hebrew University; quite the contrary, it should become the university's core and sanctuary.¹²⁰ His involvement in all aspects of the establishment of the Institute continued until its materialization, although not all his ideas were accepted. He donated the money anyway, and the Jewish Studies Institute that was eventually founded, was named after him. However, it is significant for the assessment of the decisions that brought about the materialization of the idea of the University that it was financial and political manipulations as well as academic or nationalistic considerations that made the Jewish Studies Institute feasible. But even then the concept of the Institute had not been clear or defined, and the pressure of the various interested parties continued. Magnes failed to convince his fellow university promoters of the necessity to include the study of Jewish history as a central discipline in the institute.¹²¹ The fact that the history of the Jewish people was not on the curriculum (although Joseph Klausner, the historian of the Jewish people, was available) indicates that the supporters of a more traditional and orthodox line had some influence. Magnes did try hard to have the donors' permission to appoint Klausner, yet to no avail (behind the refusal was the objection to Klausner's recent book on Jesus which pictured him in a positive way).

The opening of the Jewish Studies Institute meant that in fact Magnes had become the most powerful person in the University. Nevertheless the occasion of the opening ceremony in 1924 (it opened before the formal opening of the University in a hired Arab khan on the western slope of Mount Scopus) provided another opportunity to promote Zionist Organization interests. The theme of the Hebrew University as a Third Temple was mentioned time and again; Magnes said that the Institute was "a holy place, a sanctuary in which to learn and teach", and that although liturgy in the Temple had ceased long ago, a "*mikdash me'at*"¹²² (מִקְדָּשׁ מְעוֹט "substitute for the Temple", another term for a synagogue) has been inaugurated at the present day.¹²³

Disagreements between Weizmann and Magnes had not been resolved, quite the contrary, and as Weizmann represented the Zionist Organization the conflict reflected the fate of the University. When Weizmann suggested that Warburg's donation for the

Jewish Studies Institute would be passed on to a "General University Committee" Magnes warned against the attempt to manage the University from London. He claimed that such a step also revealed a general attitude toward Jewish inhabitants in Eretz-Israel as "natives" who are in need of direction.¹²⁴ Eventually, despite the rivalry and debates, the University did start operating. Its academic direction was based on a fusion of British, German and American academic traditions¹²⁵ for specific University regulations had not been set up as yet.

Another central and significant debate was on the issue of a teaching institute versus one inclined entirely to research. Buber, who was a Bible expert, insisted that the Jewish Studies Institute would provide as much teaching as possible. Magnes and Klausner were of the same opinion. But there were others who were worried the University might become too common an institute.¹²⁶ Magnes therefore was torn between multiple approaches and pressures. He ended up appointing those who were available and not those who would contribute to a chosen academic plan.¹²⁷ Thus, the one institute that would have marked the Hebrew University as unique, and justify its name and special place in the history of Zionism, had become an amorphous institution, which could not contribute any new value to the national and cultural revival or the creation of Hebrew identity.

In 1925 the University consisted only of the Jewish Studies research institute, and not yet visually materialized, when the carefully planned and extravagantly promulgated inauguration ceremony took place. Nevertheless the preparations had become an unprecedented, world embracing undertaking of the Zionist Organization. A ship had been chartered, flying the Zionist flag, to bring 500 eminent American Jews to Haifa harbour in time for the ceremony. They joined the thousands that gathered in Jerusalem for the occasion from all over Palestine and from Europe. Among them were political leaders, academics, religious leaders and laymen. The inauguration festivities took place for four days, from April 1st to April 4th. Lord Balfour was also present and delivered the inaugural address, thus adding a political dimension to the occasion. In major cities in Europe and the United States tens of thousands participated in meetings, academic assemblies and parades held simultaneously with the festivities on Mount Scopus.¹²⁸ Such extensive undertakings had to be motivated first and foremost by political goals and funded by political institutions, especially since the actual Hebrew University

hardly consisted of a proper academic program and of one, not very large building, formerly a residence. The articles and addresses that had been dedicated for the occasion reflected the excitement the occasion had aroused and made use of well targeted Zionist terminology. In a *The New Palestine* special issue, Louis Lipsky (a veteran American Zionist leader) wrote: "The Wandering Jew, bearing the stigma of national defeat, has travelled the world these eighteen hundred and fifty-five years, nursing the hope that in God's time he would return to the scene of his former glory...The great Empire of Rome is today ashes...The conqueror, Titus Vespasian, owes his place in history only to the act that sent the Jews once more out of their land...The Arch of Titus crumbles. And on the mountain which saw Jerusalem in flame the descendants of *Judea Devicta* gather in the year 1925 to dedicate an edifice which proclaims to the world the Return of the Exile."¹²⁹ Historical myths and religious emotions were recruited at that point, quite contrary to Zionist original inclinations, when there had been an effort to create a new secular way of life. Mordechai M. Kaplan, an American conservative rabbi, also wrote on those lines in the same issue of *The New Palestine*: "How could he [Vespasian] conceive that when the Roman Empire would be but a pale memory, Zion's children would return to Mount Scopus, where he and Rabbi Jochanan met, and there lay the foundation of a new spiritual kingdom?...Like the Academy of Jabneh, the University in Jerusalem is bound to inaugurate a new era of spiritual productivity surpassing all Jewish achievement in the past."¹³⁰ The Jabneh Academy was established to replace Jerusalem as a centre for learning, after the Romans invaded the land. The connection between Jabneh and the Hebrew University was brought up constantly in different Jewish communities around the world in articles dedicated to the inauguration of the University.¹³¹ The frequent analogy of the Hebrew University with the Temple and the Jabneh Academy suggested that many envisaged the University as a renewed centre for Judaic Studies, which would once again provide a spiritual authority for the Jewish people.¹³²

Weizmann and other Zionist leaders further advanced the secularization of the Third Temple and Jabneh myths (or depending on the audience, perhaps the sanctification of the Hebrew University) in their addresses and articles. They emphasized their role as representing a commitment to scholarship and intellectual excellence that would be expected from any modern university.¹³³ In his address at the inauguration ceremony, Weizmann too spoke of the long Jewish learning heritage, starting with the sages of Jerusalem and Babylon and later the Jabneh Academy. Yet he went on to Maimonides, the Gaon of Wilna, Spinoza, Heine, Marx, Ehrlich and Einstein, building up a

chain that actually led towards a universal and humanitarian image of the University rather than an institution focused on religion.

However, the enthusiasm, aroused by the ceremony was on a theoretical level rather than an impression based on a real existence. Bialik, who was among the dignitaries who addressed the assembled audience was perhaps the only one to point to the fact that "It is our duty to say openly and frankly that the institution which has now been inaugurated...is but a beginning, is an institution existing almost in name only. At the moment it is but an empty vessel which has yet to be filled; a child whose future has not yet unfolded".¹³⁴ Indeed Bialik was right. When the festivities were over the founders had to face expected problems any new university would and give the Hebrew University an academic substance. Moreover, it faced a number of debates and personal rivalries that were not always directly connected to the University. But first and foremost there was the question of the identity of the Hebrew University. The debate whether the University should be a "University for Jews" or a "Jewish University" had always been at the core of the idea of the University. Another conflict was caused by the wish of the Zionist movement to control the University so that it would continue to function as a means for promoting national causes, especially in the Diaspora. Not only Magnes fought against this purpose, University promoters in the United States, mostly non-Zionists, believed that the Hebrew University was just another worthy enterprise in Eretz-Israel and as such should be as independent as any university should be. They protested against what they perceived as a chauvinist approach and insisted that Weizmann would not involve the University in his political maneuvers. Louis Marshall, Head of the American Jewish Committee wrote: "Politically I am a Republican, but I should consider it a great misfortune if any of our universities in the United States was to be considered as an adjunct to the Republican Party".¹³⁵

Ultimately the Hebrew University was planned and erected mainly by Zionist activists and not by prominent Jewish scholars. However most of those activists were scholars themselves (see appendix: biographical notes). Even Weizmann, who spent a vast part of his time promoting Zionist goals, was a chemist and professor of chemistry in Manchester University. The research institutes that were eventually established on Mount Scopus soon became a complete university with different faculties and a range of subjects from all areas of learning, to satisfy the demand of the Jewish public in Palestine. After the inauguration ceremony the Hebrew University site did not serve anymore as a scene for

such extravagant Zionist productions as the inauguration ceremony and others (until 1967). The convocations for the opening of the academic year planned by Magnes were devoted purely to internal matters. When he did take the opportunity to include his views on the 1929 Arab attacks on the Jewish community in Hebron, calling for conciliation, he aroused much controversy overseas as well as in Palestine. But even when he called for applying Ahad Ha'Am's vision of Eretz-Israel as a cultural centre which transcends political aspirations of any sort, he was fiercely attacked by the Zionist establishment as expressing blasphemous ideas.¹³⁶ Magnes was not alone in the University in this respect; a number of eminent scholars shared Magnes's political beliefs (among them Buber, Bergman, Simon, and later also Senator).¹³⁷ Thus the Hebrew University became identified to a certain extent with what was considered a certain apostasy.¹³⁸

Whether or not the University played a role on the national and political scene, the wish to perceive it as such did not die; it reappeared with every political climax. "Our achievements in the political, military and economic field would have been impossible, had it not been for the training and the guidance ... received in the Hebrew University", Weizmann said shortly after the independent state of Israel was declared, and he was elected first president of Israel.¹³⁹ He thus demonstrated again the Zionist concept of the Hebrew University in Zionist ideology. Whether or not Weizmann was right is a matter for a different research; it is the concept of the Hebrew University as being essential not solely in the academic realm, but in the political, military and economic as well, which is indicative in this context. Weizmann forcefully expressed predominant political interests that placed the Hebrew University at the front of the national struggle for the establishment of the state, at a point in time when the political goals of the Zionist movement were actually accomplished. Strong nationalistic feelings and trends that prevailed in Jewish society in Palestine (and among Jews in the Diaspora) before the establishment of the State were naturally strengthened during the 1948-1949 war and immediately after the announcement of the state. In August 4, 1948, three months after the declaration of the state of Israel, while the war between the Arabs and the Jews was not yet determined, the Israeli Government made a declaration stating that "...it is incumbent upon the Hebrew University to continue its activities and to develop them in Jerusalem, as a central scientific institution of Palestine and the State of Israel. The Government of Israel will extend to the University all assistance possible for its maintenance, development and expansion of

its work. In view of the lofty mission to be performed by the Hebrew University in the life and cultural development of the Jewish people, the government calls upon the Jews throughout the world to come to the aid of the University in the fulfilment of its tasks".¹⁴⁰ Thus the Hebrew University became again a protagonist in the political struggle.

The national role attached to the Hebrew University from its beginning received a new dimension. The Hebrew University was to serve the state, very much as individuals, groups, industries etc. were expected to do. Serving the state was a value conveyed through different agents in all layers of life; education, the army, literature, the media, propaganda etc. One was supposed to serve the state in many ways, but first and foremost through military service. Therefore, not only did university students and staff serve in the army, they were also "recruited" through their attachment to the university. A description of how university teachers and students contributed to the common effort in the early 50's appears in the university's semi-jubilee publication: "The University's physicists and chemists, together with a large number of graduates and students, were playing a leading role in the scientific section of the Israel army, doing work vital for the equipment of the land, sea and air forces...In the Army's medical services, too...the University's scientists were taking a foremost part,...they were in no small measure responsible for the complete absence of epidemic outbreaks in the country - even during the siege in Jerusalem - although all the conditions for this were favourable. Hebrew University personnel were prominent also in the Intelligence Service of the Army, as well as in the field of Army education, and among other activities University teachers were delivering lectures to the troops on a wide variety of subjects".¹⁴¹ The University contributed its share in serving the state not only in times of war, as the same source describes: "...the infant State no more than the Army called for the cooperation of the University. Trained personnel was urgently required to assist in the tasks of Government, and that personnel was to be found to a large extent in the ranks of the University's academic staff...The establishment of the State of Israel had indeed thrown into relief the importance of the University's role in the Yishuv. As the only University in the country it was obviously called upon to train the scientists, the agriculturists, the doctors, the teachers, the lawyers and the civil servants who would be urgently required for years to come'.

During the pre-state period there was a tension between the Hebrew University and Zionist activists over the question of its independence and academic freedom versus its subordination to the Zionist Organization and its priorities. Now that the state was established, and the image of the Hebrew University was applied to national needs, the problem of the need for independence, essential for all universities, was accentuated.

Albert Einstein was bold enough to warn (in *The Hebrew University in Jerusalem 1925-1950*, Jerusalem, 1950): "...our highest ideal must be the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge. Only then can we create those permanent conditions in which practical achievements can also flourish and bring benefits to the country. A narrow, utilitarian spirit is as dangerous as is one which places undue emphasis on nationalism or on the purely formalistic observance of religious doctrines. We must also beware of the provincialism which so often accompanies baseless self-glorification. I hope that the University will...become a factor in Israel in strengthening the spirit of mutual understanding among men, which comes with selfless striving after truth". Self-glorification perhaps already stopped his words from making an impact. At the other pole stood Weizmann (at that time the first president of Israel) who said: "...The ideal of the Hebrew University was for many of us the noblest expression of our Zionist humanism. On it were concentrated the dreams of our youth and the endeavours of our manhood. A Hebrew University in Palestine would mean release from the pariah status which was the lot of Jewish youth in so many of the universities of Eastern and even Central Europe. It would provide a focus for the free development of the Jewish spirit. It would give scientific guidance and moral inspiration to the builders of the New Zion...".

The circumstances of an independent state put the Hebrew University in a new position. The question whether it should retain its name – Hebrew University was a valid one, although hardly ever discussed.¹⁴² It has retained its name until this day, although there are many more universities in Israel and it could have become the Jerusalem University. The fact that it remained the Hebrew University should be accounted either to the role attributed to it as a promoter of Hebrew culture and nationalism or merely to custom.

The tension between those two poles – the "secular" and the "symbolic-nationalistic" took a new turn in the Giv'at Ram site. The position of official authorities can illuminate the problem, and as the fate of the Hebrew University has always been subordinate to political considerations and circumstances the formal statement of the Israeli Government in August 1948 concerning the Hebrew University is significant. "The Government of Israel will extend to the University all assistance possible for its maintenance, development and expansion of its work. In view of the lofty mission to be performed by the Hebrew University in the life and cultural development of the Jewish people, the government calls upon the Jews throughout the world to come to the aid of the University in the fulfilment of its tasks". The national role attached to the Hebrew University by Zionist ideology from the

early days of its emergence received a new dimension; its role as a central world Jewry institution and a landmark in Jewish possession of east Jerusalem has turned into one among other emblems of Israeli sovereignty. However, informal documents present another aspect, revealing that the formal position had followed the Zionist Organization propaganda manipulation of the Hebrew University only to enhance nationalistic inclinations. A forceful and scarce public criticism of the state's actual attitude toward the Hebrew University by Professor Norman Bentwich, specifies that in fact the state not only refrained from offering the University sufficient support, it also hindered the University's efforts to raise funds and to release students and teachers from reserve military service.¹⁴³

But on the whole, the documents reveal seemingly opposite attitudes of the state establishment toward the University; one was a lack of interest and a failing to provide sufficient financial support and the other was a constant attempt to have control over the University. In his article in *Ha'aretz* (cited above) Professor Bentwich also wrote that the government of the State of Israel should learn from the British system how to support higher education and research without interfering with academic freedom.¹⁴⁴ That, as well as other protests by faculty members¹⁴⁵ reveals a dual relationship between State and the University. While there was pressure by faculty members and supporters in England to maintain an independent and free University, there was also, not only the need for the State's financial support, but also a general nationalistic atmosphere that perhaps obliterated the poignancy of the danger of a state's domination over the academy. While University administrators had formerly demonstrated that they did not altogether conform to political demands (in the case of the choice of location), the strong prevailing nationalistic emotions penetrated into every domain of life and thought. However, the Giv'at Ram campus maintained a routine of academic work in a variety of fields of knowledge. Dramatic nationalistic declarations made on ceremonial occasions for political purposes did not have much of an effect, and as a matter of fact, the Hebrew University, like so many other universities in the west, became a centre of students' dissidence.

After the 1967 war and its aftermath (see part 1, chapter 1) the Hebrew University that for about thirteen years had enjoyed its peaceful academic life away from the limelight of political events, had found itself again on the national front. The war was not yet over when politicians and University officials made a secret resolution to move the University back to Mount Scopus for political reasons (see part 1, chapter 3). The

University transformed again into its old role as a means for the promotion of national interests. At the meeting of the Mount Scopus Restoration Planning Committee, a few days after the war broke out, and east Jerusalem had been conquered, one suggestion that was brought up by Professor U. Heyd is of special interest in this context. Heyd suggested a wider historical perspective, and a personal vision for the future when he said: "The Hebrew University emerged out of a great vision, therefore we must make sure that our choice of those departments which will move to Mount Scopus will be of spiritual and political significance, in light of the given situation...We must first move to Mount Scopus those departments which link with Jewish tradition and with the betterment of our relations with our Arab neighbours. Therefore parts of Humanities and Judaistic Studies should move to Mount Scopus, and an enlarged Middle East Studies Centre should be erected. By such a suggestion we shall arouse enthusiasm in wide circles".¹⁴⁶ Once more the Hebrew University was not allowed to concentrate on its academic functions; it was summoned to enhance political and national interests. This time it was the architecture of the campus, not any academic consideration, that determined the image of the Hebrew University as a political statement. The present Hebrew University campus on Mount Scopus is a visual statement of its renewed national significance.

Notes:

¹ The earliest known attempts to erect a Jewish University occurred in Italy. In 1466 the Jewish communities around Sicily received permission from the Aragon King to establish a university for Jewish scholars and students, but the plan did not materialize. In Mantua two Jewish scholars, Rabbi David Provinciali and his son Abraham opened a university in 1564, which existed for ten years only, and left no architectural trace. Kolatt 1997: 3-4.

² Newman 1852: J. H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, London, New York, Toronto, ix.

³ Ross 1976: 48, 49.

⁴ *Ibid.*: 53.

⁵ Not all promoters of the idea of a Jewish University at that period had national values in mind, as shown by Kolatt 1997.

⁶ Myers 1995: 5, 6.

⁷ Even as far as Shanghai in China in the 1920s, where the wealthy Jewish Kadouri family members, who were acquainted with Chaim Weizmann, became interested in contributing for the erection of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. See Yehezkel-Shaked 1995: E. Yehezkel-Shaked, *היהודים, האופיום והקימונו*, ע.נ. יחזקאל-שקד, *The Jews, the Opium and the Kimono; the Story of the Jews in the Far East*, Jerusalem, 56-57.

⁸ Kolatt 1997: 4.

⁹ *Ibid.*: 6.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 7.

¹¹ Moshe Montefiori (1784-1885), a banker and Supreme-Court judge in England, was a major donor to pre-Zionist colonization of Jews in Eretz-Israel.

¹² Kolatt (1997: 7) presents comprehensive information on the Benisch proposal.

¹³ *Ibid.*: 9.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*: 10.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 13.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*: 14.

¹⁸ The German term *Hochschule* indicates an institute for higher education that differs from a university since it can be limited to certain subjects of learning.

¹⁹ Kolatt 1997: 15.

²⁰ *Ibid.*: 33.

²¹ Reinhartz 1978: 124, n. 4.

²² Weizmann 1968.

²³ Kolatt 1997: 22.

²⁴ Weizmann 1968: 166.

²⁵ Kolatt 1997: 23.

²⁶ *Ibid.*: 26.

²⁷ *Ibid.*: 27.

²⁸ Kloizner 1932: 12.

²⁹ Kolatt 1997: 31.

³⁰ Weizmann 1975: 390 n. 3, 391.

³¹ After the Sultan's refusal to Herzl's requests, the British Colonial Office suggested to Herzl a colonization of Jews in Uganda (which was a British colony at that time) as a temporary solution for the distressed situation of Jews, especially in Eastern Europe. Herzl presented the Uganda plan to the Zionist delegations at the 6th Zionist Congress (1903) thus arousing a bitter dispute and fraction in the Zionist Organization.

³² Kolatt 1997: 33-35.

³³ *Ibid.*: 37.

³⁴ Klausner 1911: 1-6.

³⁵ Klausner's proposal met with a fierce opposition of religious circles within the Hibat Zion movement. They did not approve of a modern and critical approach to religious subjects, or of schools such as Gymnasia Herzlia where girls and boys sat next to each other. Altogether Judaism to them was not merely a nationality, therefore they believed that it was wrong to present Jewish culture as a national culture. See Kolatt 1997: 38.

³⁶ "The General Assembly of Hovevei Zion in Odessa", "האסיפה הכללית של חובבי ציון באודיססה", *העולם, Ha'Olam*, 5.3.1912.

³⁷ Except for holding that the University would advance Zionist goals, Weizmann also had a personal motive. As an unsatisfied Chemistry professor in the Manchester University he had hoped to become part of the academic staff of the future Hebrew University.

³⁸ Kolatt 1997: 40-44.

³⁹ In his revived enthusiasm he wrote to his wife that in his opinion there was one slogan which would move people to support the idea of the University, and that was "The Hebrew University on Mount Zion! The third Temple!" This was the first time Weizmann ever mentioned Jerusalem as the chosen site for the University. Reinhartz 1978: 124, quotes Weizmann, 1975: 48.

⁴⁰ The GAC Resolutions, CZA, Z3/437.

⁴¹ Kolatt 1997: 39.

⁴² *Ibid.*: 40.

- ⁴³ Reinhartz 1978: 125.
- ⁴⁴ Kolatt 1997: 47.
- ⁴⁵ The new attitude towards Jerusalem was part of a changing policy within the Zionist movement. There was a realisation that most Zionist settlers prefer town life to agricultural settlements, and since the Zionist organizations were interested in a massive settlement of Jews in Palestine they began to emphasize the importance of towns as part of the Zionist project. Katz 1989: 112.
- ⁴⁶ Ussishkin 1913: 31.
- ⁴⁷ Reinhartz 1978: 125.
- ⁴⁸ Katz 1989: 107.
- ⁴⁹ Ussishkin 1913: 31.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.* Ussishkin believed that the Zionist movement could not disregard Jerusalem, since the majority of Jews identified Eretz-Israel with Jerusalem.
- ⁵¹ "לתקנתה של ירושלים", ("On the Improvement of Jerusalem"), published in *העולם, Ha'Olam*, February 26, 1913.
- ⁵² Reinhartz 1988: 125.
- ⁵³ Letter from Yelin to Ussishkin, 1913. CZA, file A24/68/21.
- ⁵⁴ Reinhartz 1978: 124.
- ⁵⁵ *Ibid.*: 127.
- ⁵⁶ Kolatt 1997: 47.
- ⁵⁷ Letter from Magnes to Weizmann, May 25, 1913, Weizmann 1975, Vol. VI, 71.
- ⁵⁸ On the subject of the recruitment of archaeology to serve the goals of the Jewish national and cultural revival in Palestine, see Shavit 1987: "'Truth Shall Spring Out of the Earth': The Development of Jewish Popular Interest in Archaeology in Eretz-Israel", *Kathedra*, Jerusalem, No. 44, 27-54,.
- ⁵⁹ Reinhartz 1978: 128.
- ⁶⁰ *Ibid.* 129.
- ⁶¹ *Ibid.*.
- ⁶² Letter from Weizmann to Magnes, June 15, 1913, in Weizmann 1975: Vol. VI, 126.
- ⁶³ Reinhartz 1978: 129.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁵ Kolatt 1997: 50.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*: 50-51.
- ⁶⁷ *Ibid.*: 51.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibid.*: 52.
- ⁶⁹ Reinhartz 1978: 130.
- ⁷⁰ See *Stenographisches Protokoll der Verhandlungen des XI Zionisten Kongresses in Wien vom 2 bis 9 September 1913*, Berlin & Leipzig 1914, 294-345, 362-365.
- ⁷¹ Ussishkin's speech in the 11th Congress, cited in *העולם, Ha'Olam*, September 18, 1913, 20.
- ⁷² Kolatt 1997: 54, 55.
- ⁷³ *Stenographisches Protokoll der Verhandlungen des XI Zionisten-Kongresses in Wien*, Berlin -Leipzig 1914, pp. 300-308.
- ⁷⁴ Heinrich Loewe, *The Jewish Chronicle*, September 19, 1913, 7.
- ⁷⁵ Weizmann 1975: Vol. VI, 197.
- ⁷⁶ The "Ezra Association" was founded by German Jews who wished to support Jewish victims of pogroms in Russia and to promote Jewish education in Palestine.
- ⁷⁷ Reinhartz 1978: 138-139.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*: p. 137. It is interesting, though, as Reinhartz points out, that Weizmann himself was ambivalent on the language issue; first because he did not want to lose their financial support, and secondly because he himself was not certain that Hebrew was sufficient for the study of Sciences.

- ⁷⁹ Letter from Weizmann to his wife, January 3, 1914. In Weizmann 1975, vol. VI, 221.
- ⁸⁰ Letter from Weizmann to Womesser, January 15, 1914. *Ibid.*: 233.
- ⁸¹ Letter from Weizmann to Magnes, January 23, 1914. *Ibid.*: 250.
- ⁸² Letter from Chelnow to Jakobsohn, March 11, 1914. *Beschluesse der Sitzung des GAC vom 27 und 28 Februar und Maerz 1914*. Cited in Reinhartz 1978: 142.
- ⁸³ Letter from Weizmann to the SAC, April 26, 1914. Weizmann 1975: 361.
- ⁸⁴ Letter from Weizmann to Ahad Ha'Am, March 28, 1914, *Ibid.*: vol. VI, 330.
- ⁸⁵ Letter from Weizmann to his wife, March 27, 1914. *Ibid.*: 329.
- ⁸⁶ Letter from Weizmann to the SAC, April 13, 1914. *Ibid.* 321-322.
- ⁸⁷ Lavsky 1997: 124.
- ⁸⁸ *Ibid.*: 125.
- ⁸⁹ *Ibid.*: 125, 126.
- ⁹⁰ The problem of the Institution of Jewish Studies and its erection is most thoroughly researched in Myers 1995.
- ⁹¹ Goren 1997: 363.
- ⁹² Goren 1982: A. A. Goren (ed.) *Dissenter in Zion; from the Writings of Judah L. Magnes*, Cambridge Mass., and London: 122.
- ⁹³ Magnes, *The Jewish Chronicle*, August 26, 1921.17, 18.
- ⁹⁴ Kedar 1997: 90.
- ⁹⁵ Goren 1997: 364.
- ⁹⁶ The speech was made in English. The written versions and the Hebrew translation, published in different publications, vary to suite the different readers. In Kedar 1997: 110-119 there is a photocopy of the original draft prepared by Weizmann which is to be found in the Weizmann Archive.
- ⁹⁷ Lavsky 1997: 126.
- ⁹⁸ *Ibid.*: 128.
- ⁹⁹ *Ibid.*: 139.
- ¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*: 130.
- ¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*: 132.
- ¹⁰² University Preparations Report, 29.6.1920, CZA, L185/31.
- ¹⁰³ Lavsky 1997: 154.
- ¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*: 156.
- ¹⁰⁵ Goren 1997: 369.
- ¹⁰⁶ Paz 1997: 286, cites a letter from Ahad Ha'Am to Bentwich, 18. 1. 1914, in Simon 1959: A. Simon (ed.) *מכתבי אהד העם*, (*The Letters of Ahad Ha'am*), Tel-Aviv, V 235.
- ¹⁰⁷ Paz 1997: 287.
- ¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*: 286, cites from Ussishkin 1934: M. Ussishkin, *ספר אוסישקין*, נ.ו. אוסישקין, (*The Ussishkin Book*), Jerusalem, 239.
- ¹⁰⁹ A photocopy of the original draft of the English version of Weizmann's speech is in Kedar 1997: 110-119.
- ¹¹⁰ Goren 1997: 368, 369; Segev 1999: 167.
- ¹¹¹ Goren 1997: 369.
- ¹¹² *Ibid.*: 371.
- ¹¹³ Myers 1985: 55, 56.
- ¹¹⁴ Goren 1997: 371, 372.
- ¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*: 372.
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 375.
- ¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁸ *Ibid.*

- ¹¹⁹ Schwartz 1997: 466, n. 35.
- ¹²⁰ Lavsky 1997: 147.
- ¹²¹ Schwartz 1997: 467,468.
- ¹²² The Hebrew word for Temple is מקדש "mikdash". מקדש מעט ("Mikdash Me'at") literally means "a small Temple". "Mikdash me'at" stands for a substitute for the Temple, meaning a synagogue or a place of learning.
- ¹²³ Goren 1997: 339.
- ¹²⁴ Goren 1980: 136.
- ¹²⁵ Goren 1997: 375.
- ¹²⁶ Schwartz 1997: 470.
- ¹²⁷ *Ibid.*: 474.
- ¹²⁸ Goren 1998: 330-331.
- ¹²⁹ L. Lipsky, "Mount Scopus", in M. Weisgal (ed.) *The New Palestine*, Vol. VIII, no. 13, March 27, 1925, 281-282.
- ¹³⁰ *Ibid.*: 286.
- ¹³¹ Goren 1998: 334-335.
- ¹³² *Ibid.*: 335.
- ¹³³ *Ibid.*: 336.
- ¹³⁴ See *The Hebrew University, Jerusalem: Inauguration*, (English translation): 36-41.
- ¹³⁵ See Goren 1998: 341.
- ¹³⁶ *Ibid.*: 342.
- ¹³⁷ See Buber, Magnes and Simon 1947: M. Buber, J. L. Magnes and E. Simon, *Towards Union in Palestine; Essays on Zionism and Jewish-Arab Cooperation*, Jerusalem.
- ¹³⁸ Goren 1998: 342.
- ¹³⁹ Weizmann 1950: Ch. Weizmann, "President Weizmann's Message", in *The Hebrew University in Jerusalem 1925-1950*, Jerusalem: 6.
- ¹⁴⁰ Cited in English in Levensohn 1950: L. Levensohn, *Vision and Fulfillment*, New York: 108-109.
- ¹⁴¹ M. Spiegel (ed.) *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1925-1950*, Jerusalem, 1950, 59-60.
- ¹⁴² In a document titled "Meeting with Mr. Morgenthau": "Name of the University, Mr. Morgenthau thinks this should be changed to 'The University of Israel' which would be better also for fundraising purpose". January 13, 1950. HUA, file 100/1950.
- ¹⁴³ Bentwich, נ. בנטביטש, "האוניברסיטה והמדינה", (*"The University and the State"*), *Ha'Aretz*, 18.4.1949.
- ¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁴⁵ Redcliffe N. Salman from England wrote to Senator in April 2, 1952: "...I was told that you were rather inclined to the view that the University should be state owned and run – Never! Study our system here of the 'University Grants Committee', it's as near a perfect system as could be advised and it works perfectly to everyone's satisfaction. It means the state pays a very considerable share of his costs but the University retains absolute freedom". Senator denied the accusation in his reply of April 29, 1952: "...I have done and shall do all I can in order to keep the University free, not run and not owned by the State...I know that according to the English system, at least in theory, there is no influence whatsoever of the State on the universities. But then there is in England a long and great tradition in that respect." HUA, file 100/152. See also letter from Horowitz to Bentwich, May 14, 1952, HUA, file 100/1952. Protokol of a Standing Committee of the University Executive Committee meeting on February 10, 1954, on a dispute between the Government and the University over the nomination of Government officials as members of the Committee (Hebrew). HUA, file 100/1954. Letter from Prof. Rotenstreich to Prof. Massar (President of the University), March 16, 1954 (Hebrew), HUA, file 100/1954.
- ¹⁴⁶ Minutes of the Committee's meeting (Hebrew), 12.6.1967, HUA, file 0801, 1967.

CHAPTER 3

CONSIDERATIONS OF LOCATION FOR THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY.

As the former chapter shows, Zionists from various countries in Europe and the United States resolved to erect the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. However, as much as it may seem unlikely today, the choice of Jerusalem was not an immediate or obvious one. The first time Jerusalem played an essential part within the Zionist Organization was at the 11th Zionist Congress, when the Hebrew University was discussed and there was a unanimous resolution that the University should be erected in Jerusalem.¹ Two different locations in Jerusalem, Mount Scopus and Giv'at Ram (see plate 3), became the dwelling sites of the Hebrew University since its establishment. Once the cornerstones for the Hebrew University were laid on Mount Scopus in 1918 a process had begun of merging the institute and the site into a unified entity in the minds of Zionists and the Jewish community in Palestine and the Diaspora. An interrelationship developed between the site with its ancient glory and the new visionary institute, that led to the creation of a merge which, to a great extent is still valid. Mount Scopus has become identified with the Hebrew University, and actually in Israel when one mentions Mount Scopus it would usually refer to the Hebrew University, and vice versa.

Rising between Jerusalem and the Judaeian wilderness, the narrow Scopus (an ancient Greek name meaning "viewing")² summit is part of a long and narrow mountain range that consists of the Mount of Olives at its southern end.³ It is one of a circle of mountains that sharply define the Old City on the Jerusalem plateau (plate 25) which lies on the main watershed of the Jerusalem Hills. Between the range of Mount of Olives and Mount Scopus and the Old City lies the deep Kidron valley which starts at the Jerusalem plateau and flows down to the Dead Sea, the lowest point on the earth's surface. These topographical features give the Temple Mount a quality of an enormous protected stage. The eastern slopes of Mount Scopus that flow steeply toward the Judaeian wilderness are rocky and barren, while the mild western slopes are covered with typical Mediterranean flora. The striking combination of natural beauty and grandeur of this view is owing to the unusual location between the two extremes, the barrenness of the wilderness on the east and the green flora and ancient yet alive city on the west. Hence the uniqueness of Mount

Scopus lies not so much in itself as in the striking views observed from it. The addition of an impressive piece of architecture at the centre of the Temple Mount plateau, whether it was Solomon's or Herod's Temples, or the existing Dome of the Rock, for many centuries intensified the visual experience for viewers standing on Scopus.

Since it had been secured for the construction of the Hebrew University, Mount Scopus has remained a sanctified site and an important national emblem in the nation's consciousness, even after the evacuation of the Mount Scopus campus in 1948 and during the transfer to Giv'at Ram. Therefore the considerations of the choice of site and the site's characteristics and significance (the Giv'at Ram site as well) are rudiment in a context of the role of the architecture of the Hebrew University in Zionist ideology and identity. Obviously the location considerations intertwine with the development of the idea of the University, due to its status as a national institution rather than an academic one.

For centuries the city of Jerusalem had been confined within its ancient walls – now referred to as the Old City. Mid nineteenth century had been a turning point in the architectural development of Jerusalem. Until then its entire built environment consisted of a multi-national, multi-cultural and multi-religious population residing inside the walls of the Old City. The many Islamic, Christian and Jewish sacred sites had always been focal points that determined the value of other buildings according to their distance or visibility in relation to the sites. Consequently the Churches built on locus of alleged scenes from the New Testament were most sacred for Christians, the Western Wall – to Jews and the Dome of the Rock to Moslems. Outside the walls, in a distance around, there were only a few walled Byzantine monasteries. Building initiatives outside the walls began gradually after 1850 and gained momentum from 1880 onwards, creating a distinct separation between the walled Old City and the built neighbourhoods surrounding it. As it was highly congested, every extramural addition around the Old City was most conspicuous and imposing.⁴ Growth was so fast, that by 1914 25,000 people inhabited the new neighbourhoods.⁵ There are distinct architectural and visual differences between the Old City and other parts of Jerusalem. The 1948 war resulted with yet another political and architectural distinction between east (Jordanian territory) and west (Israeli territory).

Among mid nineteenth century initiatives, the most prominent projects were undertaken by British, German and Russian official or religious organisations. The fact that they chose to build costly and conspicuous buildings in Jerusalem indicates, as

Crinson (1996) pointed out, that beyond their primary functions as churches, hospitals and schools they were actually unofficial representatives of their governing authorities and although they had been purpose-designed, they concealed an additional interest.⁶ Crinson suggested that in the special context of Jerusalem of mid-nineteenth century those buildings were actually meant to accumulate prestige and a demonstration of presence for their countries.⁷ Obviously this interpretation is based on the recognition that Jerusalem possessed a special appeal owing to its extraordinary religious and symbolic significance for Jews, Christians and Moslems all over the world. That the construction of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem was essentially another such declaration of presence and power is a basic assumption of this dissertation, only in this case, it represents the Zionist Organization and the State of Israel.

Jerusalem had become identified with the Zionist cause and still is, but it did not always enjoy such a weighty rank in the eyes of Zionist leaders. Since mid nineteenth century the town's political status went through a long process of ideological shifts within the Zionist movement, just as much as its sites have gradually altered. Those changes of urban and social conditions in Jerusalem contributed to the process. To picture what Jerusalem, the Old City and Mount Scopus (or Mount of Olives) had been like at the turn of the century, an account by a contemporary observer could probably provide as unbiased a depiction as one could hope for. In a Jerusalem tourist guide by E. Reynolds-Ball, published in London in 1912, he wrote that a visit to the Mount of Olives is a refuge from the congested Old City, which he described as a place of "dirt and squalor...[where the tourist will find] the multiplicity of obviously factitious or fictitious holy sites, the disputes, not only between Moslem and Christian sects, but the still more bitter internecine rivalries between Greek and Roman Catholic Churches in their eager scramble for the holy places". Furthermore, "Many travellers...cannot but regard with aversion the obtrusive ritual, the mechanical formalism of the innumerable rites and ceremonies, and the lack of real religious feeling among the clergy and monks in the never-ending services of the Holy Sepulchre Church." He concluded that "the so-called Holy City is the least religious city in the world." On the Mount of Olives, though, "we are following in the actual footsteps of Our Lord...it is believed that the physical features of the Mount of Olives have scarcely changed at all since the time of Christ, a fact that naturally adds greatly to the interest of this walk".⁸ This is not the Jerusalem of the orientalist artists. However, the description of the emotions the Mount of Olives (Mount

Scopus is its northern extension) had aroused in Reynolds-Ball will be repeated by all beholders cited in this research, while the impressions of Jerusalem would alter along with changes of trends in Zionist conceptions.

Early impressions of the founder of the Zionist Organization had been quite similar to Reynolds-Ball's. Herzl's account of his visit to Jerusalem in 1898 was not affected by his national revival vision, because Zionism at its early phase was not interested in sacred sights of religious significance. In his utopic *Altneuland* which he wrote after his return from Jerusalem, he described his disgust with the filth, stench and religious zealotry he found there, and his vision of a new modern city that would be built around the walls of the Old City along with western standards of hygiene and spaciousness. Weizmann too, in his memoirs, wrote how disappointed he was with Jerusalem and its sites when he first visited Palestine in 1907, but he shared Reynolds-Ball's impressions of Mount Scopus: "...I was struck, as everyone must be, by the glorious surroundings of Jerusalem; and I thought then that there was only one place where, in time to come, we might erect some building worthy of the Jewish community, there was one hill still uncrowned by monastery or church – the Scopus, on which stood then only the small villa of lady Grey Hill, and on which now stands the Hebrew University."⁹ Weizmann's recollection indicates that he kept Mount Scopus in mind for some further Zionist development but it was not chosen by him at that time as the University's site.

In 1912 Yehuda Leib Magnes and his wife visited Jerusalem. His biographer reported their impressions of the site: "Judah and Beatrice Magnes climbed the Mount of olives, saw there the house and garden of an Englishman, Sir John Gray-Hill, and at once felt it to be the spot for the university of their dreams."¹⁰ As no documentation has been found to attest that Magnes was the person who suggested Mount Scopus, certainly not at such an early stage, this biography cannot serve as valid evidence. Even if Magnes did tell his biographer of such an event, his recollection may have been altered by later events. Yet perhaps those personal experiences of Weizmann and Magnes and maybe other persons as well who had visited the site, did have an indirect impact on the eventual choice of the University's site.

However, the history of the actual choice of location for the Hebrew University was not obvious or simple. The complex process that finally brought it about was charged with a variety of interests, beliefs and emotions. The question of a suitable location for the proposed University has existed ever since the idea of a University was conceived. The

criteria for the location considerations were not always clearly defined and furthermore, they consisted of different layers of meaning and interests. As mentioned in the previous chapters, at the early stages of the emergence of the idea of the University there had been an uncertainty whether it should be located in Europe or in Palestine. Later, as the role of the University shifted from serving the needs of Jewish students in eastern Europe to a central propaganda tool, it became clear that the University should be erected in Palestine. This was followed by a debate as to the appropriate location in Palestine - whether it should be placed close to the *moshavot* (see Herman Shapiro's opinion on the idea of the Hebrew University and its ideal location, in part 1 chapter 2) or in a town. Since the transformation in the attitude of the Zionist movement towards Jerusalem (see Ussishkin's contribution to the shift in Zionists' attitude toward Jerusalem, part 1 chapter 2) it had been finally accepted that the University would be built there. The question of a need for a university in that town particularly was never discussed.

Both Weizmann and Ussishkin rather than attempting to convince their fellow Zionists that the inhabitants of Jerusalem needed a University, advanced an approach that linked the University with the sacredness of Jerusalem. At two different occasions each mentioned Mount Zion as the future University site¹¹, but as Mount Zion was definitely not a realistic option (it had already been occupied by a densely built compound of religious buildings), the meaning of the suggestion is merely that they must have been referring to the Mount Zion as well as the Hebrew University in symbolic concepts common at that time.¹² Therefore it seems quite probable that Weizmann and Ussishkin were not referring to the actual, physical Mount Zion, but to a general idea of a sacred place and a Jewish symbol of Jerusalem, associated to Jewish heritage. Perhaps the association of the name Mount Zion to Zionism also appealed to them. Their motive had been used to provoke a response from fellow Zionists, who were all familiar with Mount Zion as a Jewish sacred place in Jerusalem even if they had never visited there. The use of a quotation from Isaiah's prophecy (2:3): "for out of Zion shall go forth the law and word of the Lord from Jerusalem" as an inscription on documents and banners on occasions of Hebrew University promotion meetings, fund raising or conferences, was a new promise for the future.

If it was a location associated with religious or symbolic significance that was desired for the University, how come Mount Scopus of all other possibilities in Jerusalem,

was chosen as a suitable site for the Third Temple - the Hebrew University? After all – Mount Scopus was not a holy place, and if anything, was associated with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

The active search for the University site began after the 11th Zionist Congress resolution of September 9, 1913, to establish a Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Only then did Ussishkin, who was responsible for the purchase of land for the University, contact Sheinkin (an Odessa “Eretz-Israel Committee” representative, who was sent to Jerusalem to purchase land on behalf of the Odessa Hovevei-Zion) to ask him to locate land for the University.¹³ The Odessa Hovevei-Zion had already been interested in purchasing land on Mount Scopus for their plan to build "Garden-City" neighbourhoods in Jerusalem. One messenger wrote to Ussishkin on the matter: “If you will consider redeeming [lands in] Jerusalem that are not historical sites, I would recommend that you acquire all the lovely land on the Mount of Olives, that is Mount Scopus, which is north of the Mount of Olives”.¹⁴ This short text clearly illuminates the attitude towards the Mount Scopus site prior to pointing it out as appropriate for the University. The difficulty in defining it geographically shows that it was not all that familiar (not as Mount Zion was), therefore it perhaps did not exist in the consciousness of the Jewish public. It was quite common in those years to refer to Mount Scopus as the Mount of Olives, for it is actually one continuous mountain range. But most important in this context is the clear statement that the Scopus was not regarded a site of historic importance. For a while Sheinkin hesitated between Mount Mukabra (also known as the Mount of Evil Advice, plate 3) and Mount Scopus for the construction of the University¹⁵: “Mount Mukabra can be taken into account for the University. It is not as beautiful and is further away from town, but one has to consider that it is close to Talpiot [a new Jewish neighbourhood, D.D.] which might grow to become a large town. From the Mukabra one can observe the whole of the Old City of Jerusalem, and the Temple Mount, but the Hebrew Jerusalem can not be seen from there. On the other hand one can observe the Dead Sea and the Jordan valley...”.¹⁶ From this letter it is obvious that a view of historical sites was requested, as well as a high altitude as was the custom in Jerusalem for representative institutions.¹⁷ Some of the buildings built in the nineteenth century in Jerusalem by representatives of Russia, Britain, and Germany were placed on the mountains around Jerusalem. The German Kaiser Wilhelm II himself came to Jerusalem in 1898 for the inauguration of the German Augusta Victoria Hospice on the hilltop, halfway between Mount Scopus and

Mount of Olives (by the time the University was officially opened the British had taken over the Augusta Victoria Hospice and turned it into Government House and the High Commissioner's residence). Its bell-tower can be seen from far until this day. The Russian Church in honour of Maria Magdalene was built on the western slopes of Mount of Olives. Hence, the search for land on one of the mountains surrounding Jerusalem indicates that Ussishkin, Weizmann, Sheinkin and also Rupin were interested in a location that would make a political statement, introducing a Zionist presence to the environment already occupied by imposing buildings of other nations and religions. Furthermore, both options, the Mukabra and Mount Scopus, would have enabled a visual link between different Jewish historical sites and especially the Temple Mount, and the proposed University.

Later in 1913 Sheinkin wrote to Ussishkin that in his opinion Mount Scopus was the most suitable place for the Hebrew University, explaining that Mount Scopus is closer to Jerusalem, but most important, it provides a better view of Jerusalem and the Temple Mount "as though they are on the palm of one's hand".¹⁸ Also, no less important, the University buildings would be seen very clearly from everywhere in Jerusalem, he wrote, providing another important indication of the University's significance as an indication of Jewish presence.

To carry out a land acquisition on Mount Scopus without risking a clash with the Ottoman rule or with other interested parties, Sheinkin proposed to set up a private company, which would buy the land and then sell it to the Zionist Organization. While the whole procedure was to be kept secret,¹⁹ negotiations with different landowners began. Of all the plots of land on and around Mount Scopus Sheinkin reported about to Ussishkin, he thought the area on the western slopes of Mount Scopus (owned by the Gray Hill family) most suitable for the University.²⁰ Ussishkin then nominated a committee, including Sheinkin, Rupin and other members, to check each offer, consider its adaptation to the proposed University and carry out the acquisition.²¹ Ussishkin also informed the SAC that the Odessa Zionists were prepared to loan the necessary funds. But the offer was declined, perhaps because of a struggle over prestige, as contributing to the erection of the Hebrew University was looked upon at that time as a matter of great prestige. Therefore the Zionist Organization did not wish for another organization to take credit for the materialization of such a major Zionist enterprise.²² Despite this, Ussishkin's committee members proceeded with their assignment and agreed to purchase the

recommended land. Only Rupin objected; he recommended the Gray Hill residence and land²³ and the committee members accepted his suggestion. The story of the Gray Hill family and the purchase of their house did not fit in with the sanctification trend of the site and the University, therefore it has never been part of the Hebrew University ethos. Nevertheless, their willingness to participate with representatives of the Zionist Organization was another contribution to the success of the project, and their residence was a reference point in the first Mount Scopus master plans. Sir John and Caroline Gray Hill were the owners of a large piece of land on the Mount Scopus hilltop and of the only building there.²⁴ They had purchased plots of land also on the eastern, southern and western slopes in the course of a few years, from 1890 onwards. Their residence (plate 26) was built in stages from 1890 on, until it became a large, two-storey mansion next to the hilltop road. Between the main building and the road there stood a few service buildings and a massive stone gateway. From the eastern wall of the residence an open arcade stretched out towards the east, into the garden, forming a long lookout towards the garden and also a possibility to see the Jordan valley and the mountains of Moav beyond it. In 1911 Gray Hill had decided to sell his property in Jerusalem due to financial difficulties and to his ageing condition. This wish met with the search for a suitable location for the future Hebrew University (Gray Hill was in England and too old to travel to Jerusalem to complete the deal, but Sheinkin contacted him through his friend Benjamin Ivri, a Jewish merchant from Haifa, who corresponded with Gray Hill). Gray Hill was glad to sell his property for a cause in which he had ardently believed, as his address of November 30, 1913 at the Liverpool Jewish Literary Society proves. He then expressed his enthusiasm for the idea of the proposed University, and among other things he said: "...Do let it be a beautiful building...In building your University you might even rival the beauty of the Mosque of Omar [i.e. the Dome of the Rock, commonly referred to by mistake as the Mosque of Omar, D. D.]".²⁵ Gray Hill's moving appeal also points to an issue of importance for the question of the location and for the investigation of the architects' concept of the views surrounding Mount Scopus and especially the impact of the Dome of the Rock.

For anyone who has ever visited Jerusalem it is not surprising that Gray Hill spoke of an alleged comparison of a University building on Mount Scopus with the Dome of the Rock. The Dome of the Rock (plate 27) is situated on the large, partially artificial platform

of the Temple Mount, on the summit of Mount Moriah. It was built in the 7th century on the assumed site of Solomon's and later Herod's Temple. No doubt the Dome of the Rock has become the most imposing building in Jerusalem owing to its architectural magnificence and unique location. Whether the extraordinarily splendid view of the Dome of the Rock was taken into account when the Mount Scopus site was chosen remains an open question, however the possibility of a view of the Dome of the Rock was often mentioned as an asset. Anyway, this overwhelming panorama, as observed from Mount Scopus, must have been a constant reminder of the Temple.

On January 5, 1914 (two days after the meeting between Weizmann and the Baron Edmond Rothschild to discuss a donation for the Hebrew University, mentioned in the previous chapter), Ussishkin wrote to Rupin to purchase land on Mount Scopus for the Hebrew University.²⁶ With Weizmann's approval (although his conflict with Rothschild was not yet resolved)²⁷, Rupin then continued negotiations for the land acquisition, as the representative of the Eretz-Israel Office.²⁸ On the 9th of March 1914 Rupin and the Gray Hill representatives signed the acquisition documents in Jerusalem; Rupin later wrote in his diary: "Today I succeeded in buying from Sir John Gray Hill his large and magnificently situated property on Mount Scopus, thus acquiring the first piece of ground for the Jewish university in Jerusalem".²⁹ Sir John Gray Hill died in June the same year. The outbreak of the First World War had prevented the consummation of the terms of the contract, and the deal was finalised only in 1916, although the British conquest of Palestine was not yet completed (even though the last payment for the land had been delayed and handed to Caroline Gray Hill only in July 1920).³⁰ When the foundation stones had been laid in 1918 Weizmann opened his speech saying: "We have layed the foundation stone of the first Hebrew University, which is to be erected on this hill overlooking the City of Jerusalem. Many of us will have had their thoughts cast back to the great historic scenes associated with Jerusalem, scenes that have become part of the heritage of mankind. It is not too fanciful to picture the souls of those who have made our history, here with us to-day, inspiring us, urging us onwards to greater and ever greater tasks".³¹ The lofty words, worthy of the occasion, connect the site with Jerusalem and its historic heritage and connect the Hebrew University with the ancient history of the Jewish people. It was therefore a speech that delivered a purely nationalistic message.

From the various explanations for the choice of Mount Scopus for the University site it is quite clear that there was little consideration for the University's interests. There is of course a possibility that the promoters of the University followed the European and American concept of a University in the country, outside of the city and its sinister influences. If so, no such argument was ever presented at all. A remark made by Weizmann in a letter to Magnes comes closest to such a concept: "...it is essential that there should be enough room round the University to establish a settlement, something like the Tel Aviv...the University must be built in a place where there is plenty of free space around, not only for the extension of the University itself, but also for the establishment of a future new Jerusalem....".³² Bearing in mind Weizmann's former negative reaction to Jerusalem and its "old *Yishuv*", this remark could be seen as part of the Zionist wish to establish settlements of the "new *Yishuv*" all over Eretz-Israel, especially in Jerusalem. Mount Scopus certainly was the perfect choice for the fulfilment of the interests of the Zionist Organization at that time, and it is doubtful that Weizmann was not aware of the purport of the expression "New Jerusalem". It is clear that he considered a conspicuous campus an advantage, for it would then compete with the architectural "statements" and power symbols of other religions and nations in Jerusalem and on the hills around it. Furthermore, owing to the secular and mundane nature of the Gray Hill residence the Hebrew University campus would not be affiliated to any holy place, thus it would not have to compete for uniqueness. Devoid of religious, historical or national associations, the Gray Hill residence did not interfere with the nationalistic symbolism attached to the University and its location. But as to the question whether the location was also beneficial for university functions, there is no evidence of any such discussions. It is quite obvious, though, that constructing the University on Mount Scopus was beneficial for the Zionist cause. As mentioned before, from this view point the choice of location for the Hebrew University can be interpreted in the same imperialist terms as the location and construction of the German hospice and the Russian and the British churches. Zionist leaders definitely identified those buildings for what they really were, and strove to apply a similar effect, or perhaps even a stronger one, to the Hebrew University. Historical and religious symbolism provided the relevance to the site for its new vocation and added to its prestigious position in Zionist ethos.³³ Indeed the tendency to refer to the Hebrew University as a renewed Temple was not lessened after the laying of the corner stones ceremony, quite the

contrary, the image was actually emphasized in different ways. The pile of corner stones, reminiscent of the form of an ancient altar, was supposed to consist of twelve stones, one for each of the ancient Israelite tribes (in fact there were fourteen stones, as there were fourteen persons who were honoured with laying of the stones).³⁴ Through this symbolism the concept of the future Hebrew University and its location were rooted in the ancient heritage of the Hebrews and the site had become a substitute sanctuary in a way; people actually performed pilgrimages to the site, and Weizmann had a painting of it above his bed in his Rehovot residence.³⁵ Later, in 1923, on the occasion of Albert Einstein's lecture at the Gray Hill residence, when Ussishkin made the connection between the Hebrew University and the Temple of Solomon (see part 1 chapter 2), he created a reference to the past indicating that although he was standing in Jerusalem of the year 1923 he actually saw Jerusalem of two and three thousand years ago, the Golden Era of the Hebrews, that would be revived by the erection of the Hebrew University: "We pray that this temple, the home of the Hebrew University, will be a temple of science to all nations".³⁶

That an intentional effort was made to turn the site, as well as the institute, into a joint symbol of the national revival is obvious from the festivities planned for the occasion of the opening ceremony in 1925. Lipsky, in his article in the special issue of *The New Palestine*³⁷ (mentioned in Part 1, chapter 2), depicted the unique and awesome views revealed from Mount Scopus adding to them also remote and impossible views which turned his description into a metaphor: "Looking to the east...you see the Mountains of Moab and the Jordan river winding...into the silent Dead Sea. To the north you see...Haifa. To the west...Jaffa and ...the Mediterranean Sea. Behind you, southward, not far from where you stand, you look down somewhat, on the old city of Jerusalem... Mount Scopus is the all-embracing eye of Eretz-Israel". Mount Scopus and the Hebrew University (that existed only in Geddes's and Mears's plans and drawings, see part 2 chapter 1), bound together in the form of an emblem, "watched" over a much vaster vista than Mount Scopus could alone. They became a supernatural, all-embracing presence.

Lipsky then created a relevance of the Hebrew University to the fate of Jerusalem and the Jewish people two thousand years earlier by connecting the ancient history of the site with the present establishment of the University: "Upon this mountain...the Roman General...had pitched his tent the better to direct the attack of his cohorts upon Jerusalem...The invaders set fire to the Holy Temple...As a memorial of victory...a coin was struck off in his honour

on which were inscribed the words, *Judaea Devicta*³⁸ (cited also in part 1, chapter 2), and continued – “Today...the Jewish people – *Judaea Victa* – return to Mount Scopus [to]...dedicate the Hebrew National University, which is to assemble the nascent Jewish culture and ideals that have outlived all compromise, have outlived all the devious turns and twists which Exile has imposed upon us”. The Hebrew University, was thus granted the role of a redeemer of the nation. Paradoxically, then, the long tradition of associating Mount Scopus with the Romans’ setting off to attack Jerusalem and destroy the Temple³⁹, the last relic of Jewish sovereignty, had been channelled towards the creation of a new symbol of national revival. Would it be too farfetched to assume the presence of a nuance that places the Zionists in place of the Roman cohort on top of Mount Scopus, inspecting the Temple Mount in order to recapture it? Clearly Zionist leaders invented the national importance of Mount Scopus for their purpose to create a national hold in Jerusalem. Through Zionist efforts the mountain and the institute became a primary national and historic symbol, and thus they were both seen as belonging to the realm of legend, vision and ideas. Indeed Ussishkin’s observant comment on the inauguration festivities embraced the general attitude to Jerusalem and its contribution to the Zionist cause, achieved through the establishment of the Hebrew University there: Would they have come if the University would have been erected elsewhere? Every year universities open all over the world without arousing such commotion. It is Jerusalem that has brought them all here, not us.⁴⁰

Hence, one could conclude that the significance of the Mount Scopus site was an outcome of its special political merits, even though those were not openly specified in the choice considerations. That they were effective is quite clear from Richard Kauffmann’s words: “To plan and to build on this site is indeed a task of first magnitude bearing in itself distinct responsibility and calling for special effort...Building on this site...could only be imagined for a noble and distinguished object...”.⁴¹ Kauffmann’s words indicate that the architectural task of designing the Hebrew University must have been influenced not only by the beauty of the site, but also by its invented significance.

That the invented significance has become an unquestionable component of Zionist ethos is apparent from Mount Scopus’s place in Israeli national identity following the departure from the site. When the 1948-1949 war was over, and the new borders were set in early 1949, the homeless Hebrew University was the only university in the country.

As the Mount Scopus campus had to be evacuated as a consequence of the cease fire agreement (although it remained an Israeli enclave in the eastern part of Jerusalem, then ruled by Jordan) an urgent need emerged for a substitute lodging for the University. Two major forces were responsible for the forthcoming developments concerning the new University site; one was the overwhelming significance prevailing nationalistic trends attributed to Mount Scopus and the other was the anti-nationalistic beliefs that prevailed among Hebrew University officials. The Hebrew University, under Magnes's administration, had distanced itself from the Zionist Organization's control in order to maintain Magnes's idea of a free University (this power struggle might have been a continuation of the old Magnes-Weizmann conflict described in part 1 chapter 2). Magnes was supported by a large number of anti-nationalist members of faculty. Consequently, although the nationalistic significance of the Hebrew University had been established even before it existed, the University itself rejected an affiliation with the Zionist Organization after it had started functioning. When the evacuation of Mount Scopus took place the sense of loss had brought back the old emotional response to the site and the institution, and the search for a new location became a problem which extended beyond the practical difficulty. Weizmann's lament for the loss of Mount Scopus expressed the prevailing mood: "... Mount Scopus is cut off from Israel...I feel sure that the Government of Israel will not rest until this great wrong has been righted and the University-City on Mount Scopus restored to its rightful function".⁴²

With the loss of Mount Scopus it almost seemed that the Hebrew University was lost as well; furthermore, any implication of a search for an alternative university site was considered a sign of acceptance of the situation and therefore an act of disloyalty to the national cause. A letter to the editor of the Post, a local newspaper, written by Bernard Cherrick, of the University administration, in December 1950 in response to a report that the president of the Hebrew University is doubtful whether the University would ever return to Mount Scopus, depicts the trend better than any explanation, and therefore is almost entirely enclosed: "I should like to correct the impression which seems to exist in the mind of your correspondent...and which he may have communicated to others, that the Hebrew University entertains any doubts about its return to Mount Scopus. [he] bases his impressions on the recent speech made by the President of the Hebrew University, Prof. S. Brodetsky, ...Firstly, he incorrectly quotes Prof. Brodetsky as appealing for funds for building 'a University inside Jerusalem'. In fact, the President said: 'In addition to the buildings on Mt. Scopus, we have to put

up new University buildings inside Jerusalem.' That the buildings which the University intends to erect in town are not intended to substitute for Mt. Scopus was made even more clear by a further passage in his speech, in which he says: 'We must never allow any doubt to exist in our minds...that we are in any way departing from our constant demand for the return to its (Mt. Scopus) use for University needs and medicine. I have no doubt that Mount Scopus will again be a flourishing academic centre.' But the University is carrying on its important work under cramped conditions in town. It is because of this, and in consultation with the government, that the University contemplates building in the new City of Jerusalem...When the University returns to its home on Mt. Scopus, the existence of additional accommodation in town will by no means preclude further expansion on the hill".⁴³ Not only the lengthy and detailed explanation, also the apologetic tone express the need to satisfy the prevailing chauvinist ambience. Furthermore, as the following information proves, the reporter was right, therefore the University's denial of the facts is indicative; it confirms the theory that the Hebrew University was a nationalist, not an academic asset.

While publicly University officials seemed to align with national sentiments, plans for a new campus were actually being discussed. As early as December 1949 Senator and Hoffmann of the University administration met with the architect Heinz Rau (of the Government Planning Department) to consult matters of location for new University buildings. They explained to Rau that it is important that the University and the Medical Centre should be located next to each other, on the same site.⁴⁴ In other words, they were discussing a campus, even though a small one (at least eight hundred dunams, Senator suggested). In November 1950, a couple of weeks before Cherrick sent his letter to the editor of the Post, Senator expressed his opinion in a meeting of the University Permanent Committee, that Kauffmann should participate in the planning of the new University buildings, although "This does not mean that Kauffmann should be the architect of the individual buildings...At this stage we must make up our minds about the first phase, namely the general planning...We are up against a great obstacle, in that such an *Ideenskizze* would have to take into account two possibilities: a) The transformation of the whole University to Jewish Jerusalem. b) The transformation of part of the University to Jewish Jerusalem".⁴⁵

Although the indefinite nature of the future of the Mount Scopus campus was genuine, referring to a return to Mount Scopus was mostly lip-service, as reflected in communications held by the Hebrew University administrators, Government officials, Hadassah members, architects and town-planners, concerning a suitable solution for the

University.⁴⁶ Discussions of the case always emphasized the temporal character of any solution, until access to Mount Scopus would again be possible. M. Sharett, the Israeli Foreign Secretary said (in March 1952) that there were two schools of thought at the Israeli Foreign Office about fixing a new site for the University, those who thought the University should adopt another site, large enough for the entire University and those who thought that any act of that kind would be regarded as an indication that the claim to Scopus has been abandoned.⁴⁷ A special Governmental committee was authorized solely for the Hebrew University issue, but it seems that the University was not of first priority any longer, as a member of the University Executive Committee complained that it did not assemble very often.⁴⁸ University officials opposed Governmental suggestions to transfer the University to a site far from the centre of town "which would deprive the University again of that close contact which had become the one positive feature of our leaving Mount Scopus".⁴⁹ It is interesting that in the early discussions of December 1949 (mentioned above), the Neve Sha'anani site (later called Giv'at Ram)⁵⁰ had already been suggested by University officials. However, it took a few years of bitter debates to finally agree on it. Other alternatives were brought up on different occasions by various people, for instance a large piece of land near Talbie (a smart residential area, very close to the centre of the western part of town) had become the University authorities' favourite for its central location in town. The considerations were mostly of a financial, security and accessibility nature only.⁵¹ What one can delineate from the documents is that the University administration favoured a central location, Talbie, or Neve Sha'anani, but depended on the Government's approval. The Government, which contrary to its own declaration, appeared to be on the whole quite indifferent to the University's matters, preferred the remote Ein-Karem site. The fragile circumstances of the new cease fire borders brought about a Jewish population policy in the outskirts of Jerusalem. In order to create a better Israeli hold, the Government was interested in constructing the University City in the remote Ein-Karem area. To be precise, the decision was the Prime Minister's, David Ben Gurion. Yet for once University officials considered the welfare of students and faculty as first priority and would not relent. In a resolution adopted by the University Senate members on May 7, 1952, they declared:

"(a) The place of the Hebrew University is within Jerusalem, the capital and spiritual centre of Israel.

(b) Removal of the University to a distant area would isolate the institution, its teachers and students, and cut them off from the Yishuv.

(c) Since the University has struck root in the city and is striving for consolidation and expansion without delay – in view of its vast tasks – it is unthinkable that it should be moved to an area 10 kilometres away from its temporary premises in the city and 15 kilometres distance from Mount Scopus. ...

The Senate of the Hebrew University therefore turns to all the competent authorities with an urgent appeal to place a suitable site within the city limits at the disposal of the University at the earliest possible moment so that permanent buildings may be erected without any delay".⁵² Unanimously they signed a petition stating that the Ein-Karem location was unrealistic, and contrary to interests of the supreme scientific institution as well as against the interests of the state and the Yishuv.⁵³ Although they used a nationalist terminology typical to those years, it well may be that University faculty were protesting against being used for political goals, as well as struggling to promote the interests of the University and its students, as Senator revealed in a letter: "The Government – or, rather, the Prime Minister – asks us to show more vision...and the idea of a University City is constantly presented to us as a radiant goal...It is a little amusing that Government now asks us to have 'vision', when the situation is very altered...From the point of view of the University and the interests of the population, it is essential that the University be located within Jerusalem on an adequate area...The best site would be that adjacent to the new Government area...".⁵⁴ The Hadassah Organisation was pressing for a site for the new Medical Centre and Medical School for its own reasons - the organisation could not proceed with its fund raising without a specific site and an architectural plan. Therefore Hadassah members tended to accept the Ein-Karem proposition, although it was far away from the centre of town, and eventually it was constructed there. University officials insisted that the University would stay intact, including the Hadassah Medical Centre, definitely because they believed in the idea of a comprehensive University but also for reasons of convenience, as Hadassah was a powerful and influential organization. Different sites were negotiated by representatives of the Government, the University and Hadassah from mid 1951.⁵⁵ Hadassah leaders decided almost immediately to accept the Prime Minister's determined decision that Ein-Karem would be the future University site, in spite of its distance from town. University officials, on the other hand, decided to start planning its buildings for the Talbie site, which was their favourite one.⁵⁶ They knew there was land available there, and they resolved to

apply to the Government and to KKL to assist in the land acquisition. A power struggle between University officials and the Prime Minister caused further delay.

The University's resistance to the Prime Minister's decision was quite outstanding in those years, when Ben Gurion's power was at its height and it was very uncommon to oppose him. Documentation indicates that Senator led the University resistance to the Ein-Karem site, and it may well be that as he did not belong in the national front, he was probably less under the Prime Minister's influence. Senator was an experienced oppositionist since he was a non-Zionist and a member of B'rith Shalom and Ihud, associations whose members believed in dialogue between Jews and Arabs and promoted the idea of a bi-national state in Palestine. No doubt his political convictions and his experience as a non-Zionist activist in different organizations enabled him to obtain a critical attitude toward the powerful Prime Minister and to lead the struggle against his arbitrary decision. For once the arguments were of a circumstantial nature; Senator brought up time and again the difficulties working students would face in a remote campus (he said that eighty per cent of the students had to work in order to support themselves⁵⁷). He also emphasized the benefits for the city if the University would be built in its centre (closer links between the city and the University, cultural stimulation, better accommodation possibilities for students and faculty).

The Hadassah-University Medical Centre's site in Ein-Karem was dedicated in 1952, while the Hebrew University was made to wait two more years; finally progress was achieved through two Government Ministers, Pinhas Lavon (Minister without Portfolio at that time) and Professor Ben-Zion Dinaburg (Minister of Education) who entered the negotiations with the University.⁵⁸ Consequently the University's struggle began to show results; at the beginning of 1953 the Government partially agreed to the University request.⁵⁹ Only as late as June 2, 1954, the Giv'at Ram (Neve Sha'anani) site was approved. It was not as accessible from the centre of town as the Talbie site was, but not as remote as Ein-Karem.

In becoming part of the Nation's Quarter (*Kiryat Ha'leom*) on Giv'at Ram the Hebrew University actually became part of the central national buildings' complex, and physically announced its significance as an establishment of national significance. Yet it was more of an academic, educational and secular nationalist significance, devoid of historical and religious associations that have been part of the Mount Scopus site. Giv'at

Ram obtained civic and cultural importance totally removed from the kind of religious and symbolic significance attributed to Mount Scopus. Also, the Giv'at Ram site had no notable sites around it which could create points of reference, as in the case of Mount Scopus; Giv'at Ram is not within sight of the Old City and the Temple Mount which create the focal point for all the buildings around them. As a result of these geographical and topographical facts and the circumstances of the choice of Giv'at Ram, it, never obtained an importance beyond the institution's significance and some of its old glorification. The architects were free, therefore, to plan the University's layout and buildings with pure consideration of its functions, its given natural surroundings and secular environment.

Immediate measures taken to rehabilitate the Mount Scopus campus and move the Hebrew University back to what has been considered, its genuine home, can be explained basically by naming two powerful forces. One was the enormous power of the symbolic historical and religious sites in east Jerusalem and the Old City, and the second the nationalist trends that constantly advanced a cognizance of the loss of Mount Scopus and its Hebrew University. A yearning for the "return" to the Old City of Jerusalem, and to other Biblical and historic sites in the West Bank (which came under Jordanian rule after the cease fire borders were decided upon) was constantly cultivated by different cultural and educational agents of the leading Zionist ideology in the new state. Those were inaccessible since Jordan and Israel did not maintain any diplomatic relations. In Jewish-Israeli and Diaspora culture and education this yearning became a central issue. The idea that the holy places are under "captivity" grew to become a myth, which was nourished by different means, such as the study of geography in schools, youth movements' activities, literature, poetry and popular songs. There was, and still is, a consensus in Israeli public that the "freeing" of those sites in the 1967 "Six Days War", amended a historical wrong. As the site of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus had attained a sanctified and mythical status it also became one of those sites that were "set free", and perhaps even the most significant one for the secular public in Jewish society in Israel and the Diaspora. The overwhelming effect of the outcome of the war included Hebrew University faculty and administrators, who almost unanimously reacted emotionally to the prospect of the "return" to Mount Scopus. Unlike the situation in the case of the Giv'at Ram site, this time the University and the Government fully cooperated.

The 1967 war, that broke out on June 5 and was almost over on June 11, changed the territorial map of Israel and the neighbouring countries and also brought about a change of national, cultural and political concepts in Israel. Israel occupied Syrian, Egyptian and Jordanian territories, among which were east Jerusalem and Mount Scopus. The third campus, which is also the present one, was planned and constructed on Mount Scopus immediately after the war was over. It was a Government political decision that the Hebrew University was to return to Mount Scopus and consequently a new large campus was constructed, with most of the old buildings included in it. An anonymous contributor to an official Hebrew University publication, expressed the depths of emotions connected to Mount Scopus shortly after the war: "Scopus-site of the dream come true, proud home of the national university of the Jewish people, Scopus-the campus in exile, the vision cherished throughout nineteen long years as we turned our eyes to its distant prospect. Scopus-the measure of our growth and development and now--the challenge of our future."⁶⁰

On a pragmatic level the war led the University authorities to a series of actions that can only be interpreted as political. The following detailed account of University and Government officials' actions concerning Mount Scopus would provide evidence of the unique swiftness with which the matter was dealt in a definite attempt to serve national interests. Immediately after east Jerusalem was captured, four days after the war began, the possibility of rehabilitating the Mount Scopus campus was considered. One day only after the war had ended, on June 12, a special ad hoc Mount Scopus Rehabilitation Planning Committee (Supreme Court judge Chaim Cohen was chairperson and University faculty and administrators were members), appointed by the University Senate, held a meeting to discuss a "bold" suggestion to erect a second campus on Mount Scopus.⁶¹ The fact that this idea was apparently not considered politically far fetched can perhaps be accounted for by the ecstatic emotions involved. The members of the Committee unanimously expressed their wish for the University's "return" to the Mount Scopus campus, notwithstanding the obstacles. They agreed, therefore, that since the restoration of Mount Scopus would obtain enormous public interest and resources, the University should prepare its plans. On June 18, 1967 the government decided to take measures in order to legally unite the two parts of Jerusalem. The formal announcement of the union was delayed until June 27, for reasons of political convenience (the UN held sessions to discuss the new situation in the area, and it was not advisable to arouse antagonism

against the Israeli intentions). But at the University administrators and faculty did not wait for the formal announcement, they immediately took further action to assure the University's repossession of Mount Scopus; a survey of the condition of the property on Mount Scopus was presented to the University's vice president.⁶² In a Standing Committee meeting on June 30, Skotnitsky, head of the University Maintenance and Development Department reported the survey conclusions. He elaborated on the subject of rehabilitation, stating that there would be a need for a new master plan, which would probably take a long time to prepare and therefore should be ordered without delay. Consequently he said there was no point in renovating damaged buildings which might be demolished according to whatever a new master plan would suggest. The Rehabilitation Committee also made progress and on July 25 and 30 it held its second and third meetings to discuss moving a number of education, research and service units from Giv'at Ram to Mount Scopus and erecting new units there (the Committee endorsed the decision to erect another, reduced committee, and vote on which departments would move to Mount Scopus).⁶³ On June 27 the Knesset (Israeli parliament) resolved that east Jerusalem would attain Israeli jurisdiction, and would officially become part of the Jerusalem urban district. On June 28 a ceremony took place in the open-air theatre of the old Mount Scopus campus; the Hebrew University granted Yizhak Rabin, then the military chief of staff, and the hero of the Six Day War victory, an Honourary Doctorate for his achievement.

To protect itself from criticism of any kind on its decision to repossess the Mount Scopus campus, University officials emphasized that the Giv'at Ram campus was anyway too small and urgently needed more space for its various functions.⁶⁴ However, none of the documents show any attempt to question the rehabilitation of Mount Scopus altogether. Furthermore, it seems that for quite some time the intentions to rehabilitate Mount Scopus were not weakened by the lack of a clear and definite plan. The formal discussions show that it was understood that the "return" to Mount Scopus was beyond dispute. What remained unclear was which faculties and departments should move to Mount Scopus, and how to minimize the difficulties such a move must create (such as the distance from the Giv'at Ram campus services for students and staff, commuting difficulties, extra expenses, the need for more libraries, etc.).⁶⁵

Construction works to build the new campus on Mount Scopus created a *fait accompli*. Again, through its location, the Hebrew University was at the political front, and an important factor in the creation of a major shift in nationalist and cultural identity, although the decision eventually did induce criticism, especially by University faculty. Although the University “returned” to its original place on Mount Scopus, both Mount Scopus and the Hebrew University did not retain their original “place” in Jerusalem. Geographically, nothing has changed, but social and political changes created a new relationship between the Mount Scopus campus and the city, the Old City especially. Since 1948 the myth of the “abandonment” of the Old City and the road to Jericco (as in the lyrics of the popular song “Jerusalem of Gold”) related to the places only. Like orientalist drawings and prints, their native inhabitants were non-existent. In 1967, it was the places Israelis “returned” to; the Arab inhabitants were redundant. Therefore, the Mount Scopus location had actually changed, it was on a new social and political frontier.⁶⁶

Notes:

¹ Ussishkin 1947: 18.

² There are doubts among scholars whether the identification of this specific mountain as the Scopus is correct. At any event those who made the location considerations for the Hebrew University did not doubt that this was Mount Scopus, the traditional high place for observation towards Jerusalem and the Temple Mount. Mount Scopus is mentioned in ancient Hebrew literature. The Hebrew name “*Har Ha’Zophim*”, means “Mountain of Observers”. It is believed that the first mention of it was in the first century by the Jewish historian Josephus Flavius (c. 38 – 100). In *Jewish Antiquities* (XI, 8, 5) he wrote about a meeting between Alexander the Great and the High Priest on “*Har Zophe*”. In *The Jewish War* (II, 19, 4) he wrote that in the year 70 Titus Vespasianus, the Roman conqueror of Jerusalem, stood on the summit of “*Har Zoffe*” when he commanded his charging troops. The name “*Har Ha’Zophim*” first appeared in the Talmud.

³ Today the identification of the site with what ancient sources referred to as Mount Scopus (Josephus Flavius in *Jewish Antiquities*) is doubtful: Encyclopaedia Judaica: “Mount Scopus is the northern peak of Mount of Olives, mistakenly called Mount Scopus”.

⁴ Crinson 1996: 199.

⁵ Ben-Arieh 1979.

⁶ Crinson 1996: 199.

⁷ *Ibid.*: 3.

⁸ Reynolds-Ball 1912: 74, 75.

⁹ Weizmann 1949: 169.

¹⁰ Bentwich 1954: 64.

¹¹ Paz 1997: 286, 287.

¹² *Ibid.*: 287.

¹³ Letter from Sheinkin to Ussishkin, 1913, CZA, File A24/51/1.

¹⁴ Letter from Yelin to Ussishkin, (June?) Sivan 12, 1913. CZA, File A24/68/21.

¹⁵ Katz 1989: 131-132. Later Mount Mukabra was chosen for the British High Commissioner's residence, which after the end of the British Mandate became (until the present day) the UN headquarters.

¹⁶ Letter from Sheinkin to Ussishkin, Elul 29 (August? September?), 1913. CZA, File A24/51/2.

¹⁷ Karmon 1978: 49-50.

¹⁸ Letter from Sheinkin to Ussishkin, (September?) Cheshvan 12, 1913. Letter from Sheinkin to Ussishkin, (December?) Kisslev, 27, 1913. CZA, A24/51/1.

¹⁹ Katz 1989: 132.

²⁰ Letters from Seinkin to Ussishkin, above note 17.

²¹ Katz 1989: 133-4.

²² *ibid.*: p. 134.

²³ Letter from Rupin to Ussishkin, 2.2.1914, CZA, File A24/63/3.

²⁴ Sir John Gray Hill (1839-1914) was an English lawyer from Birkenhead who held an office in Liverpool. Caroline Emily Hardy (1843-1924) was a painter. Sir John and Caroline Gray Hill supported the Zionist cause and held close relations with the Jewish community in Liverpool. Since their first visit to Palestine in 1888 they returned every year until the break out of World War I. The only comprehensive publication on the Gray Hill family and their residence on Mount Scopus is Wahman 1997: 163-200.

²⁵ The address is cited in Wahman 1997: 199.

²⁶ Letter from Ussishkin to Rupin (Hebrew), January 5, 1914, The Weizmann Archive, cited in Reinhartz 1978: 140.

²⁷ Letter from Rupin to Weizmann, April 7, 1914, The Weizmann Archive.

²⁸ Katz 1989: 135.

²⁹ Bein 1971: A. Bein (ed.), *Arthur Rupin: Memoirs, Diaries, Letters*, translated from the German by Karen Gershon, London and Jerusalem, 149.

³⁰ Wahman 1997: 189. There seems to be a contradiction between the importance bestowed on the purchase of the Gray Hill property and the irresponsibility reflected in the manner the payment had been operated.

³¹ Kedar 1997: 110.

³² Weisgal 1974: VI, 200.

³³ Goren 1998.

³⁴ Paz 1997: 298.

³⁵ Kedar 1997: 105, 106. The pile of cornerstones was destroyed when the site went through extensive changes after the 1967 war.

³⁶ Goren 1997: 369.

³⁷ L. Lipsky, "Mount Scopus", in *The New Palestine*, Vol. VIII, no. 13, March 27, 1925, 281-282.

³⁸ The exact inscription was *Judaea Capta*.

³⁹ The destruction of the Temple by the Romans is commemorated in Judaism by central liturgical ceremonies. Almost every event, holiday or ceremony involves prayers for the building of a new Temple or vows never to forget the grief over the destruction. For instance, the ninth of Av, the day of the destruction, is a day of fasting and lamenting. In Jewish wedding ceremonies the bridegroom breaks a glass to commemorate the destruction of the Temple.

⁴⁰ Yssishkin 1947: 18.

⁴¹ Kauffmann, "Report; Hebrew University – Hadassah Detailed Town Planning Scheme, Jerusalem", June 6, 1946. CZA:105.

⁴² Weizmann, "President Weizmann's Message", in *The Hebrew University in Jerusalem 1925-1950*, Jerusalem, 6.

⁴³ Letter from Bernard Cherrick, Director of the Department of Organization and Information, the Hebrew University, to the editor of the Post, December 1, 1950. HUA, file 02/1950.

⁴⁴ Memo of a discussion with Rau, December 19, 1949. HUA, file 256/1949.

⁴⁵ Minutes of a meeting of the University Permanent Committee, signed by Prof. Senator, November 13, 1950. HUA, file 010/1950.

⁴⁶ For memos and correspondences on this issue, see files 256, 010, 02, 0151 and Protokols of the Hebrew University Executive Committee meetings, in the HUA.

⁴⁷ "Note of meeting at the house of the Minister [should be "ambassador", D.D.] of Israel, Mr. Elath, with the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Sharett, on Sunday, March 2nd, 1952". HUA, file 02/1952.

⁴⁸ Prof. Senator, Chairperson of the Hebrew University Executive Committee, in minutes of a meeting on June 19, 1952. The Protokols of the Executive Committee, HUA. Also Mr. Morgenthau from the United States in a meeting with president of the Hebrew University and other staff members, on January 13, 1950: "The Israel Government apparently did not consider the return of Mt. Scopus as a primary problem". Minutes, "Meeting with Mr. Morgenthau", HUA, file 100/1950.

⁴⁹ Letter from Senator to A. Bronfmann, November 17, 1952. HUA, file 010/1952.

⁵⁰ In minutes (Hebrew) of a conversation between Dr. D. W. Senator, Mr. Hofmann (a member of the University administration) and H. Rau (architect and town-planner of Jerusalem), in December 19, 1949, it is stated that '*Dr. Senator explained the need of the University for a location outside Mount Scopus, in the new circumstances which might occur...It is necessary that the Medical School will be situated next to the University, and on the same grounds. Mr. Rau explains the city plan of Jerusalem, and points out the Neve Sha'anani area as a possible site for the University*'. File 256, 1949, Hebrew University Archive.

⁵¹ It seems that security considerations were brought up more extensively than others, perhaps indicating at an outcome of the continuing violence for many years. The rarity of occasions when anybody opposed the security arguments must indicate the extent of conformity and acceptance of such arguments.

⁵² "Site of the Hebrew University (draft translation)", May 7, 1952. HUA, file 010/1952.

⁵³ "The University refuses to move to Ein Karem-Tsuba", May 7, 1952. HUA, file 010/1952.

⁵⁴ Letter from Senator to A. Bronfmann, November 17, 1952. HUA, file 010/1952. Other documents too point to the Prime Minister as the source of insistence upon the Ein Karem site, for instance section 5 of a protokol of an Executive Committee meeting no. 10, June 19, 1952 (Hebrew), HUA, file 010/1952; Minutes of a meeting in the Prime Minister's office, June 26, 1952 (Hebrew), HUA, file 256/1952.

⁵⁵ HUA, file 256.

⁵⁶ Section 3 of the protokol of the Standing Committee of the Executive Committee meeting no. 8, September 18, 1951. HUA, file 256/1951.

⁵⁷ Senator and Mazar, section 2 of "תזכיר על מיקום האוניברסיטה" (Memorandum on the Hebrew University location", August 1, 1952. HUA, file 010/1952.

⁵⁸ Senator: "Note on the Proposed Sites of the Hebrew University", October 29, 1952. HUA, file 010/1952. Lavon was not one of Ben Gurion's followers and Ben-Zion Dinaburg was one of the founders of the "Jerusalem School", a group of Hebrew University scholars of the Jewish Studies Institute who placed Eretz-Israel at the centre of their Judaic historiographic research.

⁵⁹ Letter from Senator to Grundfest, February 17, 1953. HUA, file 256/1953.

⁶⁰ "*Mount Scopus Campus Master Plan*", a publication of the Building and Development Department of the Hebrew University, (no date). This publication was obviously prepared for the University's public relations among Jewish communities abroad, otherwise it would have been written in Hebrew.

⁶¹ Document: "ישיבת ועדת התכנון לשיקום הר הצופים 12.6.67", (Meeting of the Mount Scopus Rehabilitation Committee on 12. 6. 67). HUA, file 0801/1967.

⁶² Document: "Mount Scopus", prepared by Skotnitsky and presented to Cherrick, June 21, 1967. HUA, file 091/1967.

⁶³ Document: "סיכום של הערות והצעות שהועלו בישיבות הועדה לשיקום הר הצופים" ("Summation of comments and suggestion discussed at Mount Scopus Rehabilitation Committee meetings", July 25, 1967. HUA, file 0801/1967.

⁶⁴ Interview with Prof. Chaim Barkai of the Hebrew University, former member of the Mount Scopus Programme Committee (1970-1972 chairperson of the committee), August 6, 1997. Also see documentation, files 0801 and 091, 1967, HUA.

Chaim Katseff, one of the master-plan architects, denies that there was an extra space problem. He claims that before the 1967 war, when the option to make use of the Mount Scopus campus did not exist, the Hebrew University considered becoming a small and selective university, with perhaps less Sciences, especially since more universities opened around the country (interview with Ch. Katseff, August 18, 1997).

⁶⁵ Correspondences and minutes in files 0801 and 091, 1967, HUA.

⁶⁶ Kimmerling 1989: 276-277.

PART II

THE FIRST CAMPUS (1919-1948)¹

INTRODUCTION

Between the laying of the corner stone for the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus in 1918 and Albert Einstein's first academic lecture (that had been merely ceremonial) in the old Gray-Hill residence on February 7, 1923,² the University actually existed only as an abstract idea. Academic work began only in late 1924³ and construction of new buildings began in 1927 (with the commencement of the construction of the Mathematics Institute⁴). The difficulties that caused the delay originate in two quite different problems. One is easy to detect, it evolves from a severe financial crisis the Zionist Organization was going through during the early 1920s. The other is more complicated for it stems from a clash between the sanctified yet conceptual image of the Hebrew University and the need to actually give it physical form.

Many planners and architects participated in the attempt to design and construct the first campus. Patrick Geddes, assisted by Frank Mears prepared the first Hebrew University master plan in 1919. Fritz Kornberg of Jerusalem adjusted the Gray Hill residence for its new function as a Chemistry Institute and added a wing for the Microbiology department. Kornberg also prepared another master plan (1923) and arranged the provisional open-air theatre where the official opening ceremony took place in April 1, 1925, with Lord Balfour as the honorary guest (plate 28). Mears, together with the local architect Benjamin Chaikin, designed and supervised the construction of the Mathematics building⁵ (1928), the Library (1930) and the Physics building (1930). The Geddes and Mears master plan had been finally rejected in 1929.⁶ The same year the architect Julian Levi from New York presented a plan for the Rosenbloom Jewish Studies Institute and another master plan for the University, none of which were implemented. In 1933 Chaikin designed and built the open-air theatre.⁷ Erich Mendelsohn arrived in Palestine in 1934 and until he left in 1941 he prepared a master plan for the University and constructed the University-Hadassah Hospital and Medical School, the Students' Club and the University gymnasium. The Jewish Antiquities Museum was constructed

(1941) as an extension of the Students' Club by the architects Isaac Javecz and Karl Rubin under Mendelsohn's supervision. Joseph Weiss of New York, assisted by Richard Kaufmann of Jerusalem, planned and constructed the Rosenbloom Jewish Studies Institute (1940) and in 1944 Kaufmann prepared the last master plan for the University on Mount Scopus before it was evacuated in 1948. None of the master plans had been fully implemented.

CHAPTER 1

Patrick Geddes and Frank Mears (1919-1929): THE "HEAVENLY JERUSALEM".

Patrick Geddes (1854-1932) was a Scottish botanist, biologist, sociologist, educator and town-planner.⁸ He led an exceedingly busy life, hence the following account of his activities and beliefs will focus only on those relevant to his planning of the Hebrew University. Geddes was affiliated with the Garden City movement in Britain, founded by Ebenezer Howard, who believed in integration of residential units, industry, cultural amenities and the countryside. Geddes was known to be a visionary but also a "practical" idealist, since he sincerely believed that his vision of Utopia could be implemented.⁹ He had developed a theory of unity that encompassed also the different fields of knowledge in the Sciences and Philosophy.¹⁰ A central concept in Geddes's theory was the mutual cultural fertilisation of East and West; he believed that the East provides abstract ideas, the capability to search for an inner truth in everything and the spirit that animates the universe,¹¹ while the West contributes practicality, science, technology, analytic thinking, individuality and a spirit of inventiveness.¹² While in the past, according to Geddes, the East influenced the West, in his own time the situation has reversed. As to universities, Geddes explained that they had been a secular evolution of the monastic schools and evolved also from ancient Byzantine scholarly

influences. In his opinion the new inclinations in Western universities, to divide knowledge into narrow fields of learning, jeopardized intellectual synthesis and the University's moral mission.¹³ Universities develop within their urban social context, therefore each university develops its scientific work uniquely, while striving for a synthesis of theory and empirical research.¹⁴ The result should be a unified Science that binds together all fields of experience, including sensory experience.

As early as the 1880s Geddes supported the idea that the Irish, the Welsh and the Scots should search for their ancient separate cultural roots. Consequently he had developed great interest in cultural aspects of the links between nationalism, cultural identity and social enterprise. Geddes also became interested in the relationship between nationalism and the demand for higher education in the Celtic countries.¹⁵ It is most revealing in the specific context of the Hebrew University that Aberystwyth, the first Welsh college that had been established by Welsh scholars of nationalistic inclinations, was built in those years (late 1870s and early 1880s).¹⁶

Hence, David Eder's idea to propose Patrick Geddes as the Hebrew University planner had definitely a thorough foundation. Eder believed "that buildings do profoundly affect not only those who use them, but all who can look at them; that they sway in a very essential way the relationship of man to external nature; that ugly, ignoble buildings cramp human achievement."¹⁷ Therefore he wished the Hebrew University to be planned by the most authorized person for the endeavour. Eder was even prepared to ignore the fact that Geddes was not an architect and was not affiliated to the Zionist movement or the developing Hebrew culture in Palestine. Perhaps it was only natural for a British Zionist such as Eder to choose a planner with whose work he must have been familiar. Furthermore, Geddes's reputation was world wide. But Eder's choice was also based on the specific appointment at hand. While he was in Palestine on the Zionist Commission to Palestine in 1918 and 1919, he received a copy of Geddes's "Indore Report"¹⁸ (a survey of the town of Indore in India and Geddes's plans for its development), sent to him by Geddes himself.¹⁹ Eder then wrote to Geddes that he found certain similarities between the needs for the development of Jerusalem and those of Indore; he emphasized the impact Geddes's plan for a university in Indore had on him, and notified Geddes of the plans to build the Hebrew University.²⁰ Immediately afterwards Eder wrote

the members of the Zionist Organization in London to persuade them that Geddes was the best suited person for designing the future University. To convince them, he began by pointing out that not only the importance of the University had been the question at hand, but the future of the development of Jerusalem would be determined by it as well: "The future improvement of Jerusalem with the planning of the site for our university and the building of it are, we all agree, of great importance...". He then went on to explain his choice of designer: "Our suggestion is that we should engage the most prominent expert in town planning to come on our account to Jerusalem to study the situation and draw up a report for the Zionist Organization... the gentleman with the highest qualifications for the particular job is Prof. Patrick Geddes. Prof. Geddes knows how to maintain what is traditional and beautiful in the past whilst combining it with all the necessary requirements in the way of sanitation and hygiene and modern requirements'.²¹ What was Eder's idea of "traditional and beautiful in the past" is not clear in connection to Jerusalem, and perhaps he did not foresee how crucial this point would be considering the formal aspects of the Hebrew University and their relevance to the Jewish national revival.

Anyway, Geddes's suggestions for the development of the ancient town of Indore and the erection of a university there as part of his proposed development must have appealed to Eder and seemed to him applicable to the Zionist idea of Jerusalem and the Hebrew University. Geddes's proposal for a University of Central India in Indore occupies the major part of the second volume of the "Indore Report". Geddes had claimed in the report that education is a means of preventing deterioration and repeated the ideas he had disclosed in many of his former publications on the reform of higher education. Higher education was part of his philosophy of social evolution, as well as the need to introduce modern Science and technology into universities, thus to contribute to the welfare of the people. Presenting the Indore University as part of a development which combines the ancient and traditional with the modern must have appealed to Eder as an abstract idea (Zionist ideology combined contemporary needs of the Jewish people and its ancient past to justify the establishment of a Jewish state in Eretz-Israel). Yet among other general statements on the establishment of universities and their academic plan, Geddes also wrote that as they were supposed to be part of a social and cultural environment, universities could only be established by a demand of the people. They should not be erected by public authorities. Eder must have overlooked this statement of

his when he accepted the offer to plan the Hebrew University. Furthermore, as the account of his actions towards the planning of the University will show, he had not given any indication to a consideration of the issue. Bearing in mind that the Zionist case was an exceptional one, for the Zionist authorities represented the demand of a people the majority of whom was not part of the local population in what was generally regarded its home land (i. e. Eretz-Israel), the Hebrew University therefore was definitely erected by the authorities. Hence it seems that Geddes had overlooked his own philosophy, just as he overlooked the real needs of the Hebrew University, a situation which eventually must have contributed to the fate of his plan.

Eder must have found Geddes suitable also because of the latter's enthusiasm for the Bible and the Holy Land. Geddes's Scottish upbringing had included a close study of the Old Testament. Six years before Eder had made Geddes the offer to plan Jerusalem²² and the University, Geddes had expressed the intense emotions and stimulation the city had aroused in him: "But the best example, the classic instance of city renewal (beyond even those of Ancient Rome and Ancient Athens) is that of the rebuilding of Jerusalem; and my particular civic interests owe more to my boyish familiarity with the building of Solomon's temple, and with the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, than to anything else in literature. Jews probably know more or less how the Old Testament has dominated Scottish education and religion for centuries; these were above all the stories which fascinated me as a youngster...The improvising and renewal of cities might, and should once more, find an initiative, an example, even a world-impulse, at Jerusalem."²³ Indeed Eder must have known something about Scottish upbringing, since Geddes's own words fit in perfectly with the Zionist new approach towards Jerusalem and the holy places. With the Zionist recent sanctification of Mount Scopus and its Third Temple in the image of the University it seems that Geddes was the perfect choice to provide a suitable visionary image. Geddes also recalled how as a child he had listened to the tale of the rebuilding of Jerusalem.²⁴ This latter idea, which Geddes expressed explicitly (see his letter to Mrs. Fels, an American Zionist activist, quoted below) had been in perfect accord with the Zionist idea of building the New Jerusalem.

Geddes's close associations with the Garden City movement could have also appealed to the Zionist Organization (since the Garden City movement's ideas were favoured for the planning of settlements and towns in Eretz-Israel). Apparently Geddes

was more than pleased to accept the offer; the Zionist leaders he negotiated with were probably idealists and visionaries just as much as he was. Later he wrote of the hopes and expectations the project had incited in him: "...for the first time I have had clients in the Zionists, who were ready for all I could offer, & not reluctant to leave their old & easy going habits, as with all towns I have had to do with elsewhere." But he was also prophetic: "Of course the new Jerusalem *may* fall through, as too many of my fine schemes have!"²⁵ Again, Geddes did not connect the Hebrew University with the entire population of Jerusalem. He accepted the Zionist image of the University as the epitome of the new Hebrew culture, quite contrary to his evolutionist and holistic ideas. Thus Geddes could have actively contributed to a move that would have lead to growing alienation towards the land, the town and the majority of its inhabitants. That Geddes was actually aware of the multi-religious and multi-cultural character of the population in Jerusalem, and of the need to provide for meeting points between the different sects, is apparent in his Jerusalem town planning.²⁶ Geddes suggested the erection of museums that would illustrate the evolution of Jerusalem and would become the means for the presentation of the Jewish, Muslim and Christian components of local population. Yet even the early communications of his thoughts on the subject discussed above, show that the issue of the Hebrew University had been completely detached from this latter awareness.

The Zionist Organization eventually accepted Eder's suggestion.²⁷ In July 1919 Weizmann reached an agreement with Geddes stating that Geddes would plan the University and advise on the planning of towns in Palestine.²⁸ Geddes was anxious to formalize the agreement immediately and set off to Jerusalem, on his way to India (where he had previous commitments to the University of Bombay and was due there in November 1919). His son-in-law and assistant, the architect Frank Mears accompanied him. They stayed in Palestine from September to November²⁹, and submitted the Geddes master plan (plates 29, 30) in December 1919. Beside the architectural plan, Geddes also submitted a detailed written presentation titled "The Proposed Hebrew University in Jerusalem; Preliminary Report".³⁰ During most of their 1919 visit they stayed in Jerusalem, where they dwelled at Eder's residence.³¹ They both came again to Palestine in 1920, and in 1925 on account of the planning of the Hebrew University.

When Geddes and Mears accepted the assignment there had been no academic plan or development program they could work by for the Hebrew University. Furthermore, there is no evidence of discussions between Geddes and his clients to define the specific needs and aesthetic image of the proposed University. The Geddes and Mears plan itself does not offer any implication of any interchange of ideas on any of those issues or on the aesthetic and formal aspects of the Hebrew University. Indeed, in the monumental Geddes-Mears plan there was not even a trace of the Zionist Organization decision to construct research institutes first, and a proper university only much later. It is probable that at that early stage of his work Geddes had already been informed of Weizmann's intention to found Science Institutes first, but ignored this as irrelevant and wrong.³² According to Meller³³ Geddes took no heed of the cautious Zionist decision, arguing that the renaissance of Jewish life and culture needed an ideal and a plan on a grand scale right from the start. Geddes therefore gave himself the freedom to plan all aspects of the University, the educational, symbolic and aesthetic, as he pleased (he felt he could be as innovative as he would like; he even considered introducing cinema³⁴). He might, though, have complied with some of Eder's ideas, since one could assume that Geddes and Eder had opportunities to discuss the matter when Geddes resided in Eder's house in Jerusalem. There are elements in the plan that echo Eder's ideas; the emphasis on local needs, the inclusion of an Institute of Jewish Studies, and the way the Institute was placed in the context of the University, as will be explained later. Their mutual interest in the design of the University is obvious, first of all since it was Eder who recommended Geddes for the task and was an admirer of his work. Secondly, because Eder stood out among the University promoters for his concern for the architectural and aesthetic aspects of the University. But it also seems that Eder was as detached as Geddes from the Palestinian reality and the Zionist prospects at that time, and as romantic in his attitude towards the development of Jerusalem.

In his written presentation Geddes recounted that to prepare himself for the actual planning of the University he first set off to survey the educational system and the attitude toward education in the colonies of the "new *Yishuv*".³⁵ He travelled along the coast northward and among other places he visited the Gymnasia Herzlia in Tel-Aviv and the Technion in Haifa (which was almost completed in 1919). All educational institutes

inspected by him left exceptionally "favourable" impressions on him.³⁶ The survey must have been a result of Geddes's distinctive interest in education as well as his principle that an architectural plan should be founded on a first hand discernment of specific educational needs and local demands for certain skills. In doing so he followed his own evolutionist doctrine requesting that planning should be founded on a thorough understanding of local conditions, trends and history. Consequently, following Geddes's approach and plan, the University buildings would have become part of an evolution process and would not have interfered with its natural flow of development.

In the case of the Hebrew University master plan Geddes attempted to materialize his theories by means of an academic scheme of his own as well as designing the building layout and choosing an architectural style. His academic scheme consisted of almost all fields of knowledge customary in academia, to which he added a few that he had found fit either because of his Arts and Crafts concepts (Fine and Applied Arts) or to fulfil specific local needs (Forestry and Horticulture). Geddes conceived the University as: "...a hill-top meeting-place where Sciences, Arts and Humanities may increasingly work together, in mutual respect and stimulus, towards a unity of Culture in its fullest sense; and with this monumentally expressed, in the comprehensiveness and harmony of architectural design."³⁷

The basis for the formal design was first of all the natural and topographical surroundings and the relation of the campus to the Old City. Mears illustrated the latter quite expressively when he described the entire layout of the proposed buildings as "reach[ing] forwards on either hand towards Jerusalem. Thus the student standing at the porch of the Great Hall may feel the intimate relation of the new City of Learning to the ancient City of Ideals".³⁸ The proposed campus included the Gray-Hill residence and stretched further north and west. As the model of the plan shows (plate 30), although the buildings were laid out in a symmetrical composition Geddes and Mears deliberately positioned them to follow the sloping lines of the hill.³⁹ Geddes combined the buildings in a hierarchic setting of the academic faculties, supported by the differing heights of the topography. A domed Great Hall serves as the nucleus for the whole complex. The various faculty buildings are gathered around it, held together around by a network of quadrangular courtyards following the architectural tradition of Oxford and Cambridge. The layout, then, is a

consequence of a number of considerations; an educational principle, a philosophical concept, and a wish to blend harmoniously with the topography and the surroundings.⁴⁰

The Great Hall (plates 32, 33) in the Geddes and Mears plan was designed to contain 2500-3000 auditors, and serve for ceremonies, meetings, addresses and music, not merely for university use, but for the entire population of Jerusalem.⁴¹ It stands out not only because of its large scale and its enormous dome but also for its central location. Geddes justified the existence of a domed Great Hall in a university by mentioning precedents: the dome of the Radcliff Library in Oxford, a few other later domes in Oxford University, the domed library in Columbia University in New York, and most of all the construction of the new Sorbonne in Paris, where the dome covers an amphitheatre. As Geddes commented that there is a defect in the Sorbonne because its dome is not seen from the exterior⁴² it is obvious that the formal effect of the dome held special significance for him, not exclusively in the context of Jerusalem. The Great Hall was intended to be crowned by a "floating dome", the "Dome of Synthesis",⁴³ and would be "something more than a meeting place for occasional academic functions"; it would symbolically express "the unity of purpose lying behind the many studies of the University, and [become] ... the focus of its daily life ...".⁴⁴ Yet it also had a specific local significance; in his search for an appropriate design for the dome Geddes also considered the architectural heritage of Islamic buildings in the Middle East.⁴⁵ Finally he decided that his dome would be erected on a hexagon, unlike any other building he had observed: "This plan too I had also reached independently, and alike on architectural grounds of sound construction, (as old as the bees), and on symbolic grounds as well, since a six-sided figure alone lends itself to the full notation of Life - life organic, life social and moral also".⁴⁶ Hence Geddes had founded his architectural theory not only upon architectural precedents, but also upon natural phenomena, and the "six-sided figure" is also a reminder of the six-sided Star of David. Mears referred to the Jewish symbol more specifically: "The whole scheme is thus based on the hexagonal star, the "Magen David", which, embodied in the construction and decoration of the hall, is projected into the main framework of the whole University plan".⁴⁷ Geddes and Mears thus combined a Jewish symbol with a general philosophic one throughout the form of the Great Hall and the entire University.

However, the apparent association of the proposed Great Hall to the Dome of the Rock was not accidental. Geddes seems to have deliberately juxtaposed the Great Hall and the Dome of the Rock. As mentioned before, the Dome of the Rock is situated in a most conspicuous location and it creates a focal point that is totally impossible to be ignored, especially when observed from Mount Scopus. The design of the Great Hall shows a clear resemblance to the Dome of the Rock. The minor differences only emphasize the likeness; the octagonal shape of the ambulatory of the Dome of the Rock is replaced by a hexagonal ambulatory in the Great Hall; the dome of the Dome of the Rock is borne by a taller drum than that in the proposed Great Hall. Mears designed semi-domes above the Great Hall ambulatory roof, which add a Byzantine-like look to the building, yet do not exist in the genuinely Byzantine Dome of the Rock. When Geddes specifically referred to his scale considerations for the Great Hall as related to the Dome of the Rock, he also confirmed that he had the juxtaposition of the two buildings in mind⁴⁸: "It is moreover already larger than the Dome of the Rock, and this both as regards main building and stretch of Dome: so it is perhaps well not to exceed this further: though the distance and perspective will not render this too obvious".⁴⁹

A doorway was designed on each of the six walls of the Great Hall hexagon, with the main entrance facing Jerusalem and the Temple Mount: "Of the six doorways, that facing Jerusalem is obviously the main one", Geddes wrote.⁵⁰ This too shows clearly that Geddes had considered the architectural and formal relationship between the two buildings. Five buildings and a terrace encircle the Great Hall, following its hexagonal form. The terrace is placed in front of the main entrance of the Great Hall thus forming a *belvedere* to view the panorama of the Old City and the Temple Mount. The building to the left of the terrace is the Library and Reading Room, which Geddes had described as "a students' hunting-grounds" rather than a "librarian's preserve."⁵¹ As to its location in the general plan, Geddes wrote that "it needs to be literally central and not at a too remote portion of the site." To the right of the terrace, opposite the Reading Room, is the Dining Room, a location that fits in with Geddes's principle of symmetry between spiritual and physical life as part of the general ideal synthesis. Opposite the terrace, on the east side of the Great hall, the Philosophy Building is located, with Music on its left (north of the Great Hall) and Mathematics on its right (south of the Great Hall). The five buildings stand for

themselves and at the same time also as symbols of an integrative concept of academic and intellectual life.

From the three different fields of knowledge (Mathematics, Philosophy and Music) stem the University faculties. Music was for Geddes "the highest of the Arts" and an "inspiring spirit" for architecture and all other forms of Fine Arts. Therefore Geddes combined the Fine Arts with the Technological Arts on the northern side of the campus,⁵² in the spirit of the Arts and Crafts movement. The different sciences faculties are placed towards the south, emerging from the Mathematics Building; "Mathematics with its immediate service upon the scientific side, is naturally placed southward and next this", Geddes wrote.⁵³ Philosophy, "with its high claims of university, and aim towards Unity"⁵⁴, was to remain on its own for the time being. Its location forms a meeting point between Humanities and the Sciences. No buildings stem from it, since Geddes thought it best to leave the planning of different fields, such as the History of Philosophy, or Philosophical aspects of Sociology, Psychology, Aesthetics etc. for the future development of the University.⁵⁵ Actually he placed the Philosophy building on the verge of the steep eastern slope of the mountain range, not really allowing for any construction similar to the quadrangular courtyards as in other parts of the plan, therefore one may wonder as to the prospects Geddes had in mind for the future of those fields of knowledge.

The Administration was purposely not placed among the main buildings of the University. Geddes reserved the Gray-Hill residence, situated in the master plan way back towards the south-east of the main buildings, for the Administration building. His opinion was that "Universities are not for Administration; administration is for Universities".⁵⁶ Geddes maintained that the example of many universities which have placed administration in the centre, mainly those of Paris and London, shows that "this system and regime has long and increasingly been definable as the most sterilizing of all educational systems in history", and instead of serving the university "it has proved to be the very worst of masters".⁵⁷

The History and Languages departments are parallel, long and narrow buildings on the north west. They lead towards the domed Hebraic Studies building, placed in the "finest of architectural treatment accordingly".⁵⁸ The proposed building is comparatively large, and although it is connected to the whole complex, it stands apart from the main group of

buildings. The general form, and especially the dome, echoes the shape of the Great Hall, suggesting the importance of that field of knowledge for the Hebrew University. Geddes's concept of "Hebraic Studies"⁵⁹ is manifest by its position in the plan; it is firmly connected to the core of the University since it "evolves" from History and Languages, but it is also visually distinguished as an extension that interferes with the intact symmetrical plan. Thus Geddes formed a brilliant visual solution for the contemporary debates over the proposed Jewish Studies (see Part 1, chapter 2). The location positions it as an important independent unit although it is also linked with the University in general and the Humanities in particular (following Eder's concept of Jewish Studies).

Another comparatively large dome crowns the hall at the Sciences wing on the south east end of the campus. The balanced composition of the domes and the symmetry of the layout create also a formal and thematic equilibrium that emphasizes the core and the two poles of the entire University. Namely, the "neutral", embracing-all Great Hall is placed in the centre; the Hebraic Studies, the most unique and singular among the Hebrew University departments, is placed on one end, and the Sciences Hall, perhaps the most non-particular field of knowledge, at the other end. Hence it is obvious that domes convey significant meaning in the Geddes plan. Yet his use of domes is of a dual nature since he followed both western and eastern architectural traditions. Universities in Europe and the U.S.A. often crown their main buildings with domes, as Geddes himself indicated in his written presentation of the plan referred to above. But he also responded to indigenous as well as monumental architecture of the Old City and its environs. The Oriental style of the architecture is quite noticeable in the general model (plate 30) as well as in Mears's various drawings (plates 31-34). The layout of the buildings in the model was designed to resemble an Arab village (plate 9) in the way the buildings seem to "grow" naturally out of the soil like organically united beings. As mentioned above the Great Hall echoes the Dome of the Mosque and in Mears's detailed drawings of its exterior and interior (plates 32, 33) there are distinct Oriental characteristics. In his design for the interior of the dome Mears included the Star of David in the decoration, thus combining abstract geometric decorations in an Oriental style with a symbol adopted by western Jewry. Byzantine and Turkish architecture has been the source for various architectural details; the exterior form of the dome and the

semi-domes, the ornamental details both in the exterior and interior such as the use of two alternating colours of stone for the arches and the floral design around the windows of the drum. When Geddes had to choose an architectural style suitable for building in Palestine his immediate and definite choice was the oriental indigenous style. In a letter he wrote to Mrs. Fels⁶⁰ in July 6, 1920, during his second visit to Jerusalem, he dealt with the question of local indigenous architecture and its potential contribution to the architecture of Jewish settlements in Palestine. First he described his own enthusiasm for the Arab architecture and the artistic qualities he found in it: "Now try to recall even the poorest Arab village, piled up on its hillside, box above box - but also, often, dome above dome. Here, with all its faults, is real architecture: that of the old craftsmen by no means merely sub-conscious in their building, like the bees; for when they get the chance of building the little mosque its dome is perfect, completing the piled-up masses into a **composition**, one often of true art...

There, then, is architecture in its very essence - 'the contrast and composition of masses and voids' as we call it in technical language ...these simple houses and small domes, often no bigger than a room, make up the essential picture, from sunrise joy to sunset glory: they justify the big domes here and there and give them value - the two synagogues, the Dome of the Rock, the church of the Sepulchre".

Then Geddes criticized what in his opinion was a rejection of indigenous architecture by the Jewish settlers: "...Zionists ... [are] very deeply impressed with the culture (with some of the misculture too!) of the various nations and countries from which they come. Thus the Americans are very American, the Germans very German, the French very French, English very English, and so on: - all Westerners so far, not yet re-orientalised (which may take some forty years!) - and all this in architecture as much as other things". No doubt Geddes's description was, to a great extent, a true reflection of private life and the houses, clothes, furniture and manners of the majority of Jewish immigrants. However, the letter also reveals that Geddes refrained from mentioning examples of oriental trends at the vertex of the new Hebrew culture in the 1900s and 1910s, although there is no doubt he had visited the Bezalel school of Art, the Gymnasia Herzlia and the Technion: "Thus any Western eye can see that the Arabs are dirty, untidy, in many ways degenerate, and is all too likely to overlook, or have difficulty in seeing, the **qualities** of their buildings, even those of the fine houses of Damascus type in Jerusalem, with ample courtyards, airy rooms of ample proportions within, and so on. The plain little box-like houses are appreciated hardly at all: and so, in Tel-Aviv

etc. we have nice little houses of the London and other suburban type before the Garden Village period in England, and with no Oriental character at all! ... ". In fact the orientalist phase in Jewish colonies and towns had already begun to fade when Geddes first visited Palestine. Geddes seems to have been completely unaware of those developments.

The letter to Mrs. Fles ends with the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus as an outcome of all the above: "So now imagine us as artist-architects, full of all the beauty of the hill-cities, from Stirling and Edinburgh, all the way through Provence and Italy and Greece, through Stamboul, Smyrna and Cyprus - don't we see the opportunity offered by this supreme site of all, that of Scopus? ... But let us work in the historic life and spirit of the land and place - and so try to make it the very culmination of Palestine and the Orient! How? By crystallising anew its old and simple, useful and practical, economical and homely way and style of building into their fullest and highest expression. So pray clearly understand that it is out of the old Jerusalem, with its broken yet surviving beauty, that we have each, and together, got our vision of this New Jerusalem upon the hill".

Geddes expressed his enthusiasm for the Mount Scopus site before in his Hebrew University presentation (as he did also on other occasions): "...this site, with its panoramic prospect, second to none in the world...and also incomparably first in historic outlook...".⁶¹ In light of Geddes's holistic and organic theories it is surprising that he referred only to the beauty and historic value of the site and did not offer an assessment of its suitability to the specific needs of a university. Even if Geddes did believe that the site was advantageous for a university campus he did not explain his opinion in his presentation. Nevertheless in a comment he made elsewhere concerning the old Mount Scopus hilltop road he indirectly referred to the matter. He explained that a road that would bisect the University would bring "the dust and noise of motors etc., right into the heart of the institution, to the inexpressible disturbance and damage of its peaceful and dust free working".⁶² Geddes eliminated this road in his master plan and designed a ring road instead, hence he attained also further compactness for the campus. It is apparent, then, that he supported the idea of a university outside the city bustle, although in his proposal for the development of Jerusalem he was aware of the problem of connecting the campus to the city and suggested new neighborhoods in the north east, thus bringing the city and the University closer to each other.⁶³

Geddes's approach to the planning of the Hebrew University was founded both on his solid theoretical views and on a personal taste for oriental architecture. The latter was most likely founded first of all on an orientalist vogue in that prevailed in Europe all through the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. Secondly, the recollections of his first hand impressions of Palestine reveal a profound fascination with indigenous rural architecture and especially Islamic architecture in Jerusalem. However, his conception of the Orient had not been affected so much on his first hand impressions as on orientalist depictions of the Orient. A drawing by Mears of the proposed Hebrew University viewed from the south (plate 34) could never imply that it depicted a view of a proposed university. It illustrated Geddes's and Mears's image of the University as an oriental walled town, mirroring a familiar visual image of the Jaffa Gate and the Tower of David that had always been popular representations of Jerusalem. Yet it is most probable that the topographical drawing was not made directly from the actual view of the site itself, but Mears used a romantic depiction typical of the style of mid nineteenth century orientalists. A print by W. H. Bartlett, on the cover page of his book *Jerusalem Revisited* (London, 1855), depicts the wall of the Old City with Jaffa Gate and the Tower of David (plate 35). Striking similarities between the Mears drawing and the Bartlett print lead to an assumption that even if Mears did not use the Bartlett print as a model, it is just as much characteristic of nineteenth century romantic portrayals of Jerusalem that left out sordid details, poverty and dirt. Furthermore, as Crinson pointed out, this kind of depiction followed an aesthetic convention that dictated a type of ideal landscape from which all signs of contemporary real life had been excluded, such as agricultural labour or Arab culture.⁶⁴ Both the Bartlett print and the Mears drawing suggest a Biblical scene rather than a contemporary one. Another drawing by Mears, for a proposed open space between University buildings inside the walls (plate 36) delineates the shapes and semblance of sights inside the congested Old City, but the large arched windows are more European. As was the case with other British and Zionist orientalist architects in Palestine, Geddes's and Mears's observation had been bent by their western romantic conceptions. After all they were not of the Orient and therefore they were actually alienated to local building styles. The orientalist Hebrew University campus they proposed was designed for similarly alienated Western Jews. More than anything else,

the Geddes and Mears master plan presented a beautiful, romantic and dignified campus that exhibited the magnificent composition in front of the onlooker in Jerusalem. By means of the Hebrew University master plan Geddes and Mears attempted to create, a perfect model of orientalist architecture in the midst of the Orient. In this respect they become a link between the British builders in the Orient Crinson (1996) entitles "empire builders" and the Zionist settlement of Palestine.

Of all Zionist attempts to form a connection between West and East the Geddes and Mears Hebrew University master plan and architectural designs are the most monumental and impressive. It is not surprising that they were effectively used for propaganda purposes and to impress potential donors for the Hebrew University.⁶⁵ Geddes himself commented on the matter: "...they had used our plan for world-wide advertisement of University scheme, & thus came to realise how they were committed to it."⁶⁶ Geddes's assumption had proved to be wrong but long after the Geddes and Mears plan was no longer valid it was still the most familiar symbol of the Hebrew University in Zionist propaganda, as illustrated on the cover of a United Palestine Appeal Year Book published in 1937 (plate 37). The cover is a collage-like composition designed to represent the rebuilding of Jewish society and culture in Eretz-Israel. Giant stereotyped figures of two pioneers are placed on each side of a Biblical prophet at the background. In a lower plane, on a smaller scale, a farmer is ploughing his field in front of a group of buildings, in the centre of which Mears's drawing of the proposed Great Hall appears as a symbol of the Hebrew University. The Geddes and Mears plan seems to have conformed perfectly with the sanctifying approach that developed towards the site and the institution as soon as Mount Scopus has been chosen as the location for the Hebrew University (see part 1 chapter 3).

However, the reasons that were given for the eventual rejection of the Geddes and Mears plan were more mundane and even of an indifferent and dispensable character. Actually no formal, authoritative reason for declining the plan has been found in the documents. In the final rejection letter Magnes sent to Mears in 1929 all he had said was: "that there has not been a single person of whatever profession or from whatever country to whom your plans have been submitted who has liked them. If it had been just a question of this or that person's individual taste, we should not have felt impelled to so radical and serious a step. Indeed, the question was considered thoroughly as to whether it might not be

possible, upon a basis of suggestions and emendations, to ask you to continue in charge. Our best advice, however, was that in this way the University itself would be assuming all responsibility and that the architect could not then be held responsible, and in a building which is for us of great importance, it is essential that the architect, whoever he be, be wholly responsible." Magnes then claimed that it was the University Committee that made the final decision, and that as to himself: "I personally pretend to no knowledge or judgement in the matter although in order to be entirely candid, I must add that the design did not strike me as appropriate either."⁶⁷

There were no further explanations and unless new documents are found, it seems that in fact the issue has not been thoroughly discussed in any formal forum, although in the last paragraph of his letter Magnes wrote: "... those responsible for the acceptance or the rejection of these designs are not pleased with them and are convinced that a process of emending or revising them would lead to no satisfactory results."⁶⁸ Indeed, nowhere had there been any mention of who were "those responsible", and even in the letter Magnes did not identify the body, although he did mention a University Committee. Yet this committee and its members remain obscure. As a matter of fact the abrupt dismissal coincided with the employment of Julian Levi, another architect, by the Rosenbloom family, donors for the Jewish Studies building (as would be more elaborately explained in Part 2 chapter 2). Geddes himself had on one occasion protested against his being "unscrupulously 'chunked'."⁶⁹

It must be noted, though, that despite Magnes's declaration of an all embracing disapproval of the plan, and beside the fact that the plan became an important propaganda tool, there were advocates who expressed their admiration for it on various occasions. The architect Chaikin wrote to Geddes: "I am ... convinced that the only style of architecture which will present a correct appearance on Scopus is the one evolved from the simple masses and outlines to be found in the old City."⁷⁰ Eder of course was the most ardent adherent: "The magnificent designs for our University, inspired by a genius – Patrick Geddes – and ... that brilliant architect Frank Mears ... [The] designs are beautiful, embody the spirit of the Jewish people ...", he wrote.⁷¹

But during the ten years that passed between the submission of the plan to its ultimate rejection there was no sincere dialogue between the planners and the university authorities. Documentation⁷² shows no proper debate on architectural issues, only arguments about the location of different buildings (mostly with the intention to please

the donors). Between correspondences and visits of Geddes and Mears to Palestine the implementation of the plan lost momentum. One report though, sheds some light on the reasons for that. Max Schloessinger, a member of the Board of Trustees, wrote a document titled "The Geddes Scheme; Library Building and Einstein Institute" (no date; early 1925?)⁷³. The report stands out for its detailed criticism of the plan: "In my opinion the Geddes Scheme is far too ambitious and will exceed our financial capacity for a long time to come", Schloessinger wrote. He then mentioned that even the land necessary for the building was not yet acquired. He concluded the financial issue with the following: "Some day we may have a very fine University but no money to run it. We may have achieved the highest architectural beauty but have failed to erect a home for our studies". Then follows an analysis of the plan and the innate obstacles to materialize it: "The Geddes Plan is one organic whole, so much so, in fact, that no individual part will ever look complete until the Central Building – the hexagon – will be put up." Schloessinger added that since the land purchase has not been completed, it would not be possible to build a complex of the proposed scale, as there was not enough land. Concerning the Great Hall he wrote that: "To put up the central building of the Geddes Scheme, the hexagon, to accommodate 2000-3000 students just during the short wet season when the amphitheatre [the open air theatre, D. D.] cannot be used, seems to me the height of extravagance" (the provisional open air theatre had obviously already existed, or was being constructed, at the time the document was written). Schloessinger explained the kind of plan that would be more suitable: "I am in favour of a General Scheme for all University Buildings in order to achieve harmony, beauty and usefulness. Such a general plan must be elastic in accordance with means that may be at our disposal at any one given time within the next 25 or 50 years. The erection of one building may not necessitate the erection of another building. Each building must be architecturally one whole in itself...How the University will eventually have to look, it is simply impossible to foretell, not only because so far we have not made any plan for the future development of the University but for the other more important reason that natural sciences may take a development that buildings may have to be erected the very form of which may be undreamt of today." It is not clear whether Schloessinger, when he referred to "the plan", meant the academic plan or the architectural one. It seems that in the above he meant the academic plan but when he further developed the issue he rather meant a new, improved architectural plan: "The question that we have to consider, therefore, is how we shall best and soonest obtain a general plan for the University. For this purpose we can hold (a) a general competition under the rules of

the British Institute admitting as competitors all Palestinian architects and all architects outside of Palestine or (b) a limited competition inviting five or six of the best Jewish architects all over the world...In either case the Geddes scheme could be submitted to the Assessors as one of the projects.”

The Schloessinger document contains arguments of different levels of relevance. Yet even what seems trivial, such as the question of the architect’s religious beliefs, actually was not merely a personal whim of Schloessinger’s. The issue had probably been brought up in different circles on various occasions (although there is no documentation of such arguments against Geddes in formal documents). Geddes was aware of this: “There is an active endeavour among various important Zionists to have separate competitions for University Library & other departments among *Jewish* architects & thus get rid of me – and Mears too – though thus converting our unified plan into a confused medley & even muddle...One way of countering them is by compromise. Neither Mears nor I desire to make long stays in Palestine, to carry out our plans there – so I should like to find some bright young Jewish architect whom we could associate with ...”.⁷⁴ And so he did by making Benjamin Chaikin, who had admired his plan (as mentioned above), his associate in the Hebrew University project. Eder too had confirmed Schloessinger’s remark and offered a broader interpretation: “I have heard it said that it was an acknowledgement of defeat to go outside Jewish talent to find the designer of our University building”, he wrote in an official document of the Zionist Organization.⁷⁵ It is understandable that since the Hebrew University was perceived as a beacon of the national revival, the question of its architectural designer carried a significance that had gone beyond narrow-minded segregation. It was not solely a matter of architectural preference but rather of national significance.

While discussing the planning of the Hebrew University and the Geddes plan in particular Schloessinger also illuminated a number of major general issues concerning the planning of any university. Definitely most of Schloessinger’s arguments were worthy of serious discussion, yet there is no documentation of the sort. For instance the possibility of future changes in academic plans which might demand architectural alterations, a question that should be considered for the planning of any university. Or the important issue of an open architects’ competition versus a nominated architect.

A substantial issue such as the opportunities embodied in the Hebrew University planning project for the advancement of local architecture, was overlooked by everybody

except for Geddes himself. He wrote a letter to Magnes⁷⁶ saying that he encloses a memo “as to methods of the fullest possible measure of collaboration of Palestinian architects, consistent with the unity, harmony and future extensions of the University buildings as a whole; and towards the much needed “Palestinian School” of Architecture and Town Planning.” He also stated that it was his and Mears’s desire “from the first, not to design and execute all by ourselves, as one firm of architects; but to make this whole University scheme, (with its extensions, and its housing also) the opportunity of forming the much needed “Palestinian School” of Architecture and Planning.” The suggestion had been made partially because Geddes worried that the unanimous architectural style of the whole campus might be lost. In November 1924 he wrote: “There is trouble at Jerusalem University – danger of lapse from our unified scheme into confusion of building by different architects piecemeal on different purchasers plots! – but Mears & I hope to get over it. It will be a great calamity to them if we don’t!”⁷⁷

Apparently there seems to be a similarity between Geddes’s “sanctifying” approach towards his grand architectural plan of the University and the Zionist approach towards the idea of the Hebrew University. Both parties bestowed upon the University a significance and magnitude that go beyond its customary functions. Geddes had described his design for the University as: “...a version of Revelation XXI-2”⁷⁸ (“And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband”). The sanctifying approach of the University promoters towards the idea of the University and its site has been described in part 1 chapter 3. Perhaps that explains Geddes’s certainty that his Hebrew University project would provide for the education of future local architects and determine the architectural style in Palestine. Evidently, Geddes had a School in mind, that would cultivate an orientalist style. This proposition could definitely not be accepted, any more than the master plan, since in the 1920s the Zionist Movement had discarded orientalist trends altogether. As explained in chapter 1 of part 1, at the time the Geddes plan was first presented, orientalist style prevailed among artists and architects in Palestine, but from early 1920s onwards artists and architects turned to modern European styles for their inspiration. The idea that an architectural school could be advanced through the Hebrew University project was definitely a constructive one, only Geddes was not at all aware of the changing trends in Palestine at that time. He definitely never commented on it, either for lack of awareness (as much as he was not aware of its earlier existence) or since he had

discarded the change as unimportant. It seems not too far-reaching to assume that the rejection of the Geddes plan was also due to this local transformation.

The answer to the question why the Geddes and Mears master plan had not been implemented lies, then, not only in the practical difficulties Schloessinger had pointed out in his document. Actually Schloessinger had been mild in his criticism since the Geddes and Mears plan was actually much too presumptuous and megalomaniac to be implemented. Yet there were also those qualities described above, innate in the plan, that made it actually unrealizable. The planners' ambition to create a "Heavenly Jerusalem", implied in the plan's scope, symmetrical layout, and association with the Temple Mount, procured an abstract and transcendental quality that discards implementation. Rather than an applicable plan, it is a *disegno* of the idea of an optimal university that exists in the realm of theory and symbolism. It was totally severed from the reality of local needs and capabilities. Geddes's own categorizing his design as a version of Revelation XXI-2, reveals exactly that quality of a "Heavenly Jerusalem", that made the plan so popular in Zionist propaganda pamphlets. The model and drawings described buildings that pictured a longed for fairyland or legend, just as the image of the Third Temple would have been conceived, and the sort of topographical views mid-nineteenth century orientalist artists had presented. As the layout had been designed so that it created an impressive representation for the onlooker positioned in Jerusalem (Geddes wrote of the "need of relating the general aspect of the university to be viewed from the city"⁷⁹) Mount Scopus was diverted in the Geddes and Mears plan from a site for observation upon Jerusalem into an object for observers in Jerusalem. Hence the perception of their plan as a beautiful picture⁸⁰, or a *disegno*, acquired also a quality of a contemplation piece. It was Eder again who expressed those qualities in his usual articulate manner; when he had begun to despair of his expectation that the Geddes and Mears plan would materialize, he wrote: "I had hoped that our University building would express in stone something of the striving of Israel after unity, that there would be a great organic plan, with its centre symbolising that sense of unity of some absolute, eternal truth and yet allowing a free growth of the spirit...I have always thought it was especially important for the Jewish people to have some representation in stone of their thoughts and ideas. It was because Geddes's plan seemed to be a noble one, something lofty, something harmonising with the Jewish spirit, that I have always favoured it".⁸¹ Eder thus expressed not only the conception of the Hebrew

University as an establishment of the utmost national importance, but also of its architecture as a visualized form of a naive, idealistic and totally immaterial perception of the national issue.

Notes:

¹ The only comprehensive survey of the plans, buildings and the history of the planning of the first campus of the Hebrew University is in my unpublished M.A. thesis (Dolev 1990), which is based on primary sources.

² Goren 1997: 368 and Segev 1999: 167. Segev described Einstein's visit as organized by Weizmann to promote the Hebrew University cause, after Weizmann had also taken him on a tour of the United States to help raise money there for the University.

³ Lavsky 1997: 138.

⁴ Dolev 1990: 59-60.

⁵ For rationalizations for establishing a Mathematics department as one of the first institutes of the Hebrew University see S. Katz, כץ, ש. ש. "מדע טהור' באוניברסיטה לאומית: מכון איינשטיין למתמטיקה, ומכונים אחרים באוניברסיטה העברית בתקופת התהוותה", "Pure Science' in a National University: The Einstein Institute of Mathematics and other Research Institutes at the Hebrew University during its Formative Years", in Katz and Heyd (eds.) 1997: 397-456.

⁶ A letter from Magnes to Mears in August 1, 1929, HUA, file 31. More information below.

⁷ See Dolev 1991: D. Dolev, ד. דולב, "הנגיד, התורם ועוד שלושה אדריכלים; התכנון והבניה של התיאטרון של דולב, הפתוח על הר הצופים", "The Chancellor, the Donor and Three Architects: An Account of the Planning and Construction of the Open-Air Theatre on Mount Scopus", *Studio*, 28, December 1991, 34-36.

⁸ For information on Geddes's see Geddes 1915: P. Geddes, *Cities in Evolution*, London; Boardman 1932; Mairet 1957. The most recent and up to date biography is Meller 1990. On his work for the Hebrew University plan, see Dolev 1990; Dolev 1997: in Katz and Heyd (eds.), 257-280; Dolev 1998: D. Dolev, "Architectural Orientalism in the Hebrew University - The Patrick Geddes and Frank Mears Master-Plan" in *Assaph*, Section B, no. 3, 217-234 Tel-Aviv; Shapiro 1997, in Katz and Heyd (eds.), 202-235.

⁹ Meller 1979: 13.

¹⁰ Meller 1980: 201.

¹¹ Geddes 1923 (1901): 24, 25.

¹² *Ibid.*: 32.

¹³ *Ibid.*: 3-6.

¹⁴ Geddes 1915: 302.

¹⁵ Meller 1990: 63.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*: 64.

¹⁷ Letter from Eder to Magnes, January 18, 1927. HUA, file 31.

¹⁸ Geddes 1918: P. Geddes, *Town Planning towards City Development: a report to the Durbar of Indore*, 2 vols, Indore.

¹⁹ Meller 1990: 263 (Meller erroneously writes that Eder was back in London at that time. Actually he was still in Jerusalem, as letters signed by him clearly indicate). For information on the "Indore Report" see Meller 1990: 251-263.

²⁰ In a letter from Eder to Geddes he thanks the latter for enclosing a copy of the "Indore Report" to his recent letter to him, 11.5.1919, file Z4/1721, CZA.

²¹ A letter signed by Eder, sent on behalf of The Zionist Commission to Palestine, to the Inner Actions Committee of the Zionist Organization in London on May 15, 1919. CZA, File Z4/1721.

²² *Ibid.* In the letter Eder clearly claimed that Geddes is the most accomplished person for the future development and planning of Jerusalem.

²³ Letter to Amelia Defries, 1913, in Defries 1927: A. Defries, *The Interpreter Geddes: the Man and his Gospel*, London, 260.

²⁴ Mairet 1957: 184 and Novak 1995: 55 and n.2.

²⁵ Letter from Geddes to Mumford, December 25, 1919, in Novak 1995: 55.

²⁶ Geddes 1919: P. Geddes, *Jerusalem Actual and possible: a preliminary report to the chief administrator of Palestine and the military governor of Jerusalem on Town planning and improvement*, typescript, CZA, file Z4/10.202.

²⁷ In a letter dated 12.8.1919, Dr. Sonne wrote to Mr. Simon: "The impression is that Professor Geddes is thoroughly suitable for our purpose. He brings such knowledge and experience to bear on the subject, as well as a total lack of prejudice, as are but seldom met with". CZA, File Z4/1721.

²⁸ Whether Weizmann and Geddes actually met before Geddes went to Jerusalem remains obscure. One version is that they had met briefly in London and reached a verbal agreement: Herbert & Sosnovsky 1993: 74, quote a letter from Geddes to the Secretary of the Zionist Organization, July 8, 1919, in *Geddes Correspondence*, Nat. Lib. of Scotland, MS 10516/12. According to another version Geddes tried hard to meet with Weizmann (who had been avoiding Geddes because he did not approve of Geddes's appointment) and eventually managed to arrange to travel with him when they joined the same ship in Marseilles sailing for Jerusalem. Though they agreed on many educational and political principles, they held vigorous discussions on issues of method and scale: Meller 1990: 264-265 and n. 77. Her source is file Za/2790 in the CZA, but she does not refer to a specific document. A recent search through the file did not provide any evidence that would certify Meller's account. A third version (and the most reliable in my opinion) says that actually Weizmann avoided Geddes for a long time, and they did not meet at all before Geddes went to Palestine: Shapiro 1997: 212 and n. 49, referring to a letter from Israel Zangwill to Weizmann, 19.9.19, saying that Geddes was upset since all negotiations with Weizmann were strictly through letters: CZA, file Z4/2790.

²⁹ Geddes stayed in Jerusalem from August to November 1919, according to Mairet 1957: 183. For Geddes's statement that at the same time he was also asked by the British government to advise on the matter of the Jerusalem town planning see Boardman 1932: 368.

³⁰ Geddes 1919.

³¹ Boardman 1932: 317.

³² See also Geddes's and Mears's reaction to Komberg's master plan in part 1, chapter 2.

³³ Meller 1990: 265-266.

³⁴ A letter from Geddes to Mumford, January 10, 1920: "Has higher Education with you taken up the Cinema? Have you any precedents for putting them in new University of Jerusalem – which I keep on with planning." In Novak 1995: 61.

³⁵ Geddes 1919: 1.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ Geddes and Mears 1924, *Comments on the Romberg plan for the Hebrew University*,. CZA, file L/12 39.

³⁸ Mears, in "University of Jerusalem; Notes on Scheme, by F. C. Mears, To be embodied in Dr. Weizmann's Booklet", in CZA, file Z4/2790 (no date. 1919?).

³⁹ Mears wrote that in Jerusalem "hillsides and summits were clothed rather than built upon and the natural beauty of the country was intensified ... These new buildings are therefore planned

throughout for their hill-top, so as seen from below they rise in terraces from subsidiary one-storey structure in front to their culmination in the dome of the Great Hall, which forms the essential centre of the scheme". *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ This last observation is confirmed by Mears's words: "The buildings of the University are designed to come into the closest relation possible to the Old City: - following the example of the traditional building system of Palestine, in which flat roofs and domes are combined in infinite variety of grouping". *Ibid.*

⁴¹ Geddes 1919: 31. Geddes elaborated on the issue of the dome, he explained that '*ever since the great achievements of the Pantheon in Rome, and of St. Sophia at Constantinople it has been the ambition of architects to continue the success of the latter, in achieving the 'floating dome' ... Here in this Hall a new step in this direction can be made - thanks primarily to introduction of the new, and here advisable, constructive material, ferro-concrete*'.

⁴² Geddes 1923 (1901): 27-33.

⁴³ Boardman 1932: 317.

⁴⁴ Mears, see note 38.

⁴⁵ Geddes 1919: 29: "*Les Coupules d'Orient et d'Occident" which lies beside me as I write*'.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* In a footnote on the same page Geddes listed the six factors of the expression of Life: environment, function, organism; organism, function, environment. And he added: "At any rate this symbol [the Star of David] can be none the worse in modern University use if it be also seen by its students as applicable in modern terms, and to modern studies, of nature and man, of life and society".

⁴⁷ Mears, see note 38.

⁴⁸ In a document written by the architect Alexander Baerwald (1922?): *Grunde, die gegen Geddes-Plan der Universitat Jerusalem sprechen*, "Reasons which speak against the Geddes plan for the University in Jerusalem", CZA, L/12 63, Baerwald said that the Geddes Great Hall would always come second in beauty to the Mosque of Omar (i. e. the Dome of the Rock).

⁴⁹ Geddes, Memo I, enclosed to a letter to Dr. Magnes, April 11, 1925, HUA, file 31. Mears (see note 38) also referred to the juxtaposition of the Great Hall and the buildings surrounding it with the Old City and the Temple Mount: "Just north of the site chosen for this Hall a spur runs out westwards from Mount Scopus, enclosing a shallow valley which falls steeply towards the Kidron and the N. E. corner of the City wall. The main axis of the Hall and of the central group of buildings and terraces is directed down this valley and towards the centre of the ancient City".

⁵⁰ Geddes 1919: 32.

⁵¹ Geddes and Mears (see note 37).

⁵² Geddes 1919: 35.

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*: 36.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*: 34.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*: 37.

⁵⁹ On the distinction between "Jewish" and "Hebraic" Studies, see D. N. Myers, "*From Zion Will Go Forth Torah*": *Jewish Scholarship and the Zionist Return to History*, Ph.D. Diss., Columbia University, 1991, 52-85, 361-375. And Daniel R. Schwartz, "From Rabbinical Seminaries to the Institute of Jewish Studies", in Katz and Heyd (eds.) 1997: 457-475.

⁶⁰ Mairet 1957: 186, 187.

⁶¹ Geddes 1919: 25.

⁶² Geddes and Mears (see note 37).

⁶³ See M. Shapiro, מ. שפירא, "האוניברסיטה והעיר: פטריק גדס ותוכנית האב הראשונה לאוניברסיטה, ה. מ. שפירא, "The University and the City: Patrick Geddes and the First Master Plan of the Hebrew University, 1919", in Katz and Heyd (eds.) 1997: 218.

⁶⁴ Crinson 1996: 202.

⁶⁵ The London branch of the Zionist Organization published a pamphlet (no date, 1923?) called: "The Proposed Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, Palestine". It included an illustration of the Geddes master plan under the heading: "General Plan Showing Main Departments". Geddes's name has been left out.

⁶⁶ Letter to Mumford, April 21, 1925. Novak 1995: 220.

⁶⁷ Magnes to Mears, 1.8.1929, HUA, file 31.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

⁶⁹ Letter to Mumford, 1.4.1930, in Novak 1995: 298. Geddes further explained in the letter: "After Mears had spent a good few months, with Chaikin too, in Jerusalem, & had fully redrawn & elaborated the plans of those buildings, with their *definite oral acceptance*, we were startled to receive a *lawyer's* letter acknowledging *only responsibility for first sketches*, & announcing that new architects had been employed."

⁷⁰ Letter from Caikin to Geddes, 30.5.1925, HUA, file 31.

⁷¹ Eder 1926: D. Eder, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem: Some Prospectives and Aspects*, London, 3.

⁷² Files 31, 31/1, 2, 136/1, 024, 35, 35/1, 027, in the HUA. File L/12 63, L/12 39, Z4/1 3494, Z4/1721, Z4/2790, in CZA.

⁷³ File 31, HUA.

⁷⁴ Letter to Mumford, February 18, 1925. Novak 1995: 220.

⁷⁵ Eder 1926: 3 (see note 71). He may have referred to Baerwald's criticism of the Geddes master plan, in which he said that it might be seen as shameful for the Jewish people that a non-Jew had planned the Hebrew University.

⁷⁶ Letter from Geddes (in Jerusalem) to Magnes, April 11, 1925, HUA, file 31. The letter was written during Geddes's visit to Palestine for the inauguration ceremony of the Hebrew University. From its contents it seems that it could be a response to the Schloessinger report.

⁷⁷ Letter to Mumford, November 14, 1924. Novak 1995: 206.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*: 55.

⁷⁹ Geddes and Mears (note 37).

⁸⁰ Banham 1976: 142, wrote that "one of the academic fascinations of megastructure lay in its ability to generate...splendid pictures". Indeed the Geddes master plan can be categorized as a megastructure. See also a comparison between the Geddes and the Reznick plans in part 3.

⁸¹ Letter to Magnes, January 18, 1927. HUA, file 31.

CHAPTER 2
Fritz Kornberg (1923) and Julian Levi (1929)
EAST versus WEST.

The conclusions of the former chapter on the Geddes master plan may explain why in the early 1920s, Weizmann took it upon himself to advance the building of the University and recruit other architects for this undertaking. As the University did not exist yet, and there was no university administration, Weizmann, president of the World Zionist Organization at that time, dealt with University matters. He must have suspected that a plan as grandiose as Geddes's was altogether unrealizable, given the limited funds available. However, a university or perhaps rather a university inauguration ceremony, was urgently needed for pressing political interests, including inside power struggles (the Magnes-Weizmann conflict, for instance). From about 1920 to 1923, Weizmann had negotiated with a number of architects while the Geddes-Mears master plan was still valid.

Already in late 1921 or early 1922 Weizmann approached the architect Alexander Baerwald (the architect of the Technion in Haifa), with an offer to work for the Hebrew University.¹ Apparently Baerwald turned down the offer.² In 1923 Weizmann also met Erich Mendelsohn during the latter's visit in Palestine. Their discussions of the Hebrew University architectural plans³ yielded no results for the time being. The same year the architect Fritz Kornberg (see appendix: list of persons) of Jerusalem, was appointed to prepare the Gray Hill residence for the Hebrew University's temporary needs.⁴ Concurrently, he also prepared a master plan for the University (plates 38, 39) which he submitted in August 1923. Although not confirmed by documents, Kornberg must have been familiar with the Geddes and Mears master plan at that time, for its exceeding prestige and extensive publicity. Hence he must have known that it had not been officially rejected. The obscurity of the circumstances of assigning Kornberg for the preparation of another master plan is intensified by the University's refusal to pay for it, claiming that it was not ordered at all.⁵ Yet the fact is that Kornberg's master plan had been published in a formal pamphlet issued by the British

Zionist Federation.⁶ All available evidence points out that it must have been Weizmann who ordered a new master plan from Kornberg, and yet Magnes, who had been already involved in University matters and gaining power as a leading figure, did not approve of Weizmann's interference and therefore would not validate the assignment.

The Kornberg master plan and his proposed views present a schematic impression of a large and pontifical complex. As there is no written evidence to support the architectural concept, it remains subject to speculation. The layout of the buildings corresponds to the topography of the hill and to the hill top road. The semicircular outlines of a few proposed buildings form traditional "baroque" and representational shapes, while the smaller buildings are defined by simple rectangular forms. The building complex contains three main groups. The medical school is the main group, and is situated in the centre of the campus on the mountain crest, along the hill top road. The long lines of tall buildings are interrupted by domed halls and a semicircular college building, consisting of the pharmacology, anatomy, pathology, and physiology departments along with a library. On the gentle west slope of Mount Scopus, Kornberg's plan shows the hospital clinics, arranged on either side of a long path, gradually descending the hill terraces. The far end of the passage is blocked by a building. The third group, on the eastern slope, contains the Science institutes. Among them is the existing Gray Hill residence in an enlarged version, placed in the centre of the eastern compound. This proposed enlarged building, which appears to be the largest in the entire University plan, suggests a more representational design. It includes the existing Gray Hill residence on its northern side and an added section on the south. On the eastern side of the building Kornberg proposed another semicircular building which connects with the main building with open arcades, as do all other buildings in the plan. The eastern section, with its domed roof, facing both into the semicircular inner courtyard and out onto the Judaeen wilderness, creates what seems the most imposing group in the campus. Since the plan and the drawing does not show the entrances to the buildings, it is impossible to tell how University occupants were supposed to move around, and therefore the plan as it is lacks an important indication as to the how the buildings were supposed to function. Yet it is quite

clear that this east side group creates a grand focal point, thus implying a hierarchy of the layout where the eastern part of the University is granted more prominence than others.

Despite its grand layout, the Kornberg master plan lacks the ambition to become as monumental and ideal a university as the Geddes concept of the Hebrew University had been. It does not comprehend as many fields of knowledge and does not present a concept of higher learning. It actually follows Weizmann's wish for science research institutes that would develop in to a medical centre. A striking and novel characteristic of the Kornberg plan is its lookout towards the east. It thus differs from the Geddes and Mears plan as well as all other plans that have been prepared since. Kornberg transferred the focus of the viewer placed on the "Mount of Viewers" from the Old City panorama to the empty but impressive barren hills of the Judaeian wilderness, the Jordan valley and the mountains of Moav in Trans-Jordan. Consequently Kornberg's proposal turned against the concept of building a complex which is supposed to impress the observer standing in the city and in the spirit of affiliation with the ancient Middle East (Raban, Lilien, Melnikoff and Barsky) declared that the Hebrew University should face East and the wilderness.

An unexpected instrument for the understanding of Kornberg's master plan appears in a document jointly written by Geddes and Mears: *Comments on the Romberg plan for the Hebrew University*. Geddes and Mears had seen the Kornberg master plan in the Zionist Organization pamphlet mentioned above, which included also the Geddes master plan in another page. Hence both the Geddes-Mears and the Kornberg master plans were printed in the same pamphlet. The Geddes-Mears plan, on page four of the pamphlet, was titled "General Plan Showing Main Departments", while the Kornberg plan, on page six of the pamphlet, was titled "Proposition for the General Building"; the names of the architects were omitted from both titles. It would seem probable, therefore, that both plans had been included as mere ornamentation for the pamphlet, and as a fundraising device. Geddes and Mears must have referred to a "Romberg" obviously because they had never met Kornberg or even heard of him, and therefore could discover his identity only by attempting to decipher the signature on the printed plan, which they mistakenly read as Romberg (see plate 40). Furthermore, they evidently had no idea that the University had employed another

architect, while their plan was still valid. Their comments, therefore, refer to - the "Romberg" plan on page six of the pamphlet.⁷ The "Comments" provide valuable assessments for the understanding of both master plans, Kornberg's and Geddes's.

Geddes and Mears were aware that Kornberg's approach was an attempt to implement Weizmann's academic program; they said that the plan "represents the latest views of some of the University promoters [and it] shows that the University site is becoming unduly specialised".⁸ This comment emphasizes the deliberately unspecified nature of Geddes's plan. Furthermore, Geddes thought that the University Hospital should remain in town for the patients' convenience: "...these hospitals and associated buildings are placed at the top of a very steep hill remote from the city. Hospital and Dispensary work and ordinary medical practice, must still be centred below [i. e. in town]".⁹ Unlike Geddes, the eccentric visionary, Kornberg was a practical person (he suggested low cost clay houses self built by immigrants), but it seems that he also did not share Geddes's broad outlook towards social and urban planning. Consequently, Geddes's and Mears's criticism evolved mainly around the narrow concept of Kornberg's proposed University. They objected not only to a hospital as part of the University plan but also to the loss of a comprehensive attitude: "...the scheme of a great centre of humanistic studies and outlooks, which are surely of the very essence of the University, as originally conceived, has here been lost sight of"... "Most serious of all however is the loss of the conception of the University: as a hill-top meeting place where Sciences, Arts and Humanities may increasingly work together, in mutual respect and stimulus, towards a unity of Culture in its fullest sense; and with this monumentally expressed, in the comprehensiveness and harmony of architectural design".¹⁰ The possible significance of the shift of outlook in Kornberg's plan escaped the critical eyes of Geddes and Mears who wrote that "the need of relating the general aspect of the University to be viewed from the city, has been worse than forgotten. For these buildings now too much turn the backs on the city - and the only formal court yard is that looking East towards the desert! The effect from Jerusalem will therefore be no more than that of a hill-top village straggling along the sky-line."¹¹ Metaphorically one could say that Kornberg had chosen to turn towards the East rather than towards the West only the West in this case is the Old City and the Temple Mount. Yet perhaps Kornberg had turned his University buildings towards an uncultivated, barren wilderness rather than towards the Old City with its many layers of

historical, cultural and religious implications. Since there is no written evidence to interpret his intentions, they can only be inferred from Kornberg's architectural work. But the architectural style of the buildings cannot be identified from the sketchy drawings (plates 39, 41). The fact that a few buildings are crowned with domes does not necessarily make them oriental. The perspective sketch shows simple cubic buildings, mostly with flat roofs. Therefore the clue to Kornberg's view of the appropriate architectural style for the Hebrew revival in Palestine and especially for the Hebrew University must be searched for elsewhere, in more detailed designs of about the same period.

The work Kornberg had done for the Gray Hill residence shows that he had mastered different architectural styles. The sections he had altered or added had been mostly Art Deco in style, which eventually applied an eclectic look to the basically oriental building.¹² But the many designs Kornberg had prepared for the open-air theatre (plate 42) show a distinct preference for the ancient Mesopotamian architecture as a stylistic source.¹³ This approach had been in accord with other Jewish artists in Palestine as explained in part 1, chapter 1. Kornberg had probably been ideologically closest to the sculptor Melnikoff and other modernists who had chosen the ancient, pagan land of the Hebrews for their search for roots. Melnikoff's "Roaring Lion" also faces the East and the Jordan valley. Hence the orientation of the Hebrew University buildings in Kornberg's plan had most probably been purposely planned to face the East. This apparently deliberate choice of Kornberg can be explained as a statement of a concept: the future of the new Hebrew culture lies in the inspiration of the ancient beginnings and all they stand for.

In April 1925 the Hebrew University inauguration ceremony took place in the provisional open-air theatre Kornberg prepared for the occasion. But Kornberg's master plan was never to take form, and except for Geddes and Mears, no one ever referred to it; its implementation was not even considered, furthermore, after the plan had been disowned by the University authorities in 1927 Kornberg resigned altogether. The only evidence of his master plan has been preserved in the Zionist Organization pamphlet mentioned before and in unpublished drawings in the possession of the Kornberg family. Actually the pamphlet reveals more about the Zionist Organization's attitude towards the physical form of the

University and the architectural master plans than it had intended. Beyond the ignorance and the disregard toward the architects there had been a craving for the dream world presented in both manifestations of a Hebrew University that had not existed yet at that time.

Two years after Kornberg had resigned and while the Geddes master plan was actually still the official University plan, Julian Clarence Levi, an architect who held an office in New York (together with his partner Alfred Taylor) appeared on the Hebrew University scene. In July 1929 Levi arrived in Jerusalem at the request of the Rosenbloom family (a wealthy Jewish family from Pittsburgh, USA) and of the American Advisory Committee for the Hebrew University. He came "to make suggestions...concerning the building plans of the University but primarily in connection with the Rosenbloom Building and the proposed University Hospital".¹⁴ A Judaic studies institute had already started functioning in a rented Arab Khan on the western slope of Mount Scopus (plate 43) since 1924. Levi was also asked to prepare a master plan¹⁵ and shortly afterwards, in August 1929, a letter of dismissal was sent to Geddes. Yet Julian Levi's master plan was never to be properly considered, it was not even published in any formal publication as Kornberg's plan was, and actually although there is a mention of a plan in the documents there is no reference to it being discussed at all, not even after it had been completed.¹⁶ But the fact remains that there was such a plan and that it had been ordered from the architect.

On his arrival in Palestine the Mount Scopus site had changed since Geddes and Mears first arrived in 1919. Apart for the Chemistry and Microbiology Departments in the Gray Hill mansion and Kornberg's provisional open air theatre, also the Mathematics Building and Physics Building on the east side of the hill top road, and the Library on the west side of the road were under construction (designed by Mears and Chaikin).

The visual evidence of Levi's master plan is of poor quality, yet it is all one can rely upon. It contains one plan (plate 44) that presents a campus divided into four distinctive parts and a drawing of the proposed University buildings, drawn directly on a photograph of Mount Scopus as viewed from the north west (plate 45). The plan preserved existing

buildings and buildings under construction; the hill top road remains, and is even broadened to become a boulevard. On the east – the existing Physics, Chemistry and Microbiology, Mathematics and utility buildings appear. The Geddes, Mears and Chaikin Library building appears on the western side of the road. In the centre of the proposed University a long complex of monumental buildings lead towards the largest of them all on the far end towards the west. This must be the proposed Rosenbloom Building (plates 46, 47). Further to the north there is a construction which seems basically to balance the Library in order to create a symmetrical pattern. The third group is on the north, and must be a proposed hospital. Further down the slope Levi proposed a symmetrically designed gardens. The photograph depicted existing Arab buildings in the foreground and impressionistic depictions of the proposed botanic gardens on the left, the skyline of the proposed University Hospital buildings further up the mountain, the very conspicuous proposed Rosenbloom Building further up and finally the Geddes Mears and Chaikin Library building.

There are a few clear characteristics to the Levi plan. Firstly, it is meant to be very much in line with the demands of the clients – the Rosenbloom family; it does not present a comprehensive idea of a university, but includes only those departments that were mentioned by the university authorities and the Rosenbloom family. Yet even though it had been based on such a restricted academic plan, it presented the most prominent view, achieved by its design, proportions and location. Secondly the layout of the building is traditional and Beaux-Arts in style, following a common way of designing representational buildings in the west, including the United States of America. It is quite obvious that Levi's primary intention was that the University buildings would make a respectable impression on observers in the city. The large dome of the Rosenbloom Jewish Studies Building could of course be a counterpoint to the Dome of the Rock, but since there is no evidence of any other sort of dialogue with local architecture there is no way to make a substantial assessment on this issue.

In contrast with the western type of design that dictated the form of the entire layout, Levi intended the Rosenbloom Building to be designed in an Oriental, Byzantine style. However his idea of the orient was not inspired by his immediate encounter with the East

and with local architecture in Palestine. For the fact is that in a drawing of the proposed interior he prepared (plate 48), Levi added figures of people in prayer, covered by traditional Jewish praying shawls. This definitely indicates that Levi had an image of a synagogue in mind when he planned the Jewish Studies Building, and that his formal source did not come from Jerusalem or Eretz Israel synagogues, for there was no synagogue in Eretz Israel in that style. The old synagogues that still existed at that time in the Jewish quarter in the Old City, although crowned with domes, did not have Byzantine characteristics or complex multi-ribbed plans and their size had been restricted by the density of the Old City. The design is actually almost identical to synagogues built in the United States and in Europe around the turn of the century and later into the 1920s, and 1930s. This pseudo Byzantine style trend for synagogues encompassed many regions around the world. In fact, the Temple Isaiah Synagogue in Chicago¹⁷, built in 1924 and designed by the American architect Alfred S. Alschuler¹⁸, has striking similarities to the proposed Rosenbloom Building (plates 49, 50).¹⁹ The domes, the drums and the grand main entrances in both designs, as well as the plans and the interiors show almost identical buildings. Alschuler belonged to a trend in synagogue architecture in the United States that turned towards an oriental revival which was adopted by German Jewish congregations in the United States who wished to follow Jewish congregations in Germany.²⁰ Alschuler was impressed by the synagogue in Essen, Germany, built by E. Koerner in 1913, as he himself testified in an article he wrote in 1924, and followed its architectural style in the Temple Isaiah design.²¹ But he also pointed to another source of inspiration in photographs he had seen of fragments from an ancient Hebrew Temple recently excavated in Palestine. He assumed that the fragments represented an ancient Byzantine style.²² The central-plan lent itself well to synagogue planning (as Jewish synagogue ritual evolves around the *Bimah*) in Temple Isaiah.

Although no proof of a possible direct influence of Alschuler on Levi has been found, it is quite clear that Levi connected the idea of a Jewish Studies Institute with the idea of a synagogue and that he was actually quite likely to have seen Temple Isaiah or some other synagogue built in the same style. Hence his Rosenbloom Building would have been a monumental Byzantine style synagogue. In a way this proposed style and the monumental

scale are quite related to the Geddes-Mears Great Hall, but the content is completely different and so is the association with the architecture of a certain type of synagogue. The way Levi had treated the different architectural aspects of the Rosenbloom Buildings, its location in the campus, its scale and its proportion in comparison to the rest of the buildings, may have indicated that Levi placed Jewish Studies as being central in a Hebrew University. But the fact that he had depicted the building as a monumental synagogue rather diminishes the image, as he apparently had no concept of a University context in its entirety in which it may be perceived. The Levi master plan rather seems to evolve around a monument for its donor. It is affiliated to a cultural trend that developed in the Diaspora and is completely detached from Jewish life in Palestine at that time and from its artistic and architectural developments. As explained in chapter 1 of part 1, the oriental style had been almost completely abandoned in the late 1920s in Eretz-Israel. Levi did not participate in the local search for an authentic Hebrew style and his University master plan does not contribute to the understanding of the different approaches to the problem of creating a new national style. His attempt rather illustrates the gap and alienation between the Diaspora and the Jewish settlement in Eretz Israel.

Like the previous plans, the Levi master plan did not match the humble practical needs of the Hebrew University. However his plans and drawings of the proposed University and Rosenbloom Building had been exhibited around the world and therefore one may assume that they had been beneficial to the Zionist cause. And yet this points to a more significant comprehension of the specific role the visual image of the Hebrew University performed for the Zionist movement at that time; it emphasizes the need for a grandiose visual image that was in contrast to actual academic needs of the Jewish population in Eretz-Israel.

Notes:

¹ Documentation does not provide an explanation to these moves, and if there was a Baerwald plan it was not found. Yet Baerwald wrote Weizmann a letter (German), April (?) 14, 1922, CZA file L/12 63 in response to an offer to prepare architectural designs for different University institutes, professors' houses and a master plan. Among the different requirements Baerwald made in order for him to take the offer was the demand that only one architect would be in charge of the whole project, to achieve a unified whole.

Eder wrote to Weizmann in March 12, 1922: "I do not know why so many people have to be consulted before a simple work of this kind can be carried out. The young architect who has drawn up the plans is in my opinion quite competent to carry out the work based on the Geddes plan [Mears? Chaikin? D. D.]. If Geddes is to be thrown over, then I could understand the need of consulting other architects." CZA, L/12 63. Eder must have been implying to a Baerwald plan, since Komberg prepared his only in August 1923.

² Letter from Eder to Weltch, January 17, 1927. CZA, file Z4/3497.

³ Heinze-Muhleib 1986: 172-173. And in a letter Mendelsohn wrote from Palestine of his meeting with Weizmann: "Particulars for Scopus should arrive here this week." In Beyer 1967: 76.

⁴ See Dolev 1990.

⁵ On September 23, 1927, Bentwich wrote to Komberg (on behalf of Magnes) that even though the University was not obliged to accept Geddes's plans, there had not been any official decision to request another master plan (i.e. from Komberg). HUA, file 73.

This dispute might have been caused by the tension between Weizmann (as the representative of the Zionist Organization) and Magnes, who represented the University's wish for independence. Hence it is possible that Weizmann ordered the plan from Komberg and Magnes refused to confirm the order. Another possible cause for dispute has been revealed in an interview with Mrs. Z. Komberg (June 5, 1988) who said that there had been a great deal of hostility in the Hebrew University between the "English" group and the "German" group. This may also explain the lack of cooperation between Geddes, Mears and Chaikin on one hand, and Baerwald and Komberg on the other.

An indication that Komberg had a sound base to claim that a master plan had indeed been ordered from him is the fact that eventually he hired the services of a lawyer's office in Jerusalem to represent him in this matter. HUA, file 73, 1928.

⁶ *The Proposed Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, Palestine*. The pamphlet was issued by the Zionist Organization in Britain (no date. 1923? 1924?).

⁷ Geddes and Mears, *Comments on the Romberg plan for the Hebrew University, 1924*, CZA, L/12 39. See also Part 2 chapter 1: 144, n. 37.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Dolev 1990:

¹³ Dolev 1991: ד. דולב, "הנגיד, התורם ועוד שלושה אדריכלים", ("The Chancellor, the Donor and Three Architects"), *Studio*, 28, December 1991, 34-36.

¹⁴ Letter from Magnes to Green, July 17, 1929. HUA, file 31/1.

¹⁵ Most correspondences with Levi, mainly concerning the Rosenbloom Building, are in the HUA, file 35/1. In a letter to Untermeyer, Magnes wrote that the New York architect Julian Levi was designing the Rosenbloom Building and a University master plan, January 21, 1930, HUA, file 82.

¹⁶ As a matter of fact the only visual data of Julian Levi's designs both for the Rosenbloom Building and the master plan had been found in an unidentified envelope containing photographs in the photography department of the CZA. Those must be the photographs mentioned by Levi in a letter to Magnes (March 6, 1930): "The drawings I made...have all been framed and have been shown at the Architectural League exhibition in New York and in all probability will go to the next exhibitions in Philadelphia and Chicago...I have...had 20" enlargements made of the photographs of the drawings and I am mailing (registered) these to you...Will you be good enough to hold them for me in your personal charge until I determine their further use?" HUA, file 31/1. In my search for information the envelope was presented to me and I recognized the lost Levi photographs of his plans and designs.

¹⁷ Wischnitzer 1955: 108-112.

¹⁸ A. S. Alschuler (1876-1940) worked in Dankmar Adler's office in Chicago before he opened his own practice.

¹⁹ Dolev 1990: 87.

²⁰ Wischnitzer 1955: 7.

²¹ Wischnitzer 1964: R. Wischnitzer, *The Architecture of the European Synagogue*, Philadelphia, 228.

²² Wischnitzer 1955: 110.

CHAPTER 3

Erich Mendelsohn (1934-1938)

A MERGE OF EAST AND WEST.

At the time Erich Mendelsohn fled from Nazi Germany in 1933, his reputation as a leading architect has already been established, yet from December 1934 until 1941 he chose to set up a home and an office in Jerusalem (he went to England first, where he shared an office with Serge Chermayeff). His invitation to go to Palestine was a result of the efforts of three leading figures: Zalman Schocken, his long term friend and client (see list of persons), Kurt Blumenfeld, head of the German Zionist movement and Chaim Weizmann (then the head of the WZO). And yet, why would an architect of his status go to an unadvanced area of the world, even though Europe was going through an economic crisis at that time?

Mendelsohn's interest in the Zionist movement had begun in Germany in the 1910s and in 1919 he was even mentioned in a list of potential immigrants to Palestine.¹ For those German Jews who chose to identify themselves as Zionists it was more a matter of coping with the disappointment at the deceit of emancipation than a political commitment. Like many others of his time and inclinations, Mendelsohn was very much impressed with Martin Buber's *Drei Reden uber das Judentum* ("Three Speeches on Jewishness"²), in which, following Ahad Ha'am's cultural Zionism, Buber presented his concept of being Jewish: a combination of religion – Judaism for post-assimilated Jews, art – Expressionism, and politics – Zionism and supra-nationalism.³ In contrast to traditional discernment of Judaism, Buber's presentation of Jewish culture as a unique spiritual and aesthetic perceptiveness was based on the "religiosity" of the original biblical Jew. Therefore Palestine, as the locus of the cultural revival, was a powerful incentive source.

"I love Eretz Israel and call myself its true child", Mendelsohn wrote to a friend in 1933, after he had left Germany, "Whatever work I did, especially my non-realistic outbursts in sketches and conceptions, got its strength from the biblical simplicity which fulfils itself and embraces the whole world at the same time. I know that the inimitable quality of my first constructions is of Jewish origins. Early in my youth, I was conscious of it, and that early consciousness made me see the necessity of Zionism. I saw in Zionism the only chance of finding

myself and being really creative".⁴ Mendelsohn thus construed his personal attitude toward Zionism and its role in his life - rather than subordinating his work to Zionist goals, it was Zionism that fulfilled a creative need for him. His Zionist convictions linked to his inner-self, which was responsible for his creative capacities.

The inspiration Zionism had on Mendelsohn's creative urge was linked to the significance he had bestowed on the Orient and the Mediterranean. As Mendelsohn himself testified, he felt that in a mystical way he belonged to the Orient and the Mediterranean even before he went to live in Palestine. It was more of a characteristic of his architectural work than a political or a national identification. Touring around the Mediterranean (on his way to Palestine in 1923 and to Greece in 1931) Mendelsohn had been profusely inspired. In his letters he expanded on the subject of the Mediterranean countries and the Orient. He combined the two terms into a unified concept of relating to the realm of nature, of the mysterious, of the instincts and emotions, as opposed to European order, science and analysis: "For the Orient resists the order of civilization, being itself bound to the order of nature"⁵, he wrote. Mendelsohn's approach to the Orient and to the Mediterranean was romantic, based on European traditional perceptions of both as representing passions and as opposed to the rational West. He also perceived himself as being inclined towards the instincts and emotions in his work, and therefore affiliated with the Orient in a profound manner that was not dependent on his place of birth, the culture he grew up in or his being exposed to the Orient in his travels. He therefore continued: "That is why I am so strongly attached to it, trying to achieve a union between Prussianism and the life-cycle of the Muezzin. Between anti-nature and harmony with nature."⁶ He specifically connected this to his architectural work: "My primitive instinct for architecture is often worth more than calculation and reflection"⁷, he wrote. The architecture of the Orient for Mendelsohn meant an understanding of the ancient tradition of "spatial law of cubic stratification" and "of the unity of space and subordination in space".⁸ This, according to Mendelsohn, is to be found throughout the Mediterranean countries, each in its own formal interpretation; in Egypt in the mud villages, in Palestine in the stone steps, etc., wherever "the lives of men are ordered by the standards of nature"⁹, he thus proposed a humane angle to his architectural theory. In his opinion building in Palestine should have followed the principles he had perceived in the Mediterranean countries: "...no one ought to build in Palestine who has not first studied the rural buildings of the Mediterranean". The following

will attempt to demonstrate Mendelsohn's implementation of this concept in his Hebrew University master plan.

Mendelsohn's first visit to Palestine in 1923 was to plan electric power stations, at the request of Pinhas Rutenberg, a Russian born engineer who had immigrated to Palestine and had obtained a concession from the British Government for the development of electricity in Palestine.¹⁰ Mendelsohn regarded the visit to Palestine as more than a mere work assignment: "We, the descendants of the oriental Jewish people, identify in our most essential being, in greater or lesser measure, with the land of Palestine... The fate of being set within two cycles of emotion, that is the one oriental-atavistic and the other occidental-present (of today), we experience nowhere as vividly as in Palestine. No Jew, able to understand his emotions, tours Palestine without the tragic touch of his own past and without the humble hope of its rebirth", he wrote to a friend.¹¹ Eventually, notwithstanding Mendelsohn's declared affiliation with the Orient and the Mediterranean, the power station was not built according to his plan because it was "too European" in the eyes of the British High Commissioner.¹² According to Mendelsohn, his bond with the Orient and the Mediterranean was not a matter of choice - it was his fate as a Jew. On his 1923 visit to Palestine Mendelsohn had already been affected by local indigenous architecture; in his designs for the Haifa Old Business Centre (together with Richard Neutra, his associate in his Berlin Office), although modern in style, the large introverted shopping centre derives from the traditional oriental covered bazaar and the impression of indigenous architecture is present in the details (although it was awarded first prize, eventually it was not constructed).

As Palestine was part of the Mediterranean and of the Orient, no wonder Mendelsohn felt that his stay there would provide a natural stimulation for his work. While he was on his way to Palestine in 1934, he wrote to his wife: "... I see... the blessedness of this coast, which every time brings me back to my sources... The Mediterranean is the first step towards a return to that country, to that final stage where we both belong. One is glad to know that. Glad of the fate that has driven us, that drives us...".¹³ The enthusiasm he expressed at arrival reveals an unconventional personal involvement: "I am completely absorbed. I scarcely breathe, eat little, sleep among visions of towering buildings and am wholly preoccupied...".¹⁴ At a time when conflicts between Jews and Arabs in Palestine caused growing hostility, which caused the elimination of the image of the Arab and of orientalist details from Zionist art, the encounter with the indigenous scene in Palestine was an elevating experience for

Mendelsohn. For him Arab indigenous culture symbolized the spirit, while Zionism was to him materialistic, modern and scientific; Mendelsohn believed in the necessity to merge the two, the scientific and the spiritual, that would produce a new unity. He felt that Palestine, being in the Orient and on the Mediterranean, was his "artistic home"¹⁵ as well as the ancient homeland of his forefathers: "The static and the dynamic elements came together in the equilibrium of the Mediterranean – the eternal creative force, which achieved the union of death and life in the timelessness of great art. Everywhere in the Orient this force is present. I believe I am myself a part of it. What obliges us to live in a northern country?

Civilization, enrichment coming from outside – shall we be the less for the lack of them? Is not our place here - is not Palestine for eighteen millions the only island, the point of departure and the historical point of conclusion?".¹⁶

Mendelsohn also expressed a sense of responsibility as a Jew and as an architect towards the development of the country: "I am resolved to remain here...What the country needs most is creative people".¹⁷ The latter remark was perhaps the closest Mendelsohn had come to dedicating himself to the national cause. Differences in attitude towards the fulfilment of national needs between Mendelsohn and mainstream Zionism would become more conspicuous as his architectural projects in Palestine progressed.

Perhaps Mendelsohn's opinion on local architecture had also provided an incentive for his decision to settle in Palestine. He had taken the opportunity of a meeting with Weizmann to make the latter aware of "the pitiful architecture of Palestine".¹⁸ Mendelsohn was very much interested in the Hebrew University project, yet in view of the abortive past of architectural endeavors on Mount Scopus he might have had his doubts whether his own plans would ever take form. In a letter to Schocken he wrote: "Never before has a university been built with so small an awareness of the fact that the concept of a university demands more architecturally than a heap of souvenirs of somebody's charity. There is no longer any point in attacking those who have allowed this to happen. That is all in the past".¹⁹ Mendelsohn passionately wished to plan the Hebrew University campus on Mount Scopus, and as he enjoyed an international reputation, his motives were doubtless rather artistic and idealistic, than personal profit.

In December 1934, Mendelsohn arrived in a country torn by tension between Arabs, Jews and the British mandate officials and military. Yet the advancement of his various projects had not been delayed, and until his departure in 1941 he left behind a remarkable impression on the local architectural vista.²⁰ Weizmann's residence in

Rehovot was his first assignment, and later he designed Zalman Schocken's²¹ residence and private library in Jerusalem. However, the Hebrew University project was the most ambitious of all.

Mendelsohn arrived at the height of the popularity of the International Style and of the Bauhaus in Palestine. However, his own already well-known individualistic style differed from the strictly functional and abstract modernism; it was more "organic" and could relate itself to a specific natural and architectural environment. Furthermore, Mendelsohn maintained his international status while he stayed in Eretz-Israel, and did not take part in the local nationalistic pioneering *Weltanschauung*. While the general atmosphere in Eretz-Israel was that the mere construction of buildings was a fulfilment of the Zionist dream, Mendelsohn's position allowed him to be uncompromising.²² While it would have seemed quite natural for Mendelsohn to associate with the Chug members, an incident that took place shortly after his arrival sheds light on the gap between them. In a letter to the publisher of the Chug journal he pointed out that "the hope of the Hebrew people is the construction of their national home" and that "this construction to a great extent is of economical character" Then he went on, pointing out the abyss between his conviction and theirs: "...the world will not judge us according to the quantity of citrus export...rather...according to the spiritual value of our spiritual production".²³ Mendelsohn thus pronounced ideas in the spirit of Buber's critique of nationalism that rejected the concept of creating a nation like all other nations²⁴; Buber preached that the national home of the Jews should acquire spiritual superiority in accordance with Jewish and Hasidic heritage. For Mendelsohn Buber's philosophy probably merged with his own utopic aspirations for a "European Academy" on the Mediterranean, and his beliefs which evolved from a confidence in the superiority of an individual spirituality. For Chug members those notions were completely contrary to their own secular socialism and aspirations for a collective identity.²⁵

Furthermore, Mendelsohn's German background emphasized cultural aspects of Zionism and therefore was in constant conflict with the *yishuv* east European Zionism grounded on socialist and political aspects. He was very much at home, though, in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Jerusalem of the 1930s, where cultural activities of highly educated Jewish immigrants from European countries took place (the Jewish community in Jerusalem and in Tel-Aviv enjoyed a very good philharmonic orchestra and an opera, there were a few theatres in Tel Aviv and recitals and chamber music was played on

social events). A large number of the Hebrew University faculty were of German origin, of which quite a few lived next to the Mendelsohn residence in Jerusalem. They formed a rather closed social circle and a large number of them were members of "Brit Shalom" whose message was in affinity to Mendelsohn's. In short, Mendelsohn associated with those social constituents that did not conform to the requirements of a collective identity promoted by Zionist propaganda. His alienation took a conspicuous form in his life style; for although associating with the British was generally regarded a diversion from nationalist duty, Mendelsohn had been a regular guest at "Government House", the High Commissioner's headquarters in Jerusalem. "Government House" was an island of typical British colonial etiquette. The massive building was built by Harrison in the early 1930s on Mount Mukabra, south to the Old City. Although it had been built in a local colonial style, the interior was entirely western, with a billiard room and a ballroom that had the most magnificent parquet floor and a chandelier. The curtains, furniture and silver were all brought over from England and oil portraits of the British monarchs covered the walls. The High Commissioner, who was addressed as "Your Highness", frequently entertained in "Government House" in a meticulously British manner (there were also separate toilets in the house, for English and for natives).²⁶ Mendelsohn's fame and the fact that he identified himself first and foremost as an Englishman (he became a British citizen when he left Germany), not as a Jewish settler in Eretz-Israel, may have paved the way for his friendship with the High Commissioner, Sir Arthur Wauchope, who was High Commissioner of Palestine from 1931 to 1938. Wauchope had a special interest in the arts, artists and musicians; he even spent much of his personal fortune on various educational and cultural projects.²⁷ Mendelsohn was often invited to "Government House" on formal and informal occasions. He even made secret agreements with British administrators in order to advance his interest to become the sole architect of the Hebrew University.²⁸

Mendelsohn started work for the Hebrew University immediately on arrival in Jerusalem, and continued to do so between trips to London until about the end of 1938. Between 1938 and 1941, when he left for the United States, his position as the Hebrew University architect had not been replaced. The circumstances of his employment by the University were even more ~~obscure~~ than those of his disengagement. Already during his former visit to Palestine in 1923 there had been suggestions that he should be offered the

undertaking of the planning of the Hebrew University.²⁹ In 1934 it had been mainly through Schocken's efforts that Mendelsohn was prepared to go to Palestine and work for the Hebrew University.³⁰ It was probably also through Schocken's intervention that the University officials accepted Mendelsohn as the University architect, although that point is not at all clear. Hienze-Muhlieb claims that Mendelsohn actually produced a situation of a *fait accompli*, by creating an impression that he was officially nominated to design the Hebrew University master plan, and later this erroneous information was taken up in different publications.³¹ If there had been any negotiations they must have taken place prior to Mendelsohn's arrival or immediately afterwards, for as early as December 1934 he was already taken on a tour of Mount Scopus by a member of the University's staff (there is no indication though whether it was an official tour).³²

All through the period of his stay in Palestine Mendelsohn had been deeply touched by the Mount Scopus site, and especially by the view towards the Judaeian Wilderness. Shortly after his arrival his very first impression was that: "The site is indescribably beautiful – yes, shattering".³³ And later, in 1936, he expressed an even greater enthusiasm: "The view is timeless. He who dies here has not far to travel".³⁴ Yet those impressions excluded the existing University buildings, at which sight he had been appalled: "I have visited all the buildings on Mount Scopus. A God-given piece of country between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean has been violated by devils' hands. A wretched, botched fruit of incompetence and self-complacency"³⁵, "...but the present buildings are scattered about without any plan, in a terrifying small-minded way"³⁶, "...there is only one national responsibility and that is to allow the disgrace which calls itself the Hebrew University to vanish at last".³⁷ The buildings he was referring to had been the Chemistry and Biochemistry departments in the enlarged Gray Hill residence, the administration building in the old service rooms in front of the Gray Hill house, the open-air theatre (designed by Chaikin in 1933), the Physics Building, the Mathematics Building and the Library. Nevertheless, Mendelsohn included those buildings in his master plan, integrating them into his own concept of a unified complex. While the University authorities' wish was to plan only those buildings which had been considered most urgent, Mendelsohn insisted time and again that the planning must be unified and therefore should be in the hands of one architect only (his own, of course)³⁸: "It is not simply a question of the Rosenbloom building, the Hostel building – Hadassah, but of an entirely new master plan for the whole University complex...It is for the setting-up of a master plan

and the acceptance of such an idea that I want to have support of the High Commissioner. A fine prospect, although it is bound to take years to complete."³⁹ When Mendelsohn designed a master plan for the Hebrew University it was a speculative draft of his own ideas, and eventually it had become the official master plan (as mentioned above, Heinze-Muhleib claimed that it was not ordered by the University).⁴⁰

Documents show that Mendelsohn designed a number of master plans, but not all of which have been found. The first was a draft completed in 1935 (of which only documentation of a model for the Hadassah-University Hospital exists, plate 52) to be presented to the Jerusalem District Building and Town Planning Commission (University authorities were interested in acquiring building permits as quickly as possible). The second was completed in May 1936, the third in October 1936 and the fourth in October 1938.⁴¹ The master plan and the model presented in illustrations 50 and 51 are probably the latest version. Yet from what has been found it is clear that the changes are quite minor, although they have altered the quality of the designs, and most of them had been imposed on Mendelsohn either by the District Commission or by University authorities and donors. The October 1936 version includes a curved line for the east end of the hospital, instead of the former rounded connection between the two buildings, and a ring-road on the western slope (plate 53). The Building Committee demanded the ring-road, which would have significantly altered Mendelsohn's concept of a unified complex. He therefore turned the hill-top road into an internal road, for University use only, and added a ring road for public use.⁴²

An important factor in the development of Mendelsohn's style in Palestine was an approach he had established earlier toward modern intervention in historical environments. In "New Athens" he explained that the contemporary architect should examine old architecture not in order to copy external details of the buildings but only to explore how architectural principles are appropriately applied to the site and its natural forms. "...ingenuity in the collective organization of the town, which is a good deal more important than the worship of the sacred column or the cult of bareness of the so-called moderns", Mendelsohn wrote.⁴³ Mendelsohn, then, was against any automatic application of external forms in order to create an architectural affiliation to a certain building style. As emphasized above, he required an authenticity that evolved from a sincere dialogue of the architect with the different aspects of the site. Therefore his proposed layout of the

University buildings follows the topography of the mountain, with its narrow ridge and the two extensions towards the east. Mendelsohn's insistence on keeping the hill top road was exactly for that reason; it would have emphasized the long range stretching along its north-south lines. On the southern extension on the eastern side of the road, Mendelsohn added a few buildings to the old ones. On the far southern edge of the campus he designed an elongated museum building and a much smaller building for a power station and shops. The old buildings were made to become more connected with new sections that close around a central open space and create rounded stretches facing the steep slope and echoing the mountain terraces. On the northern extension he placed a large complex of the Hadassah University Medical Centre. It includes a hospital on the north end of the complex, a Nurses' Training School further south, and on the opposite side of the road he placed a comparatively large Medical School and a Medical Research Institute. The central group contains a Botany and Zoology building and a larger Humanities complex. This group of buildings stands out by means of the different direction of the buildings (east-west) and by placing them above ground level, allowing the hilltop road to continue its course underneath them (they are built on a platform above the road). The lay out and the height of this central group allow for an almost undisturbed lookout towards east and west. Thus Mendelsohn created a mild variation and focal point in the plan as well as a combining element of the whole campus. Further south to this group and connecting with the existing library Mendelsohn placed the Jewish and Oriental building, closing three sides of a courtyard. The enlarged Library formed to echo the Jewish and Oriental Studies building, touches a University club and Students' Hostel building. Besides the Botanical Garden, the open spaces between the buildings, and the open courtyards allow plenty of greenery around the campus and open views toward Jerusalem and the Judaeian Wilderness.⁴⁴ A proposed pavilion, placed at the spot that would have provided a perfect lookout toward the Old City of Jerusalem (no. 16 in plate 53) is another evidence of the importance Mendelsohn attributed to the University's environs, without ascribing to it any extraneous significance (historical, religious, ideological *et cetera*). On the whole the very abstract outlines of the suggested rectangular and narrow buildings imply an almost standard scale, quite a uniform pattern of the buildings creating three walls around the courtyards, and a few curved forms which soften the uniform effect. The model shows an almost complete uniformity of the buildings' heights as well.⁴⁵ The size and form of the

buildings seem to be determined simultaneously by a variety of factors: Mendelsohn's concept of the University as an organic unity of equally important fields of knowledge, the buildings' functions, the way the buildings relate to each other (formally and content wise) and their location in their natural environment. There is no trace in Mendelsohn's master plan of a hierarchical approach to the different fields of knowledge or to a scale of significance applied to the various buildings, as in previous master plans.

Connected by different sized open spaces, the L or U shaped buildings create patios, thus providing a constantly changing environment, from open to closed spaces and a range of options in between. The patios and gardens provide a free viewing of the vistas of the Old City on the west and the Judaeian Wilderness on the east to occupants of the campus.⁴⁶ Mendelsohn's few sketchy drawings for the proposed buildings, although quite impressionistic, successfully illustrate his vision of his intent to achieve a natural flow of the buildings, organically growing out of the soil in harmony with the mountain topography and its terraces. The sketches suggest an invisible aerial line that connects the proposed Rosenbloom building, the Students' Club (plate 56), the city stretching on the other side of the Kidron valley, the Hospital's semi-circular terrace and the Moav mountains beyond the Jordan valley. His idea was that since there were differences of level on the site, the masses should develop each in its own specific way with each building form dependant on its relationship with the buildings next to it: "...the start of the so-called Rosenbloom building is the Clubhouse, which prepares the spatial shaping of the Rosenbloom building" Mendelsohn wrote.⁴⁷ For Mendelsohn not only the individual buildings existed in a complex; he was also interested in the collaboration of the spaces between the buildings in the overall layout for he believed that the interrelationships between the buildings and the spaces are most significant. This concept of interrelations was taken further by Mendelsohn into considerations of the building complex and the way it relates to its surroundings. He defined his approach by differentiating "A medical quarter, or the concentration of all hospitals; a university quarter, or the concentration of all sciences; a military quarter or – ...", as he wrote in an article.⁴⁸ Assembling buildings together had to create a meaning that emerged from the essential quality that brought them together; content as well as of form were components of this essential quality, both equally constructing Mendelsohn's concept. In the case of the Hebrew University Mendelsohn clearly meant that the University as an establishment should provide a unifying sense of a central and essential purpose that transcends the

specific academic goals of each individual department. Such an essential purpose could be, for instance, the search for truth, or the freedom of thought. It is most probable that the source of this concept of interrelations that lead to a transcendental existence had been again Buber's philosophy. For Mendelsohn's concept of interrelations seems to be a physical manifestation of Buber's philosophy of dialogue that evolves around the "between". Ontologically, according to Buber, the "between" may emerge only when there is true dialogue, which happens when a person relates as a "Thou" – as a whole being, a subject (as opposed to object). The realm of the "between" according to Buber is a space that comes into being when there is a dialogical encounter between persons, between a person and nature and between a person and a divine entity.⁴⁹ Mendelsohn's buildings, the spaces shaped around them and their natural surroundings are the protagonists in this Buberian context. The implementation of the dialogue Mendelsohn wished for lacks its full dimension for his Hebrew University was not completed, hence only the plans and his own proclamations reveal his intentions. No evidence has been found to assert that Mendelsohn attempted to create an architectural equivalent to Buber's philosophy, yet as he had been thoroughly influenced by Buber before, and his attitude toward the "between" in his architectural planning is highly Buberian in spirit, there is a possibility that he drew inspiration from Buber also in this respect. Nevertheless, the parallelization of both adds to the understanding of each. The affinity of Buber's philosophical concepts, such as the "between", encounter, dialogue, authenticity and freedom, to Mendelsohn's description of his attempts to achieve a true bond, or a dialogue, between his proposed buildings, sheds light on their mutual quest to attain spirituality. Therefore the carefully delineated interrelations in his plan can be interpreted as an endeavor to hold the campus buildings together in a way that transcends its physical union. To maintain a true dialogue requires, according to Buber, authenticity, abstaining from any kind of manipulation, acceptance of the other as a whole (not as an object to be used or exploited). Similar factors are inherent in Mendelsohn's attitude to his art.

The changes that were enforced on Mendelsohn did not improve his plan. In the early plan the hospital was planned to consist of three long blocks, two of which were connected on the north-east end by a semi-circular form with deep verandas. This semi-circle was a typical Mendelsohnian attribute, which in the present case served to complete and accentuate the harmony of the building with the mountain terraces.⁵⁰ But in

the later versions of the plan the hospital consisted of two building blocks only. One veranda at the eastern end of one of the buildings only was the only remnant of the original semi-circular forms. An even smaller semi-circle was placed at the end of the other building, to serve as a place of prayer.⁵¹

A comparison between the Geddes master plan and Mendelsohn's could illuminate a few of the major aspects in both attitudes. Mendelsohn shared Geddes's wish to merge the Hebrew University campus with its surroundings. Yet unlike Geddes, Mendelsohn rejected orientalist attributes; he was more interested in a merging of modernist and local architectural values. Therefore he designed the buildings as simple modernist cubical forms, which corresponded to his idea of local housing and interrelated with each other and with their natural surrounding to become an organic whole, as the indigenous houses do. Mendelsohn wanted his Hebrew University to resemble the Arab village which appeared to him as houses that have "grown" naturally out of the ground.⁵² Yet he did not attempt to imitate indigenous architecture, for instance he did not plan to build the new University buildings in local rusticated stone nor have the walls covered with cut rusticated stone. He did not introduce typical oriental elements to his proposed buildings such as vaults and arches. Quite the contrary, the buildings were designed to be constructed by modern methods, which to Mendelsohn also dictated functional and minimal forms. Those buildings that have been actually built to Mendelsohn's design (the Medical Centre - plate 55 and the Students' Club – plate 58) have been covered with rectangular, tile-like, local lime stone, laid perpendicularly to prevent any chance of imitating real building stones. It was of consequence for Mendelsohn that the building materials should be authentic and therefore the fact that the stone was only an outer layer and not the actual building material had to be visualized by means of the way the stones were laid. Mendelsohn's concept therefore is quite clearly manifested in the University buildings. They do not imitate, but they were meant to equally belong on Mount Scopus as indigenous houses belong to their environments.

While the Geddes master plan presented an ideal university, forming a theoretic hierarchy of buildings and fields of knowledge, Mendelsohn's concept of the Hebrew University had been created through the interrelations of the equally proportioned and regular buildings. Mendelsohn's buildings vary only in details such as angular or circular endings or the buildings' directions (either north-south or east-west). Thus Mendelsohn

created a plan which does not differentiate between fields of knowledge, or between locations on the mountain ridge. The plan also avoided symbolic or representational connections with sites and views on either side of Mount Scopus. The building complex humbly occupies the ridge of the mountain bearing no other historic, political or religious implications than its own function. In Buberian terms, Mendelsohn created a campus that was authentic, true to itself. Whittick explained that in Palestine, Mendelsohn's feeling for organic unity and for three-dimensional space has found confirmation and stimulus. In Palestine he could materialize his concepts of the Mediterranean and of the Orient *in locus* and the direct inspiration must have had its impact.

Even today, with the Mount Scopus campus completely altered, the Hadassah-University Hospital complex, although it has been enlarged, illustrates Mendelsohn's ability to apply modern architectural forms in a way that relates organically to the surroundings. The human scale of the walls, the spaces, the doors and windows, the clarity of forms and functions, create a warm and comforting environment. Mendelsohn's master plan was not completely realized because of severe disagreements with University administration. As it had been facing grave financial difficulties, the University's sole interest in a master plan was merely as a means to receive permits for individual buildings (the Rosenbloom building, the Student Club and the Hadassah-University Hospital). Furthermore, documentation shows that the achievement of a beautiful university campus was not a priority for the University administration. The disillusioned Mendelsohn explained his point of view in a letter to Schocken. He referred to a comment made by Felix Warburg stating that "from the point of view of the University it makes no difference whether the one or the other [architectural plans for the Rosenbloom Building, D.D.] is built".⁵³ Mendelsohn took the idea further, when he wrote that all the University is interested in was the Rosenbloom money, and that financial considerations were the University's first priority: "...provided Mrs. R.'s money is saved for the University. It was thanks to this point of view that the only Jewish university acquired the appearance which it has today. I have repeated since 1923, i.e., since my first visit to Palestine, that this point of view must carry the blame for a great part of the hostile attitude displayed by the non-Jewish intelligentsia of the country and the influential members of the Mandate government, who are mostly well-educated in matters of taste, towards Jewish urban development". Altogether the case of the Rosenbloom Jewish Studies Building demonstrates how Mendelsohn's concept of unity clashed with the ambitions of promoters, donors, administrators and other

architects in the Hebrew University.⁵⁴ Apparently because of different arbitrary circumstances, there had been some pressure to complete the Rosenbloom Building as soon as possible. Mendelsohn actually prepared a plan of the building as early as January 1935, long before the whole master plan was completed. A model of Mendelsohn's plan for the building had been delivered to the Rosenbloom family (the model has not been found, but an impressionistic sketch exists, see plate 56). Mendelsohn planned the building to become a modern twin image of the old Library building, creating a dialogue between the buildings and hence - an entire environment, rather than a cluster of single buildings. Magnes approved the plan.⁵⁵ But Mendelsohn's Rosenbloom building consisted basically of one floor only, and attained another floor only where the slope allowed one without changing the height of the whole building. The Rosenbloom family did not approve; their priorities had been revealed in the pretentious Julian Levi plan (see part 2 chapter 2) - they wanted a building that would stand out on the mountain ridge and be quite discernible when viewed from Jerusalem.⁵⁶ Eventually, in 1936 it was Joseph D. Weiss, an architect from New York who designed the Rosenbloom Building with the collaboration of Richard Kauffmann as the local architect. The construction was completed in 1940, before Mendelsohn left Palestine.

Like in the case of the Geddes master plan, again a tension arose between the planner's wish for a unified plan and the need to overcome severe practical obstacles as well as to please different parties, such as other architects in Palestine and donors. However, as a matter of fact the Jewish population in Palestine still did not demand a large university, although those who did wish for higher education had to go abroad if the Hebrew University could not satisfy their needs.

The abandonment of the Mendelsohn master plan has been commonly ascribed to Mendelsohn's dictatorial and difficult nature, and to his reluctance to accept the fact that his proven professional merits and his superiority over any other local architect at that time had not been acknowledged in Palestine.⁵⁷ As to Mendelsohn, from the very beginning of his involvement with the Hebrew University he complained of the intention of different parties to convince the University authorities of the necessity for an architects' competition, rather than offer him the planning of the entire campus.⁵⁸ The Rosenbloom family and their demands were one very active such party, and also the Union of Palestinian Architects had demanded an architects' contest, so that other architects may

also benefit from the largest building project at that time.⁵⁹ Mendelsohn's personal insistence on maintaining his own independent identity, not to give in to donors' whims, and not being committed to a certain political or national movement, is reflected in his architecture of the Hebrew University. In a politically turbulent milieu, Mendelsohn wished for his architecture to be above temporary political inclinations. Apart from the tremendous political and social difficulties Palestine was going through during the years of Mendelsohn's stay in Palestine, and the struggles he had to face with the different parties involved in the establishment of the University, his architectural plans were constantly criticized. Yet while there is an abundance of documentation on endless meetings to discuss matters such as the size of rooms, corridors, windows and so on, there is none on questions of aesthetics or content.

Mendelsohn's early hopes that in Palestine he would find a fertile ground and inspiration for his architecture proved to be naive. He did not assimilate with local modern architectural trends that had already been practiced in Palestine by architects who were trained in Europe. Although at a superficial glance Mendelsohn's and other modernists' architecture seem to follow the same style, his alienation should be interpreted in terms of concept differences. For as he was guided by his ideal of a merge of east and west and a belief that the national revival should build itself as part of the east and not turn its back on it, other architects wished to create an affiliation with western concepts only (see part 1 chapter 1). While Baerwald, Barsky and Komberg used what they considered oriental motifs for their Eretz-Israel buildings and later the modernist architects turned their backs on the east, Mendelsohn attempted to express his architectural convictions in a new local way, combining modernism with indigenous characteristics.⁶⁰ These notions had been quite unacceptable in the prevailing atmosphere among the Jewish community at that time. In a society dedicated to the "building" of a new modern nation the geographical connection to the East had been meaningless. Mendelsohn considered local indigenous architecture, climate and materials, while in Zionist ideology and consciousness Eretz-Israel was unpopulated until Zionist immigrants settled there.

However, more buildings of Mendelsohn's master plan were realized than of any other architect who worked for the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus. The whole Medical Centre complex was constructed (the hospital, the Nurses' Training School and the Medical School), as well as the Students' Club and a Gymnasium (later demolished).

His purpose to design a universal institute had not been fulfilled, a campus he carefully planned to become a suitable environment for scholarly engagement which is allowed to connect with its surrounding on its own terms. Furthermore, Mendelsohn's concept of the University shows a responsibility towards the historical moment, which included all inhabitants of Palestine, Jews and Arabs.⁶¹ His proposed Hebrew University campus was an island of dialogue and harmony, transcending temporal struggles, animosity and bloodshed. The idea of the university, as a place for scholars and students to gather together in a mutual quest for truth achieved in Mendelsohn's plan a formal expression as well as providing a meeting place for the different fields of knowledge. As a university campus situated apart from the city, it manifested the idea of the university as a place of seclusion. The buildings were not designed to make a declarative impression or to be associated with the holy and historical sites, rather the contrary, they were designed to blend with the mountain as the indigenous villages do and to simply serve their own autonomous functional and spiritual purpose.

Notes:

¹ Nitzan Shifan 1996: 162, n. 45.

² An English translation is included in N. Glatzer (ed.) 1976: *On Judaism*, New York.

³ See Nitzan Shifan 1996.

⁴ A letter from Mendelsohn to Kurt Blumenfeld, July 1933, translated in Gilbert Herbert 1987: "Erich Mendelsohn and the Zionist Dream", *Erich Mendelsohn in Palestine, Catalog of an Exhibition*, Haifa.

⁵ Letter, April 30, 1935. In Beyer (ed.) 1967: 142.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Letter, January 3, 1935. In Beyer (ed.) 1967: 141.

⁸ Mendelsohn (1931), "New Athens", *Ibid.*: 115.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Herbert & Sosnovsky 1993: 104, 105.

¹¹ Heinze-Muhleib 1986: 19-20.

¹² A letter by Mendelsohn, cited in Beyer 1967: 170.

¹³ Letter from Mendelsohn to his wife, May 30, 1933. In Beyer (ed.) 1967: 135,136.

¹⁴ Letter from Mendelsohn to his wife, December 7, 1934. *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Nikolaus Pevsner, in his introduction to Oskar Beyer's book wrote that Mendelsohn once called himself jokingly an "East Prussian Oriental". *Ibid.*: 19.

¹⁶ Letter from Mendelsohn (in Jerusalem) to his wife, December 7, 1934. *Ibid.*: 137.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Letter, December 14, 1934, *Ibid.*: 138.

¹⁹ Letter to Schocken, July 27, 1936. *Ibid.*: 145.

²⁰ The Government Hospital in Haifa (1936-1938), the Weizmann House in Rehovot (1937), the Schocken House and the Schocken Library in Jerusalem (1936-1937), the Anglo-Palestinian Bank in Jerusalem (1938-1939), the Agricultural Faculty of the Hebrew University, Rehovot (1939-1941) and the Wolf Research Laboratory at the Weizmann Institute, Rehovot (1939-1941).

²¹ Zalman Schocken was a German Businessman and publisher, an active Zionist and a collector of books on Judaism. On his arrival to Palestine he was nominated Chairman of the Hebrew University Executive Committee. Between 1926 and 1930, prior to Schocken's immigration to Palestine, Mendelsohn designed the Schocken department stores in Nuremberg, Stuttgart and Chemnitz, which became important landmarks in modern architecture.

²² Eitan 1981: 50.

²³ E. Mendelsohn, a letter in *Habinyan Bamizrah Hakarov*, 3, February 1935, p. 4.

²⁴ Nitzan Shiftan 1996: 171.

²⁵ *Ibid.*: 173.

²⁶ Segev 1999: 280.

²⁷ Sherman 1997: A. J. Sherman, *Mandate Days; British Lives in Palestine 1918-1948*, London: 258.

²⁸ In a letter as early as December 12, 1934, Mendelsohn wrote: "On Tuesday the Building Committee sits. Before then the members must be won over for the abandonment of a competition and for E. M. personally. I have lunch with Sir Arthur [Wauchope, D.D.] in order to induce him to talk to the gentlemen personally". Beyer 1967: 137.

In a letter, July 30, 1936, Mendelsohn wrote: "As regards the University and the Rosenbloom building, we [Mendelsohn and Kendall, head of the Town Planning Department, D.D.] have reached a secret agreement to continue henceforward on the assumption that Mount Scopus shall be regarded as an integrated town planning scheme and shall be built or executed by one hand. This is my counterblast to the Board of Trustees business. So I have called in the Romans – for the sake of an ideal. As soon as this affair has run a little further I shall see H. C. [High Commissioner, D.D.] and get him to help it along". *Ibid.*: 146.

In a letter of August 7, 1936, Mendelsohn described a meeting with the High Commissioner: "He said the National Home will exist as long as England exists and he wishes me to guide it architecturally - to build, as he said, all the important buildings." *Ibid.*: 147.

In a letter of August 13, 1936, Mendelsohn wrote: "I have received the following confidential letter from H. C.: 'My dear Mr. M., I am delighted to think I have now every reason to think Secretary of State will approve of your doing the work I spoke before. You will soon receive a formal letter from Secretariat. It will be one of the few joys of 1936, if you do this for us, and we secure unity of your design on Mt. Scopus...' " *Ibid.*.

²⁹ See part 2 chapter 2 p. 162, and note 3.

³⁰ Letter from Mendelsohn to Schocken, July 27, 1936, Beyer 1967: 145.

³¹ Heinze-Muhleib 1986: 177, 177 n. 2.

³² Letter, December 12, 1934. Beyer 1967: 137.

³³ Letter, December 12, 1934. *Ibid.*

³⁴ Letter, July 27, 1936. *Ibid.*: 144.

³⁵ Letter, December 27, 1934. *Ibid.*: 139.

³⁶ Letter, December 12, 1934. *Ibid.*: 137.

³⁷ Letter, December 23, 1934. *Ibid.*: 139.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*: 137, 138.

⁴⁰ Schocken also referred to the first master plan as a voluntary undertaking of Mendelsohn's, for which he also did not require to be paid. In "*Anlage zum brief des Herren Schocken an Herren Dr.*

Senator vom 14.1.1938", "Enclosed brief from Mr. Schocken to Dr. Senator of 14.1.1938".HUA, file 027/38.

⁴¹ Heinze-Muhleib 1986: 180.

⁴² Minutes of a meeting between Schocken and Senator, January 1, 1938 (German), HUA, file 027/38.

⁴³ "New Athens" 1931, first published in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, an English version is published in Beyer 1967: 114.

⁴⁴ When the Hadassah-University Hospital was built Mendelsohn himself designed the gardens.

⁴⁵ While the mandate government prohibited building more than two floors high on Mount Scopus, so as not to interfere with the sky-line, they made an exception for the hospital which was allowed three floors. Minutes of the Hospital Building Committee meeting, August 5, 1935, HUA file 0290.

⁴⁶ It is not clear whether locations number 17 and 18 in the Mendelsohn master plan are merely indications of points of the compass he wished to emphasize, or proposed sites for outlooks. If they are the formers, it is not clear why they are marked in the same fashion as the buildings, if the latter, it is strange that there is no more information to be found about their proposed design. I have not found material that would suggest an answer to this problem (Dr. Heinze-Greenberg, an authority on Mendelsohn's *oeuvre* in Palestine has been consulted). If these were indeed meant to be proposed outlooks on the eastern and western slopes I would like to suggest that they maintained the original significance of Mount Scopus as a place of lookout onto the views beyond. By placing independent lookouts on both sides of the mountain ridge, as an optional leisure pastime, Mendelsohn would have persevered the non-declarative character of the campus and created an equilibrium between East and West, thus adding further support to the idea of the University and transcending narrow national, political and cultural identities. In any case, it is clear that the possibility to be exposed to the remarkable views was imperative for Mendelsohn.

⁴⁷ Letter to Schocken, July 27, 1936. In Beyer 1967: 146.

⁴⁸ "New Athens" 1931, published in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, and an English version in *Ibid.*: 114.

⁴⁹ See Buber 1965: M. Buber, *I and Thou*, New York.

⁵⁰ Eitan 1981: 55.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² Whittick 1940: 114.

⁵³ Letter to Schocken, July 27, 1936. In Beyer 1967: 145.

⁵⁴ Magnes described those quite straightforwardly in a letter to Schocken, May 9, 1938, HUA, file 027/38: "I am glad that you want now to consider building developments at the University on their own merits and not with reference to outside pressure. This is exactly what I have been trying to achieve. Unfortunately, up till now we have had a pistol at our breast; - We must have not only a site plan but also a detailed General Design; we must submit this to Government; we must have a permanent Consulting Architect; and we must have Mr. Mendelsohn – all this in order to get a permit for one building, the Rosenbloom. That is not the way for a self-respecting University".

⁵⁵ Letter from magnes to Mrs. Rosenbloom, January 10, 1935. HUA, file 027/35.

⁵⁶ Dolev 1990: 94.

⁵⁷ Correspondences in HUA, file 027; Eitan 1981: 55, 58; Zevi 1985: 146.

⁵⁸ Minutes of a meeting between Schocken and Senator, January 1, 1938 (German), HUA, file 027/38. See note 5.

⁵⁹ Letters: December 12, December 19, December 23, 1934. In Beyer 1967: 137-139.

⁶⁰ Eitan 1981: 50.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 4

Richard Kauffmann (1944-1948)

A UNIVERSITY CITY.

Richard Kauffmann, the architect and town-planner, was one of the major modernists in Palestine and a leading theorist of the national and cultural revival (see part 1, chapter 1).¹ Kauffmann indeed possessed the Zionist ideological conviction as well as knowledge of contemporary methods for environmental planning needed to become the leading figure in Zionist planning of the built environment. While it is commonly accepted that villages emerge and grow naturally, it had been the PLDC (Palestine Land Development Co.) policy to plan the new agricultural settlements according to its ideology and Kauffmann had been the planner who materialized the ideas. An emphasis on the collective in the attempts to create a new Jewish identity underlined the ideological basis of Kauffmann's plans, and actually they were each a theoretic model for communal life. Contemporary Western trends, emphasising the functional, with no regional or hierarchic attributes, had been well adapted to the needs of the PLDC and its ideology of creating a socialist and communal society.² Recently, with the emergence of a critical historiography of those pioneering days, Kauffmann's architectural manifestation of a socialist ideology is being criticized as well. Elhanani (1998), for instance, had his doubts as to whether Kauffmann's plans achieved the prospects of his theory, especially concerning Nahalal, designed in 1921, Kauffmann's flag ship among his agricultural settlements' planning projects. Elhanani pointed out that the fact that the plan for the communal area inside the circular centre has never been realized, and had in fact remained empty, indicates a fundamental problem of a chasm between aspirations and reality. It has been the centre of Nahalal more than any other part of the settlement that evolved from Zionist ideology, for it had been planned as the communal domain.³ The problem, Elhanani wrote, was that the ideology of communal, public buildings clashed with the scale required by an agricultural settlement, and therefore, even though he had not been aware of it, Kauffmann actually could not design them. Theory, in this case as in many others, had been imposed upon life and could not offer a complete answer to real needs. The striving for a new form of communal life that would illustrate the fulfilment of the Zionist ideal for a collective identity encountered a severe obstacle even in what had been regarded for

decades, the epitome of Zionist settlement. Hence the image of Nahalal as a model for a New Hebrew society was actually a false mask. Anyway, where settlement planning was concerned, ideological concepts were valued above any other consideration at that time.⁴ The choice of Kauffmann as the next Hebrew University planner clearly indicates two trends: one was that the project had not lost its importance as a first rate national enterprise, and the second – that a shift in the way the Hebrew University had been perceived took place; from a project that reflects on world Jewry to an institute that should blend with local nationalist processes.

When Mendelsohn left for the United States, apart from the buildings that he had added to the Hebrew University campus, two more were built by other architects. The Rosenbloom Jewish Studies Building (mentioned in part 2 chapter 3) and the Jewish Antiquities Museum, built as an extension of the Student Club building by the local architects I. Yawicz and K. Rubin (plate 59) and completed in 1941.⁵ The outbreak of the Second World War terminated all plans for further building on the Mount Scopus campus.

However, in 1944, after the devastating fate of the Jewish communities in Europe had become known, the Hebrew University administrators discussed plans for preparing the University's intake of much larger numbers of students and faculty. The national importance of the Hebrew University was again emphasized, and also its responsibility towards world Jewry. The University also responded to the destruction of Jewish higher education institutions in Europe, and declared that it was the duty of the Hebrew University to make up, if only partially, for this loss by preparing for the many students that would find refuge in Eretz-Israel.⁶ As the University authorities declared that it was necessary for the University to prepare for the absorption of thousands more students and faculty, one conclusion was that more University departments would be required and lodgings for students must be constructed.⁷ It is questionable to what extent the University authorities were reacting to genuine needs or perhaps taking up the opportunity to use the University for political and national needs. The question is valid because another necessity was brought up in discussions of the University's preparations for post war days was the reinforcement of Jerusalem's status as a Jewish stronghold in Palestine.⁸ One may conclude therefore that the need to provide for the education of the refugees was placed at the front to conceal the other, political cause.

In order to achieve a political goal, a large campus was required as well as a large residential area and as many people to occupy it. A University development programme, prepared by the Hebrew University Executive Committee in 1944 and approved by the University Executive Council, proposed an expansion of the campus from the Military Cemetery in the north to the Augusta Victoria Hospice in the south.⁹ The idea was also to build a residential area for four to five hundred families and residences for four to five hundred students next to the University and transform the University campus into a University City. Norman Bentwich wrote that thus the students would be able to enjoy communal life, such as have given the historical universities in English speaking countries their special quality.¹⁰ Yet another reason, perhaps more effective than any other, was brought up in private only – the residential neighbourhood was supposed to connect with other Jewish neighborhoods, thus connecting Mount Scopus to the Jewish settlement in Jerusalem. This goal was a crucial matter of security and national importance.¹¹ The residential area would also include a few public buildings; a high school, a building for the “New Bezalel”¹², and a memorial monument for Ussishkin. The idea of a monument for Ussishkin was quite appropriate because the residential area would have been a realization of his idea of a “New Jerusalem” (see part 1 chapter 3). Bentwich (in the document mentioned above) declared that the new University City would become Jerusalem’s acropolis. In another Hebrew University document¹³ a University City was defined as the French “*Cite Universitaire*”, “a township centred for students and staff, schools, civic and shopping centres and all the other amenities of civilized life. Europe and America took over the idea and large University Cities have sprung up in Paris, Madrid, and elsewhere...and Palestine, too, whose University on Mount Scopus is now over twenty years old, is as ever thinking ahead”. Richard Kauffmann was the right person for the task, for he was an experienced town planner, employed by official Jewish authorities and affiliated to mainstream ideology. When he worked on a plan for different areas in Haifa (1921-1923) he became acquainted with the previous plans designed by Geddes and he felt that his work was a continuation of Geddes’s.¹⁴

Kauffmann’s first assignment for the Hebrew University was, as mentioned before, his cooperation with Weiss to design of the Rosenbloom Building (see part 2 chapter 3). In November 1943 he was nominated to prepare a new master plan for the University.¹⁵ He worked on the plan all through 1944, by December it was ready¹⁶ and in 1946 it had been

authorized.¹⁷ He also wrote a report on the plan, which he presented to the University authorities.¹⁸ Kauffmann justified in the report the new idea of a University City: "The University will no more have to be thought of as a merely self contained body, but will have to be conceived as a much larger unit, comprising within its organism the University proper as its central part and adding to it the various and extended functions and accommodations for every days' life, especially those for dwelling and recreation. We might call it 'University City'". It is obvious that the prospect of combining different functions together into one communal unit appealed to Kauffmann. He provided another justification, more closely connected to universal and contemporary university architecture: "In Europe as well as in the United States the need for creating University cities on a comprehensive scale has been recognized already after the First World War...", he did not specify the universities he had in mind. Just like the Hebrew University architects before him, Kauffmann expressed his enthusiasm for the site and its surroundings: "Scarcely indeed a place could be imagined with a view more unique and beautiful". He mentioned the fact that the site is not only a lookout on the view around it, but is also observed from around it and from most parts of the city. His consciousness of the responsibility such a remarkable site compelled upon him he expressed very articulately: "To plan and to build on this site is indeed a task of first magnitude bearing in itself distinct responsibility and calling for special effort...Building on this site...could only be imagined for a noble and distinguished object...", clearly indicating that the Mount Scopus site was unique, but not specifying whether this was due merely to the natural features or also to the sanctifying and historical attributes that had been attached to the site.

There were two different versions of the master plans Kauffmann prepared, the first is in the form of drawings (plates 61, 62) and the other in a form of a model (plate 63). The model must be the later version, for there is a document which says that by August 1945 the model was not ready and that it would take at least six weeks to prepare it.¹⁹ The first master plan includes the comprehensive University City (plate 61) and a fragment of it, consisting of a detailed plan the University campus only (plate 62). This plan could have been a primary proposal, which included different possibilities proposed in the University Executive committee programme (mentioned above). The model is of the entire University City (plate 63) and is not at all identical to the former one (it is not dated). It is quite probable that because a model requires more resources and preparation, it was the final version of Kauffmann's efforts, and contains alterations requested by different parties. Demands and pressures can explain the differences between the master plan and the

model, possibly mostly by the Town Planning Committee.²⁰ Since the earlier comprehensive master plan is more inclusive, the reduced plan in the model indicates that restrictions and considerations of cautiousness had to be taken into account in the final version. The model presents a less extensive residential area on the north of the campus, fewer buildings in the campus itself, and no expansion on the southern side of the campus. The following would display how both Kauffmann's plans have similarities with the Geddes and the Mendelsohn master plans, as well as presenting a new concept and a new building layout.

The early master plan of the proposed University campus comprises of new buildings as well as all the existing ones, and is divided into three major parts, following the topography of the mountain ridge and the different university faculties. On the whole the west slopes are more developed than other parts of the University campus, but bearing in mind the mild slope, the new proposed buildings would not have blocked the view of, or from, the buildings further up hill (providing they were not to be taller). A ring road on the western slope winds along the mountain curves, quite resembling the road Mendelsohn had proposed and the hill top road remains, again like in the Mendelsohn master plan, yet it is further emphasized as will be explained later.

The northern complex is composed of the Medical Centre, with the buildings built by Mendelsohn and an addition of a number of buildings designed to complete the Mendelsohn building pattern. The proposed new buildings were added around the Hospital and around the Medical Research Institute on the western side of the hill top road, with one long building connecting between them, bridging over the road. The proposed new complex on the west creates closed cloister-like gardens. The northern section and the central complex are divided by a boulevard, which bisects the campus from west to east where it ends across the hill top road with a rounded lookout.

The central section extends out towards the west, with a middle section designed as a large building complex, with a Central Assembly Hall facing Jerusalem that immediately links up with Geddes's Great Hall. As there are no detailed drawings of the proposed Central Assembly Hall there is no evidence of its architectural details, yet it is hardly likely that Kauffmann, the modernist, would have applied orientalist style to his buildings as Geddes did. Hence Kauffmann's Central Assembly Hall becomes the modern equivalent of the Geddes Great Hall first of all due to the concept of a main Hall in the

University and secondly for its central location and the relationships it creates with the other buildings. A major difference between the two buildings, beside the architectural style, is that in the Kauffmann plan the Assembly Hall does not function as a nucleus of the campus and it is located on the mountain slope and not on the peak. Hence Kauffmann's Hall does not imply, as Geddes's does, a symbolic and functional core of the University. On each side the long and narrow Administration buildings create a "frame" for the Central Assembly Hall. The entire triple complex serves also as the official entrance to the University with a grand terraced pathway leading to it from the ring road below. Rather than its position in the master plan, it is the symmetrical and highly stylized layout that renders a sense of grandeur and ceremony to this complex, thus differentiating it from the simple and standardized campus buildings. A boulevard connects the central complex with the hill top road, and to complete the symmetrical composition the Rosenbloom building on the south of the boulevard is balanced by a proposed Biology building on the north side. An arcade connects the Rosenbloom Building with the Library and further south, on the west side of the hill top road new buildings are proposed as an enlargement of the existing Archeology Building and other departments in the Humanities department. On the south-east extension Kauffmann proposed a plan that consisted of new and old buildings for the Sciences, bound together by an eastern ring road.

Kauffmann devoted special attention to lookouts, and it is indicative that he began his report with the mention of Mount Scopus's unique significance as a natural lookout, for his master plan, more than any other before, emphasized this aspect of the mountain by means of the architecture. He wrote: "The mountainous ridge to the east of Jerusalem on which the Hebrew University and "Hadassah" stand is called colloquially Mount Scopus, in Hebrew "Har-Hazofim". This very name, "Mountain of the Watchers", already indicates the predominant character of the site as being one overlooking the whole of its far reaching surroundings".²¹ Kauffmann designed the different lookouts in his plan so that one is actually directed towards them and they form an organic part of the plan. The ring road itself provides a view of the Old City all along its route on the western slope, and serves as a long and winding lookout: "The Ring-Road...is mainly a tourist and a panorama-road with no overland traffic at all. Its alignment should accordingly follow more or less the curved natural configuration of the ground, open up alternating views, thus being picturesque in its character." But at the curve immediately below the Assembly Hall the most astounding view would have opened up to passengers travelling from north to south, therefore Kauffmann planned a lookout there

(can be seen only in the University City master plan and in the model, ill. 61, 63): "The Ring-Road...leads up to the War-Cemetery and to the main entrance square of the University and Hadassah. From there it by passes the University leading round the western promontory of the University Compound, where suddenly the most beautiful view of Jerusalem opens up. At that point a circular shaped side track allows cars coming from Jerusalem to stop in order to give their occupants the possibility to enjoy the view, without hampering the traffic."²² The hill top road functions as in Mendelsohn's plan as an internal road, but along its central section it becomes, like the ring road, a lookout in itself. In the form of an open arcade or a pergola, it transforms into a promenade, which connects between two lookouts, thus accentuating the promenade and providing a long and sheltered lookout onto the magnificent view of the Judean Wilderness. In the report, Kauffmann mentioned the importance of the lookouts in his plan: "Vistas are being kept open, framed by trees or buildings, or a combination of both, at numerous points with a great variance of views. Natural conditions as well as already existing establishments define to a large extent the general trend of the layout".²³

The ring road winds around the western borders of the University buildings, widens half way through into a lookout towards the Old City and connects with the hill top road on both north and south ends of the campus. On the north end the two roads meet at a roundabout and on the south end the ring road transforms into a tunnel dug underneath the hill top road and continues directly up to a dead end at a lookout toward the desert.

Kauffmann introduced a novel arrangement of the interiors in the University buildings; since the proposed University spreads out over a vast area, which would have caused a difficulty for the students to arrive on time for their different classes, he created multi-purpose spaces, which change their function for each session, consequently the students would stay where they are but the lectures and professors would shift. It was probably in order to make this arrangement possible that Kauffmann changed the buildings into regular and modular shapes. With the aid of movable partitions he would have achieved more flexibility of the classroom spaces. Kauffmann's purpose is significant, for it positions the students at the highest level of importance, while in all former master plans the position of each field of knowledge in the campus had been most weighty. He thus introduced a new factor into the various considerations in designing the campus layout – that of the efficiency of students' operation of their tasks. In doing so Kauffmann shifted the focal point of the University from the fields of knowledge to the utility aspect of the institution as a provider of a service.

On the whole Kauffmann's proposed layout in the drawing version seems at first sight to be very similar to the Mendelsohn master plan, especially in details such as the arrangement of the buildings closing on internal courtyards. Yet Mendelsohn's spaces are quite open, while Kauffmann's are more like cloisters, and while Mendelsohn carefully planned the interrelations between the buildings, and the spaces played an important role in his plan, Kauffmann was more interested in symmetrical and representational designs. A more general difference between the plans is the atmosphere of freedom and independence in Mendelsohn's proposed campus, while Kauffmann's was more structured and indicative.

The University City plan encompasses a large residential area on the north of the campus, beyond the British military cemetery. It includes public buildings and recreation areas and connects directly to the campus by a network of roads. On the north-west a large stadium could serve the residents of the neighborhood as well as the University. On the south the University expands and encompasses the existing German Augusta Victoria Hospice (which was evacuated by its original residents and served as a British military hospital during the war) and proposed Art School buildings. Kauffmann's idea was to follow Geddes's Jerusalem town planning which suggested a park along the Kidron valley, and for the University City to grow organically from the park onto the mountain slopes.²⁴

In the model, the general division into sections is similar to that in the earlier master plan, yet most of the buildings are more spread out, opening up the closed courtyards and each building stands separately and independently, not connecting to other buildings. As the buildings in the model are placed diagonally to the hill top road, they connect to the Administration Buildings through the pattern of parallels they create. Hence a formal fusion between the representative section of the official entrance and the other parts of the campus is achieved. The model allows the buildings to be free of connecting ties, both physically and symbolically. While they probably lose the diversity of closed courtyards as well as open vistas, the model opens up more vistas on all directions. The different University departments are thus separated into independent units, devoid of connecting ties with other units, yet connecting into one large whole. In both plans there is special attention to lookouts towards west and east. There are also less buildings than in the former master plan, especially in the residential area, the Medical Centre and the southern area, which is omitted from the plan altogether. While the

German Augusta Victoria Hospice is included in the earlier master plan it is excluded from the model, perhaps because at that time it was known that it would not be handed over to the University.²⁵ Hence it is possible to conclude that the early master plan contained the preliminary ideas and suggestions for the University City, including the proposition to achieve a hold over the Augusta Victoria Hospice building, while the model presented a plan which had better chances to secure the approval of the municipal authorities.

Experienced University administrators were worried lest the construction of the Kauffmann plan would be as protracted as the former one, and eventually might not take form, especially if there would be endless consultations with different people around the world (with only one exception - Abercrombie was actually invited to Palestine to be consulted on the issue).²⁶ As in the case of former master plans, the implementation of Kauffmann's plan depended on fund raising and perhaps in this case even more than before, as the plan was large and ambitious (indeed documents reveal efforts to raise money²⁷). However, while a number of buildings were under construction, the 1948-1949 war interrupted any further progress, as well as all activities in the University campus.

Kauffmann demonstrated his town planning skills in the Hebrew University master plan in the way he displayed the different buildings and especially in the planning of the residential neighborhood, which also reveals a creative mind, especially in some of his transport solutions. But the dichotomy that existed in the planning of Nahalal between ideology and real life existed also in the plan for the University City. As much as he wished theoretically for the Hebrew University campus to connect with the city plan, Kauffmann in fact created a complex that "looks upon" or is being "looked at", but does not intimately link together with the neighboring sections of the city. The many lookouts are tightly held together with the building complex and become part of it, but they cannot substitute for a true and active dialogue with the surroundings. As an affiliation with the land had been a major component of Zionist ideology, Kauffmann as well as other architects could have contributed to that through his¹ architecture. Yet in order to achieve that one would have to closely relate to the land, to create a dialogue with it. What Kauffmann suggested in his plan was very much in accord with Zionist ideology, but instead of a dialogue, which allows a full acknowledgement of the different parties' traits and being²⁸, the Kauffmann University plan offers a rather aggressive penetration into the delicate equilibrium of the Jerusalem vista. Instead of creating a dialogue with the

mountain and its natural and urban surrounding, as the Mendelsohn plan suggested, the Kauffmann plan offers to create a building project almost as alien and domineering as the colonial buildings are. In an urban surrounding where the buildings seem to grow out of the ground by a power of nature and their existence does not depend on the use they provide for humans, Kauffmann created a building complex that is straightforwardly functional and devoid of spirituality. His campus offers its occupants a chance to look out on the sites of the Judean Wilderness and the Old City merely as viewers, but does not suggest a possibility to relate to them more directly. One can observe as a passing visitor or get to know a place more intimately, Mendelsohn offered an opportunity for the latter, while Kauffmann offered the former. And it was Kauffmann who was more in conformity with the Zionist attitude. A proper dialogue therefore was not achieved, and hence the Kauffmann Hebrew University master plan reflects on the general situation and on other cultural expressions of Zionist ideology. As explained in part 1 chapter 1, Zionist ideology (especially since the late 1920s) used its cultural and educational agents to create a new Jewish identity of owning the land rather than living with it, and of relating to it through national and religious symbolism rather than in a direct manner.

Notes:

¹ The most comprehensive study of Kauffmann's work is the unpublished PhD dissertation: Adiv 1985: U. Adiv *Richard Kauffmann (1887-1958): Das architektonische Gesamtwerk*, Technische Hochschule, Berlin. In Herbert & Sosnovsky (1993) there is a chapter dedicated mainly to his work in Haifa; Elhanani (1998) has a short chapter on his work. Kauffmann wrote a few articles: "Planning of Jewish Settlements in Palestine", in *The Town Planning Review*, XII:2, November 1926; "Fundamental Problems of Haifa's Future Development", in *Palestine and Near East Economic Magazine*, III:19, 20.10.1928; "Problems of the Organic Development of Haifa", in *Palestine and Near East Economic Magazine*, IV:4-5, 20.3.1929; "The First Planning of the Haifa-Acre Region (in the years 1925-26) and its Problems Today" in Keinan 1952: A Keinan (ed.), *In the Circle of my Generation*, Jerusalem (Hebrew); "Workers Housing in Palestine", in *Palestine and Middle East Economic Magazine*, 7-8, 1933.

² Sternhell 1998 (1995) claims that the socialist trends were not properly followed by actions and that the socialist leaders and parties were actually interested in nationalist issues.

³ Elhanani 1998: 18.

⁴ *Ibid.*: 19.

⁵ See Dolev 1990: 78-81.

⁶ "Explanatory Memorandum", February 2, 1945. HUA: 2/1945.

⁷ Students have demanded dormitories since the University opened, especially because commuting from Jerusalem to Mount Scopus was difficult and at times of political unrest could become dangerous.

⁸ "תכניות הפיתוח של האוניברסיטה העברית", ("Hebrew University Development Plans") 1945, HUA file 02; Minutes of a meeting between Dr. Senator and Weizmann, December 27, 1944. HUA: 02.

⁹ Senator, "Preliminary Observations", June 10, 1945. HUA: 2/1945.

¹⁰ Bentwich (no date): N. Bentwich *Post War Development Programme; The Hebrew University Jerusalem ; Report to the Friends of the Hebrew University*, Tel Aviv. Although it has no date it is may have been written in 1945 since it was filed with documents of the same date. HUA: 2/1945.

¹¹ Senator, in a private letter to A. Bronfmann, dating November 17, 1952, wrote: "You may remember that in the past I was largely responsible for the idea of a University City stretching from Mount Scopus to the Jewish quarter of Sanhedria. This was not only desirable but a necessity for security reasons. Had this plan been fully realised in time, Israel would not have had to yield Mount Scopus".

¹² The Bezalel School of Art closed down in 1929, and in 1935 it was reopened by the painter Joseph Budko and named the "New Bezalel".

¹³ "Building Palestine's University City", September 20, 1946. HUA: 2/1946.

¹⁴ Herbert and Sosnovsky 1993: 87

¹⁵ Letter from Dr. Senator to Kauffmann, stating that following a resolution of University administrators, Hadassah and JNF representatives in November 11, 1943, Kauffmann was offered the position of town planner for the University City. CZA: 105.

¹⁶ Minutes of meeting in Jerusalem Town Planning Office, with Kauffmann and a representative of the Hebrew University to discuss Kauffmann's Hebrew University master plan, December 21, 1944. HUA: 02.

¹⁷ Letter from Senator to Shaw, March 8, 1946, and letter from Kauffmann to Senator, June 6, 1946. CZA: 105.

¹⁸ The report was enclosed to the letter to Senator of June 6, 1946. *Ibid.* It was titled: "Hebrew University – Hadassah Detailed Town Planning Scheme, Jerusalem. Report by Richard Kauffmann, M.T.P.I."

¹⁹ Letter from Senator to Spiegel, August 29, 1945, HUA:2/1945.

²⁰ See correspondences and memorandums in HUA: 2.

²¹ Kauffmann's Report (see note 18): 1.

²² *Ibid.*: 4.

²³ *Ibid.*: 3.

²⁴ *Ibid.*: 2, 3.

²⁵ A document enclosed to a letter written by Senator in January 15, 1948, to the British Head of the Colonial Office, includes a request to annex the Augusta Victoria Hospice building to the University. CZA:105.

²⁶ Senator, in "Notes on pending matters", June 24, 1945, HUA: 2/1945.

²⁷ Letters and documents in HUA: 2/1945.

²⁸ This interpretation of dialogue is based on the philosophy of Martin Buber, see Buber 1923 (1937): M. Buber, *Ich und Du (I and Thou)*, Edinburgh. See also part 2, chapter 3 of this dissertation.

PART III

THE SECOND CAMPUS (1954-1958) – GIV'AT RAM.

Richard Kauffmann, Joseph Klarwein and Heinz Rau.

Unlike the first Hebrew University campus on Mount Scopus, where none of its master plans had been fully implemented, and its few buildings are scattered within the present campus, the Giv'at Ram campus (plates 5, 6) has maintained its physical form although today it serves the University only partially. The former university buildings now house laboratories, the National Library and different institutes. It seems rather deserted compared to the days between 1958 and 1974, when it housed the entire Hebrew University, however, architecturally it has not been altered. On entering the campus through the main entrance on the north side, which is separated from the road by a spacious parking area and roofed bus stops, one stands on a paved plane leading to a park that stretches all the way up to the Library building. While the campus was in use as a university (until the 1970s), it was most common to find students gathering on the lawn, deep in discussion (a local folklore evolved around the central role of the lawn, and it was humorously defined as another university institute – the “Lawn Studies”). A human-size statue of a seated female figure by Henry Moore is situated on the edge of the lawn toward the entrance. Winding paved paths lead along the lawn to different parts of the campus. On the right of the main entrance the Administration building stands perpendicularly so as not to impose its massive front on the newcomer. Along the right side (west) of the park an open, roofed colonnade connects the different Humanities departments, whose facades alone are visible, each decorated with a ceramic wall designed by different artist. Although each building has been designed by a different architect they all follow a uniform functional principle of an elongated form, with a lounge on the ground floor and long corridors opening to classrooms, offices and libraries on the upper floors. The sections below ground level are mostly reserved for auditoriums. On the left side of the park (east) the buildings are not visible; only when one walks down the slope the long, simple laboratory buildings appear along the terraces. At the end of

slope, the large sports centre does not interfere with the view, and yet its dynamic form is impressive. Beyond the Library, walking along the paved path toward the south the Science buildings are spread out between the pine trees, each individually designed, only their stone coating provides a somewhat unified appearance. A ring-road circles around the campus to provide access for vehicles, as the campus itself is restricted for pedestrians only. Altogether the layout of the building and the blend with the park, the gardens and the natural flora, render a serenity and calm as well as a combination of clear and easy orientation with a sense of veneration, quite appropriate to a purpose designed university campus,

The Giv'at Ram Hebrew University campus was built within the boundaries of the sovereign state, and its architectural aspect was free from political considerations. However, social transformations effected the planning. In 1949/50, when the Mount Scopus campus had been evacuated, the student body of the Hebrew University amounted to about 1400, many of which were recent immigrants (*Olim*, as they are called in Hebrew¹) from different parts of the world. The University had to provide appropriate dwelling and facilities for research and study.² Until the new campus was ready, different rented buildings and flats spread out in various parts of west (Israeli) Jerusalem served as temporary University dwelling.³ Paradoxically, together with a growing demand for an efficient campus and the Government's declarations in favour of the Hebrew University, it was a matter of national betrayal to aspire for a campus other than on the Mount Scopus location (see part 1 chapter 2).

On June 2, 1954, the Hebrew University site on Giv'at Ram was dedicated. Four years later, on April 27, 1958 the new campus was formally opened, although only partially completed. New circumstances and especially the new context of a state add a number of considerations to the investigation of the planning of the Hebrew University campus. While essential issues, such as the concept of the Hebrew University within the established state and the choice of location, have been discussed in former chapters, others remain to be investigated. For instance the impact of the enormous social and political changes after the Zionist goals had been fulfilled, the problem of state-university relations, the manner of choosing the architects and its reflection on social and cultural progress and on the prospects of making an impression on national identity and culture.

Three architects participated in the task of designing the master plan, Richard Kauffmann, Joseph Klarwein and Heinz Rau. All three were modernists, educated in Germany, and became prominent architects in Palestine/Israel. Although an architects' competition had been discussed, University authorities decided to renounce the suggestion and rather have University administrators nominate the architects. As in the case of the former plans, an understanding of the procedure of appointing the architects is imperative to comprehend the connections between the planning of the University and contemporary social and cultural trends. After all the Giv'at Ram campus had been erected within a context of state authorized regulations, therefore abstaining from proper procedure of assigning architects for public undertaking must be indicative. Considering the dynamics of Israeli society and culture, it would be reasonable to conclude that appointing the architects was an act of preserving power and control in the hands of a select group, that would sustain the hegemony of the traditional Zionist collective identity. In a meeting on May 14, 1953 Professor Senator, on behalf of the University Executive Committee explained the decision to nominate Kauffmann, Rau and Klarwein;⁴ he said that the most prominent architects do not participate in competitions, hence if the University would have insisted on one, it would have lost the chance to benefit from the work of those architects.

The decision had been the concluding stage of a few years' debates. Rau, in his capacity as member of the Government Planning Department, was consulted on University matters and site consideration already in 1949 (as mentioned before in part 1, chapter 3). The choice of Richard Kaufmann would have been quite obvious, as he was the last Hebrew University planner for the Mount Scopus campus. As early as 1950 Professor Senator, then the University's vice president, was of the opinion that Kauffmann "is a good town-planner, a good architect, knowing a good deal about the University's requirements, and with experience on Mount Scopus...Mr. Kauffmann is understandably a bit touchy on the subject of the architectural planning of the University...I am inclined to believe that as a first step we should get...an *Ideenskizzen* from 3-5 people including Mr. Kauffmann...It has been suggested that we get a town-planner from abroad to advise us. Abercrombie and Harrison might come into consideration...I am on the whole in favour of a limited competition".⁵⁶ Again University officials did not show much concern for an architectural concept or style, and the considerations for the choice of architect seemed to be arbitrary. However, Senator

progressed quickly with his efforts to advance the actual construction of the University, for shortly afterwards (in November 1950) he met with Kauffmann and their discussion narrowed the possibilities. Kauffmann then showed good will and a desire for a helpful cooperation even if a competition would take place for the general planning. Yet he favoured Senator's suggestion that the planning would be handed over to a small group of architects who would work together with him as Kauffmann was in his 60s (which evidently was considered quite old in those days), it was suggested that younger architects should be selected.⁷ But apparently no action was taken afterwards, as Kauffmann's disappointed letter of February 1951 proves. He must have been aware, though, of the convoluted political causes for the delay (which have been discussed in detail in part 1 chapters 2 and 3). However, as the Hebrew University must have been the most prestigious and desired project at a time when projects of that scale were rare, naturally Kauffmann had been interested in securing it for himself. As negotiations concerning a new campus had been discreet, only those within a certain social circle would have had access to information and solicitation. Kauffmann obviously had been among them, and he wrote to the University authorities, that as he was the most recent University planner, it was only right that he should take on from where he had been interrupted.⁸ Eventually, as already mentioned, Kauffmann was appointed, together with the architects Heinz Rau and Joseph Klarwein. No explanation can be found for the choice of Rau and Klarwein (whose reputation as architects had not been doubted); it may well be that it was Kauffmann who chose to work with them. Thus an opportunity for a breakthrough in mainstream architectural style had been rejected as well as a fair chance for young and unknown architects, who were not affiliated to the dominant circle, to come forward and make their imprint.

The different aspects of the new site profoundly affected the planning of the new Hebrew University campus. A number of governmental offices had already been built on another part of Giv'at Ram at the time the Hebrew University was being constructed (buildings for different institutions were built later on Giv'at Ram – the Knesset, the national convention hall, the Bank of Israel, the Supreme Court and the Israel Museum). No historic or religious symbolism has been attached to the site, nor were there monuments or buildings that could imply points of reference of any sort. The topography

of the University site offers a long and narrow north-south stretch of the ridge and moderate slopes on three sides – west, south and east. The land is rocky terrain typical to the mountains of the Jerusalem region. It was approved as the Hebrew University site only in June 2, 1954, so whatever planning took place beforehand must have been part of the University officials' strategy in their struggle against Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister, to promote their preferred location (see part 1 chapter 3). The earliest draft of the master plan was submitted in December 1952 to a committee of the Board of Governors (this early plan has not been found) and apparently was the basis for the next plan.⁹ The general aims of the plan were "to build a modern University with a sufficiently large campus, with buildings set in beautifully arranged gardens and with all those amenities which are necessary for promoting students' life on the campus."¹⁰ Quite a changed attitude compared to the planning situation in the Mount Scopus campus; rather than nationalistic symbolism it is focused on ordinary university functions.

The next plan was submitted in 1953 (plate 64), and another extended plan, of 1958 (plate 65), shows a few changes in the original plan and includes new proposed buildings beside the buildings that had been completed and those that were under construction. The initial formal concept, of a campus that would stretch along the mountain ridge from north to south, has already been established in the early plan (1953) and in the buildings that had already been constructed. The 1953 plan shows that the main entrance to the University is at the far end on the north, and University faculty buildings are placed along the moderate western slope, leaving a large section at the centre of the ridge, free of buildings, for a park. The buildings stretch between the Administration Building in the north, next to the main entrance, and the National Library on the south of the park, and as they descend down the sloping terraces they gain floors. Behind the Library toward the south the architects located buildings dedicated to the University's extra curricular cultural activities; a museum, a restaurant, students' dormitories and a club. The park extends down over the terraces of the eastern slopes, toward the stadium. All traffic is directed to a ring-road that encircles the University, thus allowing the campus itself to benefit from a quiet, motor-free surrounding. This early plan also shows the position of the campus in the larger context of the "nation's compound" at Giv'at Ram. Apart from the Civic Centre, all other planned buildings and more, were eventually erected.

In the late plan (1958) the basic layout of the first master plan is maintained, and except for the shifting of certain faculty buildings from the western slope to the eastern terraces, formerly meant to be part of the park, other differences are quite minor. Unlike the buildings on the west side of the park, which are positioned perpendicularly to the axis of the plan, the buildings on the east are placed along the natural terraces, parallel to the axis, and thus accentuate it. The National and University Library is much larger than in the early plan and on the far south end of the campus the dormitories are pushed further south beyond the ring road, and a synagogue (1957, designed by H. Rau and D. Reznick) was added¹¹, standing on its own in the space which formerly was designed for the dormitories. The addition of a synagogue has been a novelty, for all former Hebrew University plans did not include one.

Aerial views of the completed Giv'at Ram campus dated 1984 (plates 5, 6) show that eventually more buildings were added to the original master plan, but on the whole they all fit in with the general lines of the first concept of the layout. The south west aerial view shows that the expansion spread out mainly toward the western slope and the southern part between the Library and the synagogue, following requirements for additional schools and departments and more space for the existing ones. It also shows the almost uniform design of each faculty building along the line of perpendicular buildings, which are all two floors high on the side facing the park (the facades), and all have additional sections on the western side as they slope down the terraces. The architects chose to allow the buildings to follow the natural slope instead of changing the topography. Yet in a certain contrast to this concept of interrelating with nature, the rigid cubical shapes of the buildings and their functional and economic designs are extremely industrial and synthetic. In 1958, in a *Handasah ve'adrichalut* (Engineering and Architecture Magazine) special issue dedicated to the new Giv'at Ram Campus, engineer Y. Ben-Sira wrote: "The Jerusalem landscape, striving upwards, is of such a unity and uniqueness that it demands of man to follow or integrate or else violently revolt against it. It looks somewhat offended by the succession of geometrical blocks, well behaved it is true, but of an order of their own, rigid, repetitive, and simplified, suggesting a certain barrenness, as if the imagination of their authors had failed to be fertilised by the majestic landscape of Jerusalem".¹² Ben-Sira's perception of the mountains around Jerusalem as imbued in religiosity, is a reminder of the attitude toward Mount Scopus, and quite alien to contemporary

matter-of-fact approach to Giv'at Ram. This contrast embodies a larger contradiction between the perception of the Hebrew University as a sanctified nationalistic symbol and that of an ordinary academic institution. Ben-Sira represented a predominant nationalistic perception that could not leave historic, religious and political purport behind at the sight of the Jerusalem mountains. In contrast, Hebrew University officials and architects explicitly aimed at a secular institution exemplified by a plan that would respond merely to the University's needs and to the given natural features of the land.

In the aerial view from south east (plate 6) additional buildings for the Student Centre and Sports Centre appear on the lower part of the slope, north to the stadium, as well as laboratories which blend with the hill terraces, of which Ben-Sira wrote that " ...as you look on the laboratories, you have an impression of walking, in all humility, the mountain paths of Jerusalem, as if special care had been taken to emphasize the proper relation between man-made objects and the natural wonders of the Eternal-City".¹³ Indeed, the planners of the Giv'at Ram campus definitely respected the natural topography, and successfully planned the laboratories to blend into it and accentuate it. One wonders what Ben-Sira would have commented at the sight of buildings on terrain devoid of connotations such as the "Eternal-City" evoked in him. Together with the acceptance that Mount Scopus and the Old City are not accessible any longer, the architects of the Giv'at Ram campus could not affiliate with the term the "Eternal-City", with the religious, symbolic and political implications of such a definition of Jerusalem.

In order to discuss the stylistic aspects of the Giv'at Ram campus and its implications, one should go back to the year 1953, when the planning of the Giv'at Ram campus had commenced. Rau had gone on a tour of Europe, and according to documentation included university campuses in the sites he visited,¹⁴ yet no reports of the tour have been found, therefore it is not possible to provide a direct reference to the planning of the Hebrew University. Yet the fact that he went to tour Europe indicates that the three architects and University officials took it for granted that the architectural realization of the idea of the University should seek for inspiration in the west. At a time of unprecedented immigration to Israel from North Africa, Yemen and India, as well as Europe, there was no attempt to seek a style that would create a bonding power between east and west. It is clear that the desire to create a new Israeli style was generally subordinated to European dominance and the Hebrew University campus in

Giv'at Ram in particular attests to this conclusion. An affiliation with the erection of new universities in Britain in the 1950s and 1960s seems appropriate. Although England had a long tradition concerning universities, the demand for new universities for a larger public emerged after the Second World War. Those universities, like the Hebrew University, were purpose designed, and made use of modern architectural methods and style. Similarly to the Giv'at Ram campus the universities of Warwick, Essex, Sussex and others, were only indirectly connected to religious, political, or social aspects of the public they serve. They attempted to create a self-contained academic community avoiding references to foreign symbolism.

However, as a European oriented compound the architectural achievement was definitely an outstanding one, and its value is still appreciated forty years after its completion. Indeed the Hebrew University achieved a number of architectural triumphs; at last a complete campus, following a comprehensive and consistent architectural concept had been erected. The regular faculty buildings, in spite of the criticism of their exterior shapes, express a sense of equality granted to the different fields of knowledge, including Jewish Studies. Outstanding in scale and position in the layout are the Administration and the Library. The Administration building (1957), designed by Dov Karmi, is shaped as a functional and ordinary modern office building, one that could serve an administration of any sort in different parts of the world. It is made up of modular units that break up the facade of the tall building into small, human scale squares. The Library (1961) was designed by a group of architects (A. Yasky, A. Alexandroni, Z. Armoni, C. Habaron, M and S. Nadler S. Pozner) as a large elongated cube, imposing over the entire compound both for its scale and its location, for while the different faculty buildings disappear down the slope, the Library is conspicuous and can be observed from most parts of the campus. The significance is clear enough – the National and University Library is the beating heart of the campus, and creates a juxtaposing pole to the administration. The idea is that between them the University resides and functions. Geddes would not have approved of as dominant a position for administration in a university. However, this meaningful layout is not exhibited in an extrovert manner; for an overall sense of order and serenity envelops the entire complex, a characteristic which contributes to the profound difference between the Giv'at Ram and

the Mount Scopus sites. While Mount Scopus requires looking out and looking at, Giv'at Ram allows a concentration on the place itself, all attention is pointed toward the centre, which is the park and the spacious lawn. Not only the lawn made place for meeting fellow students and faculty members, the entire campus offered many such opportunities, either in the interiors of the faculty buildings with their spacious lounges and patios or in the open arcade that connected the buildings and provided shelter from rain and sun.

As so many times before, a paradox is disclosed also in relation to the extreme contrast between the beautiful and pleasing campus and housing projects which during those early years of the newly established State had been almost exclusively dedicated to immigrants and holocaust survivors. The poor quality of those massive hasty and cheap housing projects has been commonly ascribed to the devastating economic situation. In fact, Jewish donors from all over the world donated generously for the construction of public buildings in the new state, hence there were ample resources, but they had been directed to monumental buildings rather than to decent housing.¹⁵ The Giv'at Ram campus stood out, then, for its scale and costliness. Both its exclusive purpose and the luxurious spaciousness and building materials had been alien to prevailing atmosphere of collective participation in national efforts and of being content with little. Thus, by means of its architectural form, the University preserved its elitist image and its ambivalent connection to local population.

Notes:

¹ Jewish immigrants to Israel become automatically Israeli citizens, by a law passed by the new Knesset, called חוק השבות, (The Right to Return). The word Olim is reserved for Jewish immigrants only, and means "those who ascended, who make Alia".

² The University's demand for state support was based mainly on the argument that since the University lost its dwelling as result of the war and its consequences, the University had a legitimate right to be compensated by the state for the loss. This is stated clearly in a letter from Dr. D.W. Senator (Executive Vice President of the University) to Dr. Salaman in England: "The University has lost its home on Mt. Scopus in and by the War of Independence and it is necessary

that the State should compensate the University for the loss", April 29, 1952, The Hebrew University Archive, File no. 100, 1952.

³ Altogether the University was spread over 46 different locations. It is interesting that the largest dwellings were rented from the Church: the main building was the Terra Sancta building, built between 1924 - 1927 by the Catholic Church as a youth centre. Later the Franciscans rented it for their college, and after the war it was deserted until the Hebrew University rented it. The statue of the Madonna on the roof above the main entrance remained, and it is still there to this day. A few rooms were rented from another convent in the centre of Jerusalem, the Ratisbonne.

⁴ Section 5 of *Protokols of the Executive Committee*, no. 7, May 14, 1953. HUA.

⁵ Minutes of a meeting of the Hebrew University Permanent Committee, signed by Senator (University vice-president), November 13, 1950. HUA, file 010/1950.

⁶ Memo of a discussion between Senator and Rau, December 19, 1949. HUA, file 256/1949.

⁷ "Conversation with Mr. Richard Kauffmann", signed by Senator, November 14, 1950. HUA, file 02/1950.

⁸ Letter from Kauffmann to the University management, February 26, 1951. HUA, file 256/1951.

⁹ Senator, "תכנית השיקום והפיתוח של האוניברסיטה העברית", ("Program of Reconstruction and Development of the Hebrew University"), April 26, 1953. HUA, file 010.

¹⁰ Senator, "תזכיר: תכנית השיקום והפיתוח של האוניברסיטה העברית, מצורף ל"תכנית השיקום והפיתוח של האוניברסיטה העברית", enclosed to "Program of Reconstruction and Development of the Hebrew University", *ibid*.

¹¹ The synagogue was designed to serve reformed worshippers.

¹² Ben-Sira 1958: 131. Ben-Sira restricted his criticism of the block-like buildings to the exterior only, and as to the interior he wrote that "one feels on entering one of the buildings dedicated to teaching or research, a fulfillment and adequacy rare indeed".

¹³ Ben-Sira 1958: 131.

¹⁴ Letter from Hoffmann to the Immigration and Citizenship Service, October 13, 1953, file 010/1953, HUA.

¹⁵ See Elhanani 1998: 69 and note 1. Elhanani partially condemns the donors who demanded that their money would go to a select project for their own personal prestige. Indeed in almost every room in the Giv'at Ram campus a plaque bearing names of donors has been put up, an endless source of witticisms among students and perhaps staff too.

PART IV
THE THIRD CAMPUS (1967-1974):
THE RETURN TO MOUNT SCOPUS;
David Reznick, Shmuel Shaked and Associates¹

*...the site...was one of superb natural beauty, providing a magnificent background for the artist's work and inspiring ever fresh ideas of design and composition. It was difficult because beauty imposes a specially heavy responsibility on the artist. It must be guided by careful thought and painstaking devotion. Nothing must be done to disrupt its magic, yet no effort must be spared to reveal its hidden glories. For beauty belongs to the world, and man must walk warily ere he decide to tamper with it.

Anonymous²

An official publication of the Hebrew University presenting the first stages of the master plan promised "...a campus combining both grace and functionalism...".³ Unfortunately the materialization of the plan achieved neither. The second Mount Scopus campus (plate 7, 8) is visible from east Jerusalem and the mountains surrounding it. It is a large scale compact complex, held together by a wall and by the impenetrable effect of the tightly held together buildings. The exterior does not give away the identity of the complex or the different functions of the buildings. The watchers' tower in the centre, could manifest the site's original significance, but as it is not accessible (it is occupied by military security services) it has lost its potential. The campus is approached through different gates; a few for pedestrians, on the far north and south ends, one for public transportation through a tunnel and a few for cars through a ring-road and car parks situated behind the walls. Pedestrians and motor passengers "penetrate" the building complex through the all-campus pedestrian street, which connects most University departments. The pedestrian street is mostly closed to the outside, yet in certain sections large windows open to the internal closed garden. Along the pedestrian street the required destination is identified by colour of the walls and written signs. A set of disorientating very narrow labyrinth-like corridors and stairs lead to the classrooms, studies and offices.⁴ Occasionally spaces open up along the pedestrian street (plate 68)

with grand staircases and monumental pillars, that would indicate a place of special significance, only they lead to more offices or classrooms. The pedestrian streets of the Social Sciences, the Humanities and the Education complexes meet at a junction of assembled central functions – the Administration, the Library and the Forum. The latter is a large hall, designed for students' extra-curricular activities, but its differing levels and breaking up of the space do not invite much voluntary or spontaneous activity. The old buildings are scattered in the campus; a few are untouched, some are slightly altered or enlarged, and others are completely transformed. Perhaps the most surprising peculiarity of the campus is that there are very few places in the campus that allow a view of the Old City or of the Judaeian Wilderness. The only unit that purposely opens up to the view of the Temple Mount is the synagogue (designed for orthodox worshipers), situated at the bend of the Humanities Building.

Reznick, the chief planner of the Mount Scopus campus participated in the planning of the Mormon University (1987) on the western slopes of Mount Scopus, a little further south to the Hebrew University campus (plate 69). As an associate of Frank Ferguson, an architect from the United States, he collaborated in the planning of the small institute that is completely orientated toward the Old City, not only due to its position on the hill terraces, but also for the enormous glass walls that direct toward a viewing of the Temple Mount and the panorama of east Jerusalem. Considering the major differences of the two institutions⁵, Ferguson and Reznick offered in the Mormon University a blunt anti-thesis to the concept of Hebrew University campus.

Striking similarities exist between the Mount Scopus campus and a number of universities designed in the 1960s mainly in England in the United States and in Canada. Although there is no evidence that Reznick had visited them, the similarities cannot be accidental. Southeastern Massachusetts University (Paul Rudolph, late 1960s) for instance, is a large scale, pre-planned complex that follows a unified architectural idea.⁶ All characteristics of a megastructure are inherent in the Mount Scopus campus, as well as the Southeastern Massachusetts University, and many other universities of that period. The megastructure type of planning for a university was not invented for the Mount Scopus campus; it was a 1960s trend that advocated powerful over-all campus forms.⁷ As Reyner Banham (1976) explained not all large buildings are megastructures.⁸

In what way is the Hebrew University campus a megastructure, and what does this classification reveal about its architecture? A megastructure, Banham wrote, is “modular, large, extensible, and has a more permanent structure (and service infrastructure) carrying less permanent subsidiary structures.”⁹ In the 1960s megastructures were popular, especially where central governments were concerned, Banham said, but added that to a great extent this architectural development came from within the profession, a testimony to architects’ arrogance.¹⁰ University campuses lend themselves to this type of planning, due to their comprehensiveness. Most of the 1960s universities in England were built as variations of the idea of a megastructure, and the Universities of Warwick, and East Anglia were designed to evolve around a central pedestrian street.¹¹ A most striking resemblance exists between the Hebrew University and Scarborough College in Toronto (John Andrews, with Page and Steel, 1964-5; plates 70, 71), which is a “brutalist”, industrial-looking complex, connected by an indoors pedestrian street. That an internal pedestrian street does not necessarily have to be as desolate as those in Scarborough and in Mount Scopus is demonstrated in the University of Alberta, Edmonton (A. J. Diamond and Barton Myers, 1974), where it looks more like a regular street, or a shopping mall, thus gaining liveliness and an opportunity for socializing.

How did the idea of a megastructure penetrate in to the planning procedures of the new campus? Proceedings towards the planning and construction are covered with a thick sheath of secrecy. Apart from the Mount Scopus Rehabilitation Committee meetings, Hebrew University officials too dealt with the new situation of the Mount Scopus campus. Documentation shows that from June 21 (ten days only after the war ended) onwards, A. Skotnitsky of the University Household and Development department held a correspondence with other senior University administrators, discussing the condition of the Mount Scopus buildings.¹² In a document dated June 30 he wrote that he came to the conclusion that in order to restore the Mount Scopus campus, a master plan should be designed.¹³ He did not specify whether the plan should offer an entire substitute for the Giv’at Ram campus, or only a number of extension departments.

The Mount Scopus Committee distributed a report to be considered by the members towards the July 25 meeting.¹⁴ Its conclusions were that to divide the University

between two campuses would cause too many difficulties, especially because of the distance between the two sites and the complicated commuting conditions. Taking the poor condition of the old Mount Scopus buildings into consideration, the report offered the possibility of restoring the existing buildings and moving the Faculty of Law back to Mount Scopus, since it could exist as an independent unit. It was also suggested that University authorities should discuss what other departments could also function on their own and move to Mount Scopus. There was also a mention of a possibility to add land and buildings to the Mount Scopus campus if required.¹⁵ At the July 25 meeting the Committee decided that the Mount Scopus campus must become active again for teaching and research;¹⁶ members specified the concrete actions towards the rehabilitation - to make academic plans, build a housing project "which will determine our feasible presence", and raise money for restoration. The conclusion at the meeting was that since the area of the University on Mount Scopus is not very large, it would be best to concentrate on a few independent units. Professor Amiran (a member of the Committee) pointed out that two campuses would be too expensive, therefore the committee decided to form a smaller sub-committee which would investigate the problems and come up with suggestions in a couple of weeks.¹⁷

There are no further documents until January 1968, when it seems that the Mount Scopus problem was handled more definitely. Therefore it is hard to trace the process which brought about the actions which were to follow. Yet a couple of events stand out in the vagueness of the proceedings described above, the appointment of two persons who became central in the forthcoming erecting of the new Mount Scopus campus, the architect David Reznick and University Director General Yoseph Harpaz. No documentation has been found to indicate when and why the architect David Reznick became involved with the planning of the renewed Mount Scopus campus. Reznick himself said in an interview that immediately as the war was over he was asked by Government officials to draw a map of the boundaries of the old Hebrew University Campus on Mount Scopus.¹⁸ Reznick drew the boundaries as he was required, but also made a preliminary sketch of a future university campus complex.¹⁹ Within one month he had the sketch and the boundaries map ready. All this took place in secrecy so as not to

create antagonism and controversy. When construction works began on Mount Scopus it was a *fait accompli*.

Reznick's former experience in university architecture was in the Giv'at Ram campus, where he worked in collaboration with Heinz Rau on a couple of buildings, but he was not involved in designing the master plan. Two major factors had an impact on the megalomaniac dimensions and imposing appearance of the new campus. One was the political interest in a presentation of dominance, and the other - the dominance of the Director General of the University in matters of the academic institution. The issue of the Mount Scopus site as providing a testimony of dominance was actually a continuation of the situation before 1948 (the theory did not stand the test of the Jordanian rule between 1949 and 1967, because all that time Mount Scopus was an Israeli enclave) with added nationalistic conviction because of political, social and cultural developments. The personal issue of a Director General was new as well as unprecedented. Never before was the Hebrew University managed by a Director General or any other member of the administration. The question of the Director General's responsibility for the concept and planning of the new campus would not have been mentioned here unless it was an integral part of a significant trend.

Shortly before the 1967 war, in order to overcome complaints of administrative inefficiency, the Board of Governors resolved to appoint a director general. Yoseph Harpaz, who had acquired his administrative skills as a formerly high ranking officer in the army, was appointed Director General of the Hebrew University immediately after the war, in August 1967.²⁰ Hence the University administration was subordinated to one powerful person. Altogether this move raises questions as to the concept of the University as an institute for the advancement of research and education or an efficient administrative unit. The University's decision suggests that there were those among influential forces in the University that favoured a powerful administrative supervisor, although there was a danger the appointment might destroy the essential balance between administration and faculty.

Harpaz became at once a dominant figure in the University and among other things he also took over the Mount Scopus development planning. It is claimed that it was he who pushed towards building a large-scale campus on Mount Scopus, which

would eventually replace the Giv'at Ram campus.²¹ Harpaz also initiated the establishment of an administrative supervising body that would serve under him and would be in charge of the development of the new campus. Administrative aspects of the University may have improved, but what is more significant is that faculty members were powerless *vis a vis* Harpaz's interference in academic matters.²² This rather lengthy description of power struggles within the University at a time of drastic changes is justifiable, because it shows how important aspects of responsibility (or rather lack of responsibility) toward values such as freedom and independence which are essential for democratic life have been abandoned in the University. Those link together with the more general trends that developed in Israeli society after 1967 as would be explained more elaborately later.

Reznick's preliminary plan and Harpaz's intentions for the future campus were kept secret (until March 1968), even though the Mount Scopus Programme Committee was set up in January 1968, with the participation of all the heads of University departments. According to Harpaz's definition of the Committee's assignment it was supposed to prepare a programme that would serve as a basis for the new master plan.²³ Yet the Standing Committee defined it as an attempt to prepare a preliminary plan for moving units from Giv'at Ram to Mount Scopus.²⁴ No evidence has been found in relevant documents of any discussion of this contradiction. Perhaps the vagueness of the purposes was politically advantageous at the time, since the future of the occupied territories was uncertain, although there was a consensus in Israel that Jerusalem must never be divided again. On February 5, 1968, the Programme Committee presented a report which included a statement of the University's intention to "ascend" (*la'alot*) to Mount Scopus, to populate the Mount Scopus campus, and of the need for a second campus on Mount Scopus.²⁵ Among other things, the report stated that "even if the University's requirement for more space was not urgent, the national needs, and the symbolic significance of the return of the Hebrew University to its original home are sufficient to necessitate the repossession of the Mount Scopus site". As for the Committee's suggestions for the new plan, it does not go much further than the restoration of the existing buildings with the exception of a recommendation for a housing project. But on the other hand the Committee also suggested that most faculties move from Giv'at Ram to Mount Scopus.

No accessible documents have been found which further follow the proceedings until the actual decision to build a new campus on the Mount Scopus site was made publicly known.²⁶ It is therefore not certain that such a decision was ever taken. In which case it may be that interested parties simply had the power to create facts which suited their purposes. Another possibility is that the relevant discussions were secret and are hidden in the secret files which exist in the Hebrew University.²⁷ That secrecy should be kept after so many years on matters of a University location or its academic content is bewildering if not worrying, for it indicates the kind of control that could ruin the foundation of the University's *raison d'être*.

The plan to rehabilitate the Mount Scopus campus was first publicized only at the Hebrew University Board of Governors meeting on Mount Scopus on March 27, 1968.²⁸ Since it bore far-reaching political consequences, it is certain it was approved by the Israeli Government, and actually the University and the Government must have operated jointly. Later documents show that Government officials, including the prime-minister Levi Eshkol, participated in discussions on the issue, and not only did they permit the rehabilitation of Mount Scopus, but also the plan for an enlarged campus and the use of state funding for that purpose.²⁹ As secrecy often does, it served the interest of those parties in the University who wished to avoid opposition to their actions; in this case those who wanted to advance the idea of a grand scale building project for the new campus on Mount Scopus.

Again there was no architects' competition for the new Mount Scopus master plan. For lack of documentary evidence, the hasty manner in which the planning was offered to Reznick can only be ascribed to the urgent need to manifest dominance over Mount Scopus and east Jerusalem and to Reznick's contacts with official authorities. Reznick's description of the process that led to his nomination as the University planner does not really clarify the decision.³⁰ However, he prepared a preliminary sketch (which could be found neither in the Hebrew University archive nor in Reznick's office) that developed later, with the assistance first of architect and town planner Shmuel Shaked and later also Ram Karmi and Chaim Katseff, into the Mount Scopus campus master plan. The only documents that could shed light on the first steps of the planning were two Hebrew University publications holding plans of the future campus.³¹ Neither state a

date of publication and the plans do not include dates either, but the architects themselves offered a chronology of the plans for this thesis. The extent of resemblance to the final version of the master plan also serves as a basis for sorting out the order of the plans.

In the first version of the master plan (plate 66) the buildings were linked together in the centre of the campus to create a massive complex which covered the whole mountaintop. The old buildings (the Centre for Legal Studies - former Law Department and National Library, southern part of Archaeology and three buildings of the Faculty of Science) stood out as independent buildings in a narrow internal open space bordered by the new buildings. From this central mass, other buildings spread out down the western slopes and along the south-eastern ridge. The central bulk contained the libraries, the Social Sciences, a faculty of Science, and the Centre for Legal Studies. The buildings over the slope on the western terraces were of the Humanities and the adjacent School of Education. At the north end of the plan the Student Centre was located with a central auditorium placed inside the complex, and at the south-east end the Archaeology building, the Buber Centre, various Science buildings and other buildings which were not yet defined. The students' residential area was spread out on the northern side of the campus, opposite the Hadassah Hospital and the British military cemetery. There are three different types of resident buildings; Reznick designed the smaller modular units of apartment buildings arranged around patios, and Karmi and Katseff designed the two larger scaled complexes toward the west. One complex was organized around triangular patios mounting over a road, and further west on the other side of another road leading to the University, a dormitory complex was designed as long, connecting series of units arranged in a form that resembles long arms evolving from a central and more spacious building. At either end there is again a larger set of connecting units.³² The plan suggested that the University would be approached by motor through the old hill top road, while buildings would be built over it to prevent a dissection of the campus. In addition to the hill top road the plan suggests a ring road which encircles the campus, and connects to a new set of roads connecting Mount Scopus to the students' dormitories, to future residential areas and to other parts of town.

In the text accompanying the plans the architects' wrote that the site is "An important element symbolically, expressing the integration of the past and future, is the visual

connection between the university and the old city. However, functional considerations, too, determined the choice of the western part of Mount Scopus as the main focus for development ...".³³ They did not explain what they meant by "the visual connection", it may have meant what Reznick later said about intending the silhouette of the University complex to "echo the walls of the Old City".³⁴ The architects did not explain why this parallel was significant to their work and in what way they meant the architecture of the University to relate to it. The text also explains that the architects took topographic and climatic limitations into consideration (Mount Scopus becomes very windy in winter), which account for the compactness of the planned campus. It was also emphasized that it was the planners' intention to enable pedestrian access to all parts of the campus. The libraries of all faculties were grouped together in the centre of the campus to create a formal as well as functional and symbolical focal point. The architects themselves explained in the text that "The four main faculties, Humanities, Social Sciences, Education and Law, will extend from both ends of the Library and from both sides of the main road with the lecture halls concentrated on the lower levels, beneath the Library. This solution enables the creation of teaching units according to subjects, while ensuring efficient operation of the lecture halls as a pool for all departments. The centralized location of libraries and lecture halls has additional advantages from the traffic aspect: the concentration of students requiring these facilities ensures their adequate service by public transport."³⁵ The centrality of the library in the plan followed the traditional role of the Library in the Hebrew University since it was first constructed by Geddes, Mears and Chaikin in the form of the Wolfsohn Library building, and through the Library in the Giv'at Ram campus. It thus retained the concept of a National Library which should be open to all, yet is also part of the University complex.

The later master plan, by the same architects, was also presented in a Hebrew University publication which contains a more detailed development of the former master plan, and quite a few changes (plate 67). It was prepared with collaboration with the Programme Committee which commenced its activity about that time. The very abstract plan shows that the basic megastructure concept remained, and like the early version, it shows a complex which combines together the different parts of the old campus, although the old buildings take on a more important role. It is as though the architects realized that drastic changes take more time and expenses, therefore it will be more practical to make as much immediate use of the old buildings as possible. The road plan

is the same, but the text adds that the plan provides easy access by motor to different parts of the campus through underground parking areas.

Although the buildings were not assembled as massively as in the early plan, still most of the buildings are bound together either by connecting pedestrian streets or by creating a chain of linked buildings. The Humanities and the School of Education on the western slope, which outgrow the other faculties in the early plan, are more in proportion to the others in the later plan. The buildings on the western slope are not as terraced, therefore they accentuate the effect of a massive wall. In this plan the megastructure was divided into separate faculty structures - the Social Sciences, Education the Sciences and the Humanities. The Humanities complex was in a form of a semicircle with an extension, and the Main Library and the Main Hall were at both ends of the semicircle. The School of Education, formed the south-west corner of the campus, and was set as a continuation of the Humanities building. The other buildings consisted of independent units - the Legal Studies, the Synagogue, the Institute of Archaeology, the Truman building and the Sciences. The Student Centre, was temporarily a separate unit, intending it to become part of a large construction in the future, which would close on the north-east corner of the campus.

On the whole, the large proposed constructions on the western slope encompassed an internal space and embraced the old buildings and a few new ones. The functional emphasis was on a protected complex (defense against the winds in winter). Mobility around the large constructions was based on an indoor pedestrian system. The text said that this pedestrian system should encourage social activity by enabling easy passage from the teaching to shopping areas, the Synagogue, etc.

The principles behind this second stage of the master plan were presented in the University publication: "It is the belief of the planning team that university education and the academic life of a university community go beyond the basic purpose of acquiring and transmitting knowledge. They provide a rare opportunity for both the student body and the faculty to participate in a process of interaction that fosters the growth of the human personality. With this in mind, the team has striven to create an environment which will be conducive to such interaction while yet fulfilling other functions of an intellectual centre. In an age of mass media and mass education, we have endeavoured to create a campus where the stress is on the individual both as an individual

and as a member of his society".³⁶ In fact an inherent contradiction exists between theory and practice, for the final product is quite contrary to the architects' declarations.

The Mount Scopus Development Committee emphasized in its discussions that neither national-ideological issues nor functional matters were present in the architects' declaration, as a basis for their plan for the new campus.³⁷ Whether or not the architectural style should be inspired by nationalist ideology, the fact is that it was the Committee itself that introduced it. Yet the only mention of an ideological awareness of the architects was expressed in the following short paragraph: "Future expansion will of necessity be to the east, where the steeper slopes of the ridge make building operations lengthier and more expensive. The planning team sees this approach as a symbolic integration of the past and future and as a resumption of the dialogue between the University and the Old City of Jerusalem".³⁸ Here too the architects did not elaborate on their notion of the nature of the dialogue with the Old City. It is questionable whether merging with topography was a consideration in that direction, for the later architectural plan did not integrate as much as the former one with the topography of the western slopes of Mount Scopus. Reznick testified that there had been an attempt in that direction by keeping the lines of the University buildings as horizontal as possible, so that they would blend to some extent with the hill's topography, and would not compete with the building scale of the Old City.³⁹ However, eventually the scale of the Hebrew University had grown, and consequently the idea of the campus as a megastructure developed even further as work advanced and other architects joined the original team.

More than thirty years after he conceived the first draft for the master plan, Reznick explained the visual and symbolic ideas which guided him: "I was thinking in a visionary way - the revival of the Jewish culture is symbolized by Mount Scopus. Even the location of the site in itself is symbolic - it stands between east and west, between wilderness and civilization. It is a lighthouse of the revival of the Jewish nation. When I was a child in Brazil, we knew about Mount Scopus and the Hebrew University through the Keren Kayemet (National Land Fund) postcards. For us it was a symbol. I came to Israel in 1949 and settled in Jerusalem in 1955. I used to watch Mount Scopus from Abu-Tor and wish some day my grandchildren will be able to go there. So for me to build on Mount Scopus was a sort of peak. I was thinking of Jewish students coming from the Diaspora to the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, and through Mount Scopus they will absorb the spirit of the whole land. This was part of my programme".⁴⁰ Reznick hence admitted that although he and his colleagues may not have elaborated the

nationalistic ideology in their declarations, it was actually an essential motivation behind the planning.

It is true that once the decision was taken to create an alternative campus for the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, a spacious campus was needed since it was planned for twenty thousand students (there were eleven thousand students in the Hebrew University in 1967) not including the Sciences students, which at the time of the planning were to remain in Giv'at Ram. Reznick recalled that at the time he was working on the master plan he was aware of the designs for the new universities in England.⁴¹ Indeed there is an affinity with the 1960's universities in England, Canada and Germany.⁴² The giant proportions, though, were not only a result of the megastructure concept, and the rising number of students, but also as Reznick himself said: "It was not only the desire to echo the Old City wall that inspired me. It was also my wish to create a forceful presence. Here I am and nobody will move me from here. The architect is not even aware of this. I agree that there is in the plan a political statement. Even though I do not believe in political architecture".⁴³ Universities as megastructures served political ambitions also in Italy in the 1960s and early 1970s (corresponding to the planning and construction of the Mount Scopus campus). Behind the functional intentions of a master plan for the Florence University (Vittorio Gregotti, 1972) there had been a scheme to grant one political group more power over another, by creating land dominance.⁴⁴

When work toward realizing the plan began, Ram Karmi joined Reznick and Shaked on the master plan team, and the implementation of the different parts of the master-plan was divided between a number of architects.⁴⁵ The sole criterion for choosing them was the amount of notoriety they enjoyed in Israel, because the University wanted the best architects to design the new campus.⁴⁶ Again the planning of a prestigious project remained in the hands of a traditionally elite group. Karmi became very active in the master plan group and his concepts of architecture became more dominant than before. The location of the Synagogue, the design of which was assigned to him, was changed a few times. There was a demand that there would be a view of the Temple Mount from the Synagogue, that the building would not be isolated, and that it would be singled out by its architectural design.⁴⁷ Never before did a synagogue receive such attention in the planning of the Hebrew University. Eventually it was decided that it would be located at the west angle of the Humanities building.⁴⁸ The large glass wall of

the synagogue placed in an angle facing the Old City and the Temple Mount becomes a replacement of the traditional Torah shrine. The usual symbolic depiction of the Temple with which Torah shrines are usually decorated is replaced in the University synagogue by the real Temple Mount which appears in all its glory through the glass walls. The synagogue, therefore, is one of the few places in the entire University which provides a panorama of the Old City; it also provides a context that emphasizes the blend of religious and national values which became a most powerful force in Israeli polity and society.

The Forum (designed by Chaim Katseff) was planned as a crossroads between interfaculty passages, and according to the Programme Committee it served different functions – a central meeting place, shops, access to bus stops, post-office etc. Yet as a crossroad it misses its function as a meeting place, since it does not provide sufficient space for getting together and for conversing.

The general impression of the architectural realization of the master plan is of a massive compound, alienated to its surrounding, and once penetrated, it causes disorientation and confusion. The above indicates a wide and deep gap between the architects' intentions as specified in the formal publications as well as informal interviews (with the exception of Shaked, who admitted to having regretted his approach to the University architecture) and the final results. A comprehension of the national and social trends in post-1967 Israel provide a better understanding of the architecture. The aftermath of the Six Day War and the control over the Jewish sacred sites in Judaea and Sammaria opened up new possibilities for the Israeli state, which actually became more of a Control System than before. The mountain regions which have become accessible to Israelis were the site of the Biblical Kingdoms of Judaea and Israel, and ever since the Zionist settlement of Eretz-Israel it was densely populated by Arabs. Since the 1947/48 war Jews were completely barred from establishing settlements or even visiting in those regions. The occupation created not only an expansion of the state's boundaries, but also, and perhaps more significant, an "overlap between the boundaries of the Israeli control system and the theological 'Land of the Bible'".⁴⁹ Combining religious emotions with political actions was accelerated and its effects are a threat to democracy in Israel to this day. Locating the synagogue on the Hebrew University's "prow" was indicative of the new

state of mind, although the architect is not one of the orthodox zealots that settled in the occupied territories. Although for a while very few voices were sounded in public, to warn from the dangers of becoming an occupying state and demanding that Israel withdraw from all the occupied territories⁵⁰, it has since created a deep cleavage in Israeli society.

So incredibly expeditious was the University in its reaction to the new situation that it could seem that the war was initiated for that purpose. The Israeli Government's policy supported the University's actions, as they were in accord with its wish to obtain a hold of all of Jerusalem. In an effort to justify the decision to "return" to Mount Scopus with non-political defenses, University officials emphasized time and again an urgent need for a larger campus.⁵¹ This may be true, yet there are contrary opinions as well; Chaim Katzeff, for instance, clearly stated that he believed that a new large campus would not have been erected had Mount Scopus not become accessible again.⁵² In 1967 the Hebrew University was not the only university in the country any more; universities had been going through different stages of establishment in Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Ramat Gan. The recovery of the old Mount Scopus campus could have served for different purposes, as anyway it was not fit to serve its purpose any more (there were not enough buildings or space for the larger number of students and for the larger range of fields of knowledge the Hebrew University encompassed since 1948). The Hebrew University could have considered different options for its future, or to limit its expansion to the Giv'at Ram premises. The need for expansion in itself does not explain the move to Mount Scopus, therefore it is obvious that it was politically motivated.

Understanding the concept of the post-1967 Mount Scopus master plan requires a more thorough investigation of the site's significance. The "return" to Mount Scopus meant far more than a political wish to occupy a conquered territory; it was also a return to the one Jewish hold of territory in the Land of the Patriarchs. In 1967 the symbolism attributed to the combined entity of the Hebrew University and Mount Scopus lost its Holy Temple associations, instead the years of nurturing the myth of Mount Scopus as a major national asset that had been temporarily lost and a yearning for its retrieval placed it with other sacred sites of the ancient Land of the Patriarchs. The situation in 1967 was therefore unique and unprecedented. For the first time since the destruction of the Temple by the Romans Mount Scopus could become again THE lookout on Jerusalem

and the Temple Mount unified under the rule of a Jewish rule. Yet was it really? Kimmerling points out a dual attitude of the Israeli state toward the occupied territories; while the territories were desirable their inhabitants were not.⁵³ The majority of Arab inhabitants of the Old City remained there, the Temple Mount was controlled by the Islamic "Wakff" (the independent authority responsible for the Temple Mount). Hence it was not possible any more to look at the Dome of the Rock from the summit of Mount Scopus and see a vision of Solomon's Temple (except for praying worshippers in the synagogue), as Zionist leaders and University promoters did when an image of the Holy Land as devoid of inhabitants since the dispersion prevailed. That vision had disappeared not only with the very recent heroic accounts of the seizure of the Old City by the Israeli military forces, but also as Zionist rhetoric had changed since those first days of Zionism. Furthermore, since the 1930s and especially since the evacuation of the Mount Scopus campus in 1948 the Hebrew University has become in the mind of the public an institution of higher education, not a substitute Temple. This imagery, that could probably persist as long as the University was no more than an unrealized idea and site, could not be effectively used any more, it had become obsolete. Consequently a shift was inevitable in the way the Mount Scopus site was supposed to relate to the Temple Mount. On the one hand Mount Scopus of the post-1967 period had become a new frontier; Kimmerling used the term (which originally had a positive connotation of new vistas to be explored) to define the occupied land as bearing settlement potential, from the point of view of the Israeli control system. The Palestinian inhabitants of the territories, though, were conceived as a threat to the Israeli definition of its own boundary and to the state's safety in case of any possible military attack.⁵⁴ The Old City of the post-1967 era was therefore not just the legendary site of the Holy Temple, it was also seen for what it really was, the religious Islamic centre, and a town inhabited by people with an identity that belongs to the present. Physically the Old City and the Temple Mount have not changed, their image in the eyes of their Israeli observers has changed. This concept can offer an interpretation of the concealment of the Old City by the architects of the new campus, who did not provide for lookouts on all sides of Mount Scopus. They did create a very conspicuous fortress for beholders in the Old City. Hence the new campus does not create a dialogue with its surrounding, it only sends out

one-way messages of power. It fits Banham's description of the megastructure as "above all a monumental order of heroic scale",⁵⁵ and in this sense it is an equivalent of other megastructure campuses, but it is its Mount Scopus location again that provides the special political significance. The term "control system" used by the Israeli social historian Kimmerling⁵⁶ can be applied to the University campus as well. The architects, who created a labyrinth of internal pedestrian streets connecting most of the University buildings together, defend themselves by claiming that the University has failed to provide an effective and informative systems of signs and directions.⁵⁷ In fact they have created a construction in which the individual is supposed to lose a sense of potency and capability to function independently, values that a University is supposed to nourish.

Notes:

¹ A number of architects were in charge of designing major parts of the campus: R. Karmi (Humanities), A. Yaski (Buber-Rousseau Building, Beit-Hillel), C. Katsef (the Forum), Y. Rechter (the Library and the restoration of Hadassah Hospital), D. Eitan (Social Sciences Building).

² In a document titled "Designing Palestine's University City" (Kauffmann?) September 20, 1946. HUA: 2/1946.

³ *Mount Scopus Campus Master Plan*, a publication of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

⁴ The problem of disorientation is a notorious one, and since there is not much one can do to improve the situation, jokes are made up, such as about the student who graduated in Psychology because he could never find the Sociology department. Or a spooky one - that the strange mysterious smell in the campus comes from the rotting bodies of those who were lost in the building, and could never be found.

⁵ The Mormon University is actually a Middle East Studies Institute, for only 175 Mormon students at a time. A large part of the complex consists of residential units for the students who are not allowed to dwell anywhere else.

⁶ See "Campus architecture" in *Architectural Record*, January 1975, 123-140.

⁷ *Ibid.*: 123.

⁸ Banham 1976: 9.

⁹ *Ibid.*: 142.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*: 10.

¹¹ *Ibid.*: 131.

¹² The first letter in the correspondence (21.6.1967) was from A. Skotnitsky to B. Cherrick, executive vice president (Hebrew), with an estimate of repair costs of the Mount Scopus University buildings. File 091, 1967, HUA.

¹³ Letter from A. Skotnitsky to the Standing Committee members (Hebrew), June 30, 1967. Skotnitsky wrote that until the new master plan will be implemented, the open-air theatre and the Rosenbloom building should be restored, since they are valuable both concretely and as a means

for propaganda. If it will not be done it will be difficult, wrote Skotnitsky, to explain to the many visitors the poor condition and the postponing of the restoration of the old buildings. But, he added, it would be futile to restore the other buildings before it is decided which of the buildings remained and which demolished. File 091, 1967, HUA.

¹⁴ Report of the Committee for the Examination of the Mount Scopus Restoration Suggestions, material for the July 25, 1967 meeting of the Mount Scopus Committee (Hebrew), file 0801, 1967, HUA.

¹⁵ To prepare for a return of the Faculty of Law to the Rosenblum building on Mount Scopus, B. Cherrick (Executive Vice-President) wrote a letter (1. 10. 1967) to C. J. Rosenblum in Pittsburgh, USA, and told him about the plan, suggesting also that he would donate money for the restoration. File 091, 1967, HUA.

¹⁶ Conclusions and Remarks Brought up at the Mount Scopus Restoration Committee Meeting, July 25, 1967. File 0801, 1967, HUA.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ Reznick, in an interview, July 4, 1994.

¹⁹ Interview with Reznick, July 5, 1994. More on this preliminary plan, in the next chapter.

²⁰ In an interview with the architect Avraham Yaski, August 8, 1994, he said that Harpaz controlled the planning and construction project like a general, he had a central position concerning every decision, big and small – from nomination of architects up to the smallest detail of design.

²¹ The information on Harpaz's role is based on and on U. Benziman, ע. בנימין, "רישומו של המנכ"ל", יוסף הרפזי ("The Impression of the Director General Joseph Harpaz"), *הארץ*, *Ha'arets* (daily newspaper), December 12, 1969, on the interview with Yaski (note 20) and an interview with the architect Ch. Katseff, August 18, 1997.

²² *Ibid.* Benziman assessed that those faculty members who did not approve of Harpaz, gave up on opposing him because they believed that after all good order was essential.

²³ Letter from J. Harpaz to Heads of Departments, January 21, 1968, HUA.

²⁴ Minutes of Standing Committee meeting, February 19, 1968. File 0801, 1968, HUA. The Programme Committee's mission was defined as an introduction to a presentation of its report.

²⁵ Mount Scopus Programme Committee Interim Report, February 5, 1968. File 0801, 1968, HUA.

²⁶ There is a top secret file in the University, containing minutes of committee discussions on the issue. The fact that there is a secret file is no secret, and the head of the Hebrew University Archive is free to pass on this information.

²⁷ See note 22.

²⁸ Y. Kastan, י. קשטן, "ממרומי ההר למעמקי המציאות", *הארץ*, *Ha'arets* (daily newspaper), March 26, 1968.

²⁹ Minutes of the Mount Scopus Development Academic Committee meeting, May 31, 1968, File 0801, 1968, HUA.

³⁰ Interview with Reznick, July 5, 1994.

³¹ *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem - Guidelines for the Master Plan on Mount Scopus* (no date) and *Mount Scopus Campus Master Plan*, publication of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem Building and Development Department (no date).

³² This information is not stated in the publication. It was given by Katseff in an interview, August 18, 1997.

³³ *Mount Scopus Campus Master Plan*, a publication of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

³⁴ Interview with Reznick, July 28, 1994.

³⁵ "*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem - Guidelines for the Master Plan on Mount Scopus*" (note 27).

³⁶ See note 27.

³⁷ Professor Avram Kampf recalled in a number of conversations that at the time he was lecturer in the Hebrew University History of Art Department he was offered to participate in one of the

sub-committees to discuss the needs of a Humanities Building. Eventually he quit in protest because Harpaz and the architects were not really interested in what faculty members had to say.

³⁸ See note 2.

³⁹ Interview with Reznick, July 5, 1994.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

⁴² Banham 1976: 130-163.

⁴³ Interview with D. Reznick, July 28, 1994.

⁴⁴ Banham 1976: 147, 148.

⁴⁵ Dan Eitan designed the Social Sciences building, Karmi designed the Humanities and the Synagogue buildings, Avraham Yaski designed the complex which included the Student Centre, the Buber-Rouseau building, Beit-Hill and the Archaeology complex. Katseff designed the Forum. Ya'akov Rechter designed the Library, Ze'ev Ravina designed the Administration building.

⁴⁶ Interview with Reznick, July 5, 1994. The information was also confirmed by Ch. Katseff, who said that J. Harpaz, then the Director General of the University, was most active in choosing the architects (interview with Katseff, August 18, 1997).

⁴⁷ Ch. Katseff, in minutes of meeting no. 34 of the Programme Committee, December 1, 1971, file 0801, 1970-1971, HUA.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Kimmerling 1988: 276.

⁵⁰ The most well known was Prof. Isaiah Leibowitz of the Hebrew University, a philosopher and scientist, who aroused much antagonism through his blunt criticism until his death in 1997.

⁵¹ Interview with Prof. Chaim Barkai of the Hebrew University, former member of the Mount Scopus Programme Committee (1970-1972 chairperson of the committee), August 6, 1997. Also in documentation, files 0801 and 091, 1967, HUA. Katseff, who denied that there was an extra space problem, claimed that before the 1967 war, when the option to make use of the Mount Scopus campus did not exist, the Hebrew University considered becoming a small and selective university, with perhaps less Sciences, especially since more universities opened around the country (interview with Ch. Katseff, August 18, 1997).

⁵² In an interview with Katseff, August 18, 1997.

⁵³ Kimmerling 1988: 278.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*: 274, 278.

⁵⁵ Banham 1976: 148.

⁵⁶ See Kimmerling 1998.

⁵⁷ Interview with Reznick, July 5, 1994.

PART V

CONCLUSIONS:

The Hebrew University as a case study: The effect of the connection between nationalist ideology and architecture on the visual image of the University.

The Hebrew University came into the world as a Zionist objective devoid of a visual image. Now, the present campus provides it a visual image that is the objective. It is the formal aspect of the Hebrew University in the context of its geographical and political location that delivers its special ideological and national message of the new Zionism. While there is nothing uniquely Israeli, Hebrew or Jewish about the Hebrew University, for its academic curriculum is no different from other universities in Israel and in the west in general, its expression of dominant, forceful physical presence, is an ultimate figuration of present Israeli nationalism. The undercover imperialist conception behind the Geddes plan finally achieved its conspicuous realization in the form of the Mount Scopus campus. Yet while the Geddes master plan manifested an imaginary "Ideal Jerusalem", Reznick and his associates used fashionable architectural vernacular, accepted and familiar in western architecture, that is applied to conceal the campus's true purpose. The second Mount Scopus campus heralded the appearance of post-1967 Zionism, which clings to a contested right over the Land of the Patriarchs and its sacred sites. Quite contrary to the ideology of "working the land" and creating a new secular culture in the early days of Zionism, the occupation generated a culture that is a combination of power and self-glorification with a reverence toward sacred sites.

After many years of the Hebrew University's existence in the form of an idea, the first attempts to give it architectural form had failed. Although there were various explanations for each failure, there was a shortcoming common to them all. The idea of the Hebrew University was caught up in a host of contradictions and paradoxes that caused confusion as to its vocation and function. No wonder this confusion affected formal considerations, especially as the physical image of the beacon of the Zionist

Organization, namely the Hebrew University, did not seem to gain much interest even among its most ardent promoters. In fact, that in itself was one central paradox. Another important one was the paradox of erecting a University for the Jews all over the world, especially those that suffered from discriminating policy in east European universities, which is situated in Palestine, where some Zionist settlers regarded university education as a betrayal of their pioneering convictions.¹ The Hebrew University, as a supreme representative of cultural Zionism was supposed to become a means for the implementation of the "melting-pot" ideology. Instead its architectural form exhibited an exclusive western hegemony (for the Geddes plan too, was a European interpretation of the Orient). Furthermore, while the most urgent Zionist project was to provide for Jewish immigrants, who were willing to suffer deprivation while fulfilling the national cause, most of the Hebrew University master plans consisted of over-scaled, expensive layouts and buildings. Above all, since a university academic plan and activity did not exist until the late 1920s (and even then it was quite insignificant), its promoters could not provide the architects with founded data necessary for an architectural planning, all they could pass on was a visionary conviction. Those contradicting messages doubtlessly complicated the architectural task. Later, when the Giv'at Ram and second Mount Scopus campuses were planned, written and visual information on the massive construction of university campuses in America and England provided contemporary references and sources of influence (even though documentation and interviews do not provide verifications). As since the 1930s Israeli cultural agents were quite West oriented, those university exemplars, were well suited to collective and national identity convictions of Jewish Israeli architects and their clients, and therefore were readily copied.

A choice of West or East is part of a major problem concerning the question of the contribution of the Hebrew University campuses to a local Hebrew style. Lacking roots in a local tradition, a number of planners turned to oriental architecture as a source of inspiration. The variety of approaches to oriental and indigenous culture and architecture (Geddes, Levi) reveals the fundamental gap between local reality and its image in western eyes. One attempt to bridge the gap was Mendelsohn's architectural designs, yet not only did it arouse antagonism among Jewish separatists, it also presented basically European modern principles that were merely artificially affiliated to

indigenous Arab characteristics. Nor did other Zionist cultural or architectural projects cope with the problem more successfully. But as the Hebrew University project had been the most prestigious and well funded of all Zionist building enterprises in Palestine, it could have become a leading force in the attempt to create an authentic Hebrew style. Its alienation from local Jewish and indigenous existence prevented it, as did also the ambivalent attitude of Eretz Israel settlers toward the University.

Zionist ideological trends were mirrored in the different architectural master plans. Accordingly, the most crucial prohibition Zionism had generated was followed and the architects refrained from any references to Jewish traditions nurtured in diverse communities along centuries of exile. Geddes presented a visionary image of a return to the Golden Age of Biblical Jerusalem that corresponded to early Zionist enthusiasm and even *naïveté*. Kornberg expressed the reliance on the ancient east, the origin of the Hebrews, for cultural roots. Levi represented Jewish Diaspora nostalgia for the East, which symbolized imaginary Biblical vistas. Mendelsohn introduced a modern vernacular that was already well-rooted in Zionist architectural trends, that from then on would be identified with mainstream cultural Israeli identity. Hence Mendelsohn's International Style, although individually interpreted through his own genius, was followed by Kauffmann, Rau and Klarwein, whose modernism was affiliated to social and ideological ideas adopted by Zionism. On the same lines, Reznick's megastructure, although unprecedented in contemporary Israeli architecture, was accepted, for it was in accordance with a popular western vogue. However, none of these trends emerged from real demands of the local population, and definitely excluded Arabs and also Jews who did not originally come from Europe or America.² Thus the Hebrew University architecture had more of an effect on local political life than on local architecture.

As the Land of the Forefathers is located in the Orient, early immigration to Palestine was followed by an ideological obligation toward the East. Most interpretations of the Orient were quite in accordance with Edward Said's theory of the West imposing its power over the Orient through the manner of depicting it.³ In its search for roots, invented Hebrew culture turned to the Orient, paradoxically following contemporary European trends. However, as the Jewish settlers were not passers-by but situated in the Orient, it was quite simple to pretend that the new Hebrew culture truly originated in

the East, while in fact the representations of it in Hebrew culture and art did not originate from a direct encounter with it. Geddes's proposed Hebrew University campus was embraced by University promoters in Palestine and around the world, for although he did not belong with Zionist inventors of a Hebrew identity and culture, he offered a magnificent example of what orientalist architecture in Palestine could be. It presents the kind of delicious nostalgia for a lost Biblical past that made the David Roberts' depictions of Holy Land sites so popular. If only Jerusalem could transform into what Roberts and Geddes envisioned, but alas it could not, and reality, which included a large population of Arabs, could not disappear. But it could be ignored, by rejecting indigenous influences altogether and completely accepting western values and trends. Becoming westernized actually ended the search for an authentic style, especially since International Style and Bauhaus principles could be adapted to Zionist socialist trends and the emphasis on a collective identity. The architects of the Giv'at Ram campus were among other cultural agents of the period who, following Zionist aspirations for a collective identity, participated in creating a serious flaw – they completely ignored the indigenous inhabitants and Jews who emigrated from Eastern countries. Reznick and his associates who planned the present Mount Scopus campus followed in their footsteps; they also copied a western architectural style (but did not achieve the architectural quality of the Giv'at Ram architects). Thus they are also responsible for ignoring the exceptional chance that could have offered a unique opportunity to develop, instead of a melting-pot and a collective identity, a multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society.

Had the promoters and architects of the Hebrew University been more attentive to its own needs and to universal values the university stands for, namely "truth", "freedom", "tolerance", "objectivity", "neutrality", "independence", its architectural manifestation perhaps could have been evaluated more by means of architectural terms and less through political interpretations, which are essentially foreign to the idea of the university.

Notes:

¹ Prof. Avram Kampf, in discussions along the years, recalled how as a youth in the 1930s, when he studied in the Ben-Shemen agricultural school, it was regarded bourgeois and a betrayal of pioneering and socialist principles to be intellectually inclined, and most of all to aspire to study in the University.

² To prevent a possibility of a misunderstanding, it should be noted that Arabs and oriental Jews were not excluded from the Hebrew University as students and as staff. A possibility of including their culture was excluded from Zionist ideology and actions.

³ Edward Said 1978: Orientalism; Western Conceptions of the Orient, London.

PLATES

List of References:

Primary sources:

HUA, files 31, 31/1, 2, 136/1, 024, 35, 35/1, 027, 010, 0801, 091, Protocols of the Executive Committee and of the Senate.

CZA, files L/12 39, Z4/I 3494, Z4/ 2790, Z4/1712.

Other sources:

Avineri 1985: S. Avineri, *הרעיון הציוני לגונו*, ש. אבינרי, (*Varieties of Zionist Thought*) Tel Aviv.

Banham 1976: R. Banham, *Megastructure, Urban Future of the Recent Past*, London.

Barshai 1983: B. Barshai, ברשאי, ב. "ההכנות לפתיחת האוניברסיטה בירושלים ושנותיה", *קתדרה*, ("The Preparations for the Opening of the University in Jerusalem and its First Years"), *Cathedra*, 25, תשרי תשמ"ג, (September 1983), 65-78.

Barshai 1989: B. Barshai, ברשאי, ב. "האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים 1925-1938", *Cathedra* 53, September: 107-127.

Ben-Arieh 1979: J. Ben Arieh, י. בן-אריה, "גידולה של ירושלים במאה ה-19", (*Jerusalem's Growth in the 19th Century*), in J. Rappel (ed.), *תולדות ארץ-ישראל*, י. רפל, (*History of Eretz-Israel*), Tel Aviv, 539-556.

Ben-Arzi 1997: Y. Ben-Arzi, י. בן ארצי, *המושבה העברית בנוף ארץ ישראל: 1882-1914*, *Early Jewish Settlement Patterns in Palestine, 1882-1914*, Jerusalem.

Ben-Sira 1958: Y. Ben-Sira, "The University Compound, Jerusalem", *הנדסה ואדריכלות*, *Handasah ve'adrichalut*, Tel-Aviv (English version): 131.

Ben-Yehuda 1970: B. Ben-Yehuda, ב. בן-יהודה, *ספורה של הגמנסיה "הרצליה"*, (*The Story of Gymnasisa "Herzlia"*), Tel-Aviv.

Bentwich 1954: N. Bentwich, *For Zion's Sake: A Biography of Judah L. Magnes*, Philadelphia.

Berkowitz 1993: M. Berkowitz, *Zionist Culture and West European Jewry Before the First World War*, Cambridge.

- Berlovitz 1996: Y. Berlovitz, ברלוביץ, י. *להמציא ארץ, להמציא עם; תשתיות ספרות ותרבות ביצירה*, של העלייה הראשונה ("Inventing a Land, Inventing a People; on the literature of the period of the first *aliyah*"), Tel Aviv.
- Beyer 1967: O. Beyer (ed.), *Erich Mendelsohn: Letters of an Architect*, London, New York, Toronto.
- Bialik 1925: Ch. N. Bialik, speech (Hebrew) in *חגיגת הפתיחה (The Opening Celebration)*, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 30.
- Biger 1989: G. Biger, ביגר, ג. "Building and Construction in Jerusalem Under British Rule, 1917-1948", in H. Lavsky (ed.), *ירושלים בתודעה ובעשייה הציונית*, לבסקי (עורכת) (*Jerusalem in Zionist Vision and Realization*), Jerusalem, 183-215.
- Boardman 1932: P. Boardman, *The Worlds of Patrick Geddes; Biologist, Town-Planner, Re-educator, Peace-warrior*, London & Boston.
- Cohen 1991: U. Cohen, כהן, א. *האוניברסיטה העברית 1918-1948: אי של אוטונומיה מול אליטה*, כהן (*The Hebrew University 1918-1948: Island of Autonomy Confronted by an Elite of Power*), unpublished seminar paper for Prof. J. Shapira's Political Sociology course, Tel-Aviv University.
- Crinson 1996: M. Crinson, *Empire Building; Orientalism and Victorian Architecture*, London and New York.
- Dekel 1984: A. Dekel, "The Idea of the Jewish University." Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.
- Dolev 1990: D. Dolev, דולב, ד. *האדריכלות של האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים, 1918-1948*, (The Architecture of the Hebrew University, 1918-1948), unpublished MA thesis, Ramat Aviv University, Tel Aviv.
- Eitan 1981: O. Eitan, איתן, א. "Eric Mendelsohn in Eretz-Israel", *קו (Kav)*, 3, December 1981, 49-58.
- Elhanani 1998: A. Elhanani, אלחנני, א. *המאבק לעצמאות של האדריכלות הישראלית במאה ה-20 (The Struggle For Independence; The Israeli Architecture in the Twentieth Century)*, Tel-Aviv.

- Even-Zohar 1981: I. Even-Zohar "The Emergence of a Native Hebrew Culture in Palestine: 1882-1948", in *Studies in Zionism: An International Journal of Social, Political Intellectual History*, No. 4, Tel-Aviv University, Autumn, 167-184.
- Feiwel, Buber, Weizmann 1902: B. Feiwel, M. Buber, Ch. Weizmann, *Das Projekt einer Juedischen Hochschule*, Berlin.
- Flexner 1968: A. Flexner, *Universities: American, English, German*, New York, Oxford.
- Friedmann 1911 (May): A. Friedmann, "Judische Kunst in Palaestina", *Ost und West*, Berlin.
- Geddes 1915: P. Geddes, *Cities in Evolution: An Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics*, London.
- Geddes 1919: P. Geddes (assisted by F. Mears), *The Proposed Hebrew University in Jerusalem*, unpublished, can be found in the Central Zionist Archive, Jerusalem, file Z4/1 3494.
- Geddes 1923 (1901): P. Geddes, "A Needed Research Institute: Geographical and Social", in *On Universities in Europe and India, and a Needed Type of Research Institute, Geographical and Social: Five Letters to an Indian Friend*, Madras.
- Goren 1998: A. A. Goren, "Sanctifying Scopus: Locating the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus", in E. Carlebach, J. M. Efron, D. N. Myers (eds.), *Jewish History and Jewish Memory*, Hanover and London, 330-347.
- Goren 1997: A. A. Goren, "מבט מהר הצופים, יהודה ל. מגנס והשנים הראשונות של א.א. גורן", *האוניברסיטה העברית*, ("Judah L. Magnes and the Early Years of the University", in Katz and Heyd, 1997: 363-385.
- Gorny: J. Gorny, "רומנטיות רומנטיים באידיאולוגיה של העלייה השנייה", *דבון ירושלים*, ("Romantic Elements in the Ideology of the Second Aliya"), *Jerusalem Quarterly* 13, 73-78.
- Gorny 1985: J. Gorny, "השאלה הערבית והבעיה הערבית", *The Arab Question and the Jewish Problem*, Tel Aviv.
- Gorny 1987: J. Gorny, "מראש-פינה וזגניה ועד דימונה; שיחות על מפעל הבנייה הציוני", *From Rosh-Pina and Degania to Demona; A History of Constructive Zionism*, Tel Aviv.
- Gropius 1965: W. Gropius, *The New Architecture and the Bauhaus*, Massachusetts.

- Harlap 1982: A. Harlap, *New Israeli Architecture*, USA.
- Heinze-Muhleib 1986: I. Heinze-Muhleib, *Erich Mendelsohn: Bauten und Projekte in Palastina (1934-1941)*, Munich.
- Herbert & Sosnovsky 1993: G. Herbert & S. Sosnovsky, *Bauhaus on the Camel, and the Crossroads of Empire - Architecture and Planning in Haifa During the British Mandate*, Jerusalem.
- Hess 1976: M. G. Hess, *The University; The Anatomy of Academe*, USA.
- Lavsky 1997: H. Lavsky, ח. לבסקי, "בין הנחת אבן הפינה לפתיחה: ייסוד האוניברסיטה העברית, ת. לבסקי, 1918-1925, ("From Foundation Stone to Opening: The Establishment of the Hebrew University, 1918-1925"), in S. Katz & M. Heyd (eds.) 1997: 120-159.
- Levin 1984: M. Levin, מ. לוין, *עיר לבנה, אדריכלות הסגנון הבינלאומי בישראל; דיוקנה של תקופה*, ת. לוין, (White City, International Style Architecture in Israel; A Portrait of an Era), Tel Aviv.
- Kampf 1984: A. Kampf, *Jewish Experience in the Art of the Twentieth Century*, USA.
- Karmon 1978: Y. Karmon, י. כרמון, "תמורות בנוף האורבני של ירושלים במאה ה-19", ("Changes in the Urban View of Jerusalem in the 19th Century"), *קתדרה (Cathedra)*, 6, Jerusalem.
- Katz & Heyd 1997: S. Katz & M. Heyd (eds.), י. כץ ומ. הד, *תולדות האוניברסיטה העברית, בירושלים; שורשים והתחלות*, (The History of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Origins and Beginnings), Jerusalem.
- Katz 1989: Y. Katz, י. כץ, "המפנה ביחס של אוסישקין וחובבי ציון לפיתוח ירושלים ולהקמת, י. כץ, "The Change in the Attitude of Ussishkin and the Hovevei Zion to the Development of Jerusalem and the Founding of the Hebrew University Prior to the First World War", in H. Lavski (ed.), ח. לבסקי, *ירושלים בתודעה ובעשייה הציונית*, (עורכת), Jerusalem, 107-136.
- Kedar 1997: B. Z. Kedar, ב. ז. קדר, "טקס הנחת אבן הפינה לאוניברסיטה העברית בט"ו באב תרע"ח, ב"ז קדר, ("Laying the Foundation Stones of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 24th July, 1918"), in S. Katz & M. Heyd (eds.) 1997: 90-119.
- Kimmerling 1988: B. Kimmerling, "Boundaries and Frontiers of the Israeli Control System: Analytical Conclusions", in B. Kimmerling (ed.), *The Israeli State and Society; Boundaries and Frontiers*, New York: 265-283.

- Kimmerling 1993: B. Kimmerling, ב. קימרלינג, "ייחסי מדינה-חברה בישראל" ("State-Society Relationships in Israel"), in U. Ram (ed.), רם (עורך), *Israeli Society: Critical Perspectives*, Tel-Aviv, 328-350.
- King 1980: A. D. King (ed.), *Buildings and Society*, London.
- Klausner 1911: Y. Klausner, י. קלויזנר, "בית מדרש למדעי הרוח", ("A Humanities' School") in *השלוח*, (*Hashiloach*), vol. 25, 1915: 1-6.
- Klausner 1932: Y. Klausner, י. קלויזנר, *האוניברסיטה שלנו*, *Our University*, Tel-Aviv.
- Kolatt 1997: I. Kolatt, י. קולט, "רעיון האוניברסיטה העברית בתנועה הלאומית היהודית", ("The Idea of the Hebrew University in the Jewish National Movement"), in S. Katz & M. Heyd (eds.) 1997: 3-74.
- Mairet 1957: Ph. Mairet, *Pioneer of Sociology - The Life and Letters of Patrick Geddes*, London.
- Meller 1979: H. Meller (ed.), *The Ideal City*, Leicester University Press.
- Meller 1980: H. Meller, "Cities and Evolution: Patrick Geddes as an International Prophet of Town Planning before 1914", in A. Sutcliffe (ed.) *Modern Urban Planning 1800-1914*, New York.
- Meller 1990: H. Meller, *Patrick Geddes; Social Evolutionist and City Planner*, London and New York.
- Myers 1995: D. N. Myers, *Re-Inventing the Jewish Past; European Jewish Intellectuals and the Zionist Return to History*, New York and Oxford.
- Nitzan-Shiftan 1996: A. Nitzan-Shiftan, "Contested Zionism – Alternative Modernism: Erich Mendelsohn and the Tel Aviv Chug in Mandate Palestine", in *Architectural History*, 39, 147-180.
- Novak 1995: F. G. Novak, *Lewis Mumford and Patrick Geddes; The Correspondence*, London and New-York.
- Ohana 1997: D. Ohana, ד. אוחנה, "זרטוסטרא בירושלים: קווים להשפעת ניטשה על 'העברי החדש'", ("Zaratoustra in Jerusalem; Nietzsche's Influence on the 'New Hebrew Person'"), in D. Ohana and R. Wistrich (eds.), *מיתוס וזיכרון: גלגוליה של התודעה*, בתוך ד. אוחנה ור. ויסטריך, *הישראלית*, (*Myth and Memory; Transfigurations of Israeli Consciousness*), Jerusalem, 269-289.

- Stemhell 1998 (1995): Z. Stemhell, *The Founding Myths of Israel; Nationalism, Socialism, and the Making of the Jewish State*, Princeton.
- Ussishkin 1913: M. Ussishkin, *The Promised Land*, Petrograd (Russian).
- Ussishkin 1947: M. Ussishkin, *דברים אחרונים*, (Last Words), Jerusalem.
- Wahman 1997: J. Wahman, ורמן, י. "מאחזת גריי היל ל'מגרש האוניברסיטה' בהר הצופים", ("From Camp to Campus: Gray Hill's Country House and the Origin of the Hebrew University"), in S. Katz & M. Heyd (eds.) 1997: 163-200, Jerusalem.
- Weizmann 1968: Ch. Weizmann, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*, Oxford.
- Weizmann, 1949: Ch. Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, London.
- Weizmann 1950: Ch. Weizmann, "President Weizmann's Message", in *The Hebrew University in Jerusalem 1925-1950*, Jerusalem.
- Whitelam 1996: K. W. Whitelam, *The Invention of Ancient Israel*, London & New York.
- Wischnitzer 1955: R. Wischnitzer, *Synagogue Architecture in the United States; History and Interpretation*, Philadelphia.
- Whittick 1940, 1956: A. Whittick, *Eric Mendelsohn*, London.
- Zalmona 1981: Y. Zalmona, "History and Identity", in *Artists of Israel: 1920 – 1980*, Exhibition catalogue, The Jewish Museum, New York.
- Zalmona 1985: Y. Zalmona, י. צלמונה, *בוריס שץ*, (Boris Schatz), Jerusalem.
- Zerubavel 1996: Y. Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots; Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition*, Chicago and London.
- Zevi 1985: B. Zevi, *Erich Mendelsohn*, New York.

Biographical note:

Ahad Ha'Am (Asher Hirsch Ginsberg, 1856-1927) – Hebrew essayist, thinker and leader of Hibbat-Zion movement. Ahad Ha'Am had a broad, but self taught education in philosophy as well as science. In 1884 he settled in Odessa, then an important centre of Hebrew literature and Hibbat-Zion activity. His first important article, *Lo zeh ha'derech* (1889), "The Wrong Way" (1962), was written under the pseudonym Ahad Ha'Am ("One of the People"). The article criticized the Hovevei-Zion policy of immediate settlement in Eretz Israel as impractical and moreover, as a betrayal of a lack of understanding that the envisioned renewal of the Jewish people would first require its spiritual and cultural regeneration. He advocated instead educational work as the groundwork for more dedicated and purposeful settlement. Towards this goal Ahad Ha'am was instrumental in the founding of B'nai Moshe (1889), a semi-secret society pledged to placing on the agenda of the Hovevei-Zion the overriding need to revive the Hebrew language as the basis of a revitalizing Jewish culture.

His later articles dealt with subjects connected with Judaism, the settlement of Eretz-Israel and the Hibbat-Zion movement.

In 1891 Ahad Ha'am visited Eretz-Israel and summed up his impressions in *Emmet me'Eretz Israel* ("Truth from Eretz Israel"), a strongly critical survey of the economic, social and political aspects of the Jewish settlements. He also criticized the Baron Rothschild's officials in Palestine, their dictatorial attitude, the ensuing degeneration among the settlers and the neglect of national values in the Rothschild education system (the *Alliance Israelite Universelle*).

In 1896 he became manager of *Ahi'asaf* publishing house and editor of the monthly *Ha'shiloah*, the most important organ of Zionism and Hebrew literature in Eastern Europe. After the Sixth Zionist Congress (1903) he intervened vigorously in the Uganda controversy; he regarded the plan as a natural consequence of the detachment of political Zionism from Jewish values.

In 1907 he moved to London and participated in the efforts to obtain the Balfour Declaration (see Weizmann). In 1922 he settled in Palestine.

Baerwald, Alexander – (1877-1930) was born in Germany and educated in the Technische Hochschule in Berlin. He worked as an official architect with the Prussian Public Works Department. In 1909 and 1910 he visited Palestine and in 1924 he settled in Haifa. Buildings he designed in Palestine were influenced by indigenous Arab style. Baerwald designed the Technion building in Haifa and became its first professor of architecture.

Bergman, Samuel Hugo – (1883-1963) studied philosophy in Prague and Berlin. In Prague he joined the Zionist student circle. In 1903 he began to publish articles on Zionist themes. He became acquainted with Martin Buber, who had a lasting influence on him. From 1907 to 1919 Bergman was librarian at the University Library at Prague (except during the First World War, when he served in the Austrian army). In 1920 he immigrated to Palestine and settled in Jerusalem. He became the first director of the National and University Library, a position he held until 1935. Bergman helped found the Workers' Union and was on its executive council. In 1928 he became lecturer in philosophy at the Hebrew University, in 1935 he became professor. He was a member and main spokesman of B'rith Shalom. Bergman was the editor of general philosophy for the Encyclopaedia Hebraica. His two main interests were science and religion. In his views on faith he departed from the prevailing rationalism and anthropocentrism. His attitude to religious problems has been influenced by Rudolf Steiner, Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig, as well as by Christian thinkers and Indian philosophers.

Buber, Martin – (1878-1965) born in Vienna. Philosopher and theologian, Zionist thinker and leader. From 1896 he studied at the universities of Vienna, Leipzig and Zurich, and finally at the University of Berlin. He joined the Zionist movement in 1898, was a delegate to the Third Zionist Congress in 1899, where he spoke of the importance of education as opposed to a propaganda (he was influenced by Ahad Ha'am). This emphasis on cultural rather than political activity led, at the Fifth Zionist Congress in 1901, to the formation of the Zionist Democratic Fraction which stood in opposition to Herzl. Buber took up the study of Hasidism and its religious message and wrote a few books on the subject. In 1923 Buber published his *I and Thou* (1937) which contains the basic formulation of his philosophy of dialogue. In 1925 the first volumes of the German translation of the Bible appeared as the combined effort of Buber and Franz

Rosenzweig. After Rosenzweig's death in 1929 Buber continued the translation alone, and completed it in 1961. In 1925 Buber began to lecture on Jewish religion and ethics at the University of Frankfurt and in 1930 he was appointed professor of religion there. In 1933, with the rise of the Nazis, he was forced to leave. In 1938 Buber immigrated to Palestine and settled in Jerusalem. He was appointed professor of social philosophy at the Hebrew University. He was very active in Ihud (association for dialogue between Arabs and Jews).

Chaikin, Benjamin – (1885-1950) was born and educated in England. In 1920 Chaikin moved to Jerusalem and was employed by the University to become the local associate of Geddes and Mears. He was in charge of the three buildings designed by Geddes and Mears for the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, and of the repairs of the Chemistry and Microbiological Building after the damages caused by the 1927 earthquake. In 1933 the University open theatre was built after his design and in 1934 he proposed a plan for a Jewish Studies building, and in 1941 the Haifa City Hall was built to his design.

Eder, David - (1866-1939) was a well-known psychiatrist in England. Eder was a leading member of the Zionist Organization in Britain, and nominated member of the Zionist Commission in Palestine in 1919. An ardent admirer of Patrick Geddes and his work, he proposed him to the Zionist Organization to design the first master plan for the Hebrew University.

Herzl, Theodor – (1860-1904) born in Budapest and in 1878 moved to Vienna where he entered the university. In 1884 he was granted a doctorate in Law. Playwright and essayist, worked as a reporter for the Paris representative of a Viennese newspaper. In 1894 he covered the Dreifuss trial, which had an enormous effect on him. Author of *Der Judenstaat* (1896) and *Altneuland* (1902). Founder of the Zionist Congress and the Zionist Organization.

Kauffmann, Richard – (1887-1958) was born in Frankfurt-am-Main and studied architecture in Munich under Theodor Fischer (1909-1912), and was thus introduced to the Garden City movement. In Munich he also took a course on agricultural building, probably to be able to contribute to the work of Akiva Jakob Ettinger, a theoretician of the Jewish settlement movement in Palestine. Ettinger was influential on settlement

policy and practice and on his emigration to Palestine in 1918 he became head of the agricultural settlement department of the Zionist Organization. Later Kauffmann studied also in Frankfurt and Darmstadt. In 1919 he won first prize in the Raigorod Competition for the plan of a garden city for Khrakov. Kauffmann worked in Germany and later in Norway and in 1920 he immigrated to Palestine and settled in Jerusalem. In 1939 he became associate architect to Joseph D. Weiss who was in charge of the planning of the Rosenbloom Building in the Hebrew University and in 1944 he was nominated to prepare a University City master plan. A few buildings were under construction when war broke out and Mount Scopus was evacuated. In the 1950s he worked, together with other architects on the new Hebrew University master plan in Giv'at Ram.

Klarwein, Joseph – (1893-1970) architect and town planner, born in Poland and educated as an architect in the Technische Hochschule in Munich. He immigrated to Palestine in 1933. Among his works was *Bet Hakranot* (a commercial complex) in Haifa, The master plan for the Hebrew University campus on Giv'at Ram, and the Knesset (Israeli parliament) in Jerusalem.

Klausner, Joseph – (1874-1958) Hebrew essayist, historian and Zionist; born in Vilna and grew up in Odessa. He studied Philosophy and Semitic languages and received his Ph.D from Heidelberg and succeeded Ahad Ha'am as editor of *Ha'shiloah*, which he edited from 1902 to 1926. He also participated in Zionist activities and was a major Hebrew University promoter. His idea of the University was of an institution that would combine Judaism and Humanism. In 1919 he settled in Jerusalem and with the opening of the Hebrew University was appointed to the chair of Hebrew literature. In 1944 he was appointed professor of Jewish history. His main fields of research were the Second Temple period, the Hebrew language and Hebrew literature.

Kornberg, Fritz - (1889-1944) born in Germany. During the First World War he served in the German army on the east European front, there he was introduced to clay houses built by peasants. After he graduated the Charlottenburg Polytechnic School, he took a special course for building clay houses. Immediately afterwards, in 1920, he immigrated to Palestine, where he presented the Jewish Agency with his idea of the clay house as a quick and cheap solution for immigrants' accommodation. He believed

that if each immigrant could build his own clay house on arrival, the immigrants would benefit from cheap houses, easy to maintain and fit for their individual needs (the suggestion was not accepted). In 1922 Kornberg settled in Jerusalem, where he renewed his acquaintance with Weizmann, whom he had met before during the war. Weizmann offered Kornberg the office as the University architect. Kornberg made the necessary changes in the Gray-Hill residence to prepare it for academic work. He also submitted a master plan for the University, and chose the site on the eastern slope of Mount Scopus for the open-air theatre for which he drew plans. Kornberg built a provisional wooden stage on the open-air theatre site for the official opening of the University in 1925. He also constructed a number of small utility buildings around the campus. Kornberg designed and constructed houses in Haifa, the Ben Shemen agricultural school and Agnon's residence in Talpiot in Jerusalem.

Magnes, Judah Leon - (1877-1948) American born reformed rabbi and the first chancellor (later president) of the Hebrew University. He received his PhD in Semite Studies in the University of Heidelberg in 1902. While in Europe he became active in Zionist circles influenced by Ahad Ha'Am. He had extensive connections with the Jewish aristocracy in the United States and was an ardent Zionist. In 1912 Magnes commenced his activities towards the establishment of the Hebrew University together with Weizmann and other Zionist leaders. But a conflict of opinions came between Magnes and Weizmann. When Weizmann focussed all Zionist prospects on British support at the outbreak of the First World War, Magnes had become an extreme objector to the "imperialistic war" and resigned from the Zionist Organization. He became an active pacifist and therefore what had been regarded Weizmann's great achievements, such as the Balfour Declaration had been conceived by him as unlawful consequences of British imperialism. Magnes immigrated to Palestine in 1922. His involvement with the establishment of the Hebrew University enabled him to contribute on a cultural level rather than on political matters. He became head of the Hebrew University Institute of Jewish Studies, and in 1925 he was appointed first Chancellor of the University, a position he held until 1935, when the Board of Governors named him President.

Magnes supported the *B'nith Shalom* association (the "Alliance for Peace") in Jerusalem; a Jewish organization for rapprochement between Jews and Arabs (founded in 1926) and belonged to a similar organization named *Ichud* ("Unity") which was established a while later.

Rau, Heinz – (1896-1976) an architect, born and educated in Germany. In 1933 Rau immigrated to Palestine. In 1949 was assigned to work under Arie Sharon in the Government Planning Department. Although he was a modernist he was deeply inspired by indigenous Arab architecture. Among his major works were the Giv'at Ram Hebrew University campus master plan, the Hebrew University synagogue (with D. Reznick).

Reznick, David – born and educated in Brazil. As an architecture student Reznick apprenticed at Oskar Miemeyer's office. After immigrating to Israel in 1949 Reznick joined Ze'ev Rechter's office, later he became Heinz Rau's partner and in 1957 opened his own office in Jerusalem. Among his major works are the Kennedy Memorial, the master plan for the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus, the Hyatt Hotel in Jerusalem, the Mormon University on Mount Scopus (with Frank Ferguson).

Rothschild, Baron Edmond de – (1845-1934) philanthropist and patron of Jewish settlement in Palestine; born in Paris. He became active in Jewish affairs in the 1880s following the pogroms in Russia. He took over the support and supervision of a number of Jewish agricultural settlements in Palestine in the late 1880s. In 1900 he established the Jewish Colonization Association (ICA) as a way of improving the management of the colonies, and in 1923 he formed the Palestine Jewish Colonization Organization (PICA), headed by his son James. Rothschild supported the Hebrew University and was made honorary president of the Jewish Agency in 1929.

Rupin, Arthur – (1876-1943) born in Rautisch, Posen; was a sociologist, economist and a leading Zionist official. He directed the Bureau of Jewish Statistics and Demography in Berlin from 1903 to 1907. In 1908 he was appointed head of the Palestine Office by the Zionist Organization and directed the Zionist settlement programme in Palestine. He was a member of the Zionist executive from 1921 to 1927 and 1929 to 1931, and from 1933 to 1935 he headed the Jewish Agency's department for the settlement of German immigrants. His books on the sociology of the Jews were pioneer studies of

their kind. He was a founder and chairman of *Brith Shalom* (an association for the promotion of dialogue between Jews and Arabs).

Shaked, Shmuel – (1937-1999) architect and town planner. Among his major projects were the master plan of the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus (together with Reznick) and Giv'at Shapira neighbourhood in Jerusalem.

Schloessinger, Max - (1877-1944) born in Heidelberg; Semite scholar, merchant, Zionist administrator. He studied at the universities of Berlin and Vienna and at the *Lehranstalt fuer die Wissenschaft des Judentmus* in Berlin. Instructor and librarian at Hebrew Union College from 1904 to 1907, he resigned because of the anti-Zionist stand of the administration. He established a flourishing export-import business in Germany and, following the First World War, in Holland, before moving to Palestine. A member of the board of governors of the Hebrew University, he served at various times as deputy to Magnes in the office of chancellor.

Senator, David Werner – (1896-1953) born in Berlin; he was secretary-general of the European office of the JDC (the Jewish Distribution Committee, which coordinated the overseas relief work of the American Jewish Relief Committee) from 1925 to 1930. He was a member of the Jewish Agency Executive from 1930 representing the non-Zionists, he resigned in 1945 in protest against Zionist movement actions which he believed did not follow its original purpose. Senator was a member of *B'rith-Shalom* and *Ihud* (associations for the promotion of dialogue between Jews and Arabs). After the evacuation of Mount Scopus Senator became the Executive Vice President of the Hebrew University.

Sokolow, Nahum – (1859-1936) born in Poland; a pioneer of Hebrew journalism and a Zionist leader. He was one of the editors of *Ha'zefira* and later of *Ha'olam*. From 1911 he was a member of the Zionist executive and collaborated with Weizmann during the First World War in negotiating the Balfour Declaration. From 1931 to 1935 he was president of the World Zionist Organization.

Ussishkin, Abraham Menahem Mendel - (1863-1941) born in Russia; a Zionist leader, member of *Hovevei-Zion*. He was an early supporter of the Hebrew University and participated in all phases of its organization. From 1923 to 1941 he headed the Jewish

National Fund, residing in Jerusalem and serving on the executive of the Jewish Agency.

Weizmann, Chaim – (1874-1952) - born in the Russian Pale of Settlement. president of the World Zionist Organization between 1920-1931 and 1935-1946. The first president of the state of Israel. Because of the *numerus clausus* policy of Russian universities he studied in the Darmstadt Polytechnic in Germany. Later he moved to Berlin to study Biochemistry at the Institute of Technology in Charlottenburg and joined a Zionist group there. At that time Weizmann's Zionist ideas were very much influenced by Ahad Ha'Am, who defined the object of Jewish nationalism in cultural and spiritual terms. Weizmann became a delegate to the Zionist Congress and participated in the Second Congress in Basle in 1898. The same year he went to the Fribourg University in Switzerland to complete his doctorate. In 1901 he became an assistant lecturer at the Geneva University, and soon became also a prominent figure in the Zionist Movement.

Although he did not doubt Herzl's primacy, he criticized his emphasis on the external forms of diplomacy. On the eve of the Fifth Zionist Congress in Basle (1901), Weizmann and a number of other delegates formed an opposition group, the Democratic Fraction. Their aim was to break out of Zionist's diplomatic emphasis in order to develop cultural, educational and social institutions in Eretz Israel, which would both symbolize and stimulate the concrete work of the state-building. The promotion of a Jewish/Hebrew University was among those efforts.

In 1903 the Zionist Movement was torn apart by the Uganda controversy; at a time of persecution of Russian Jews, the British foreign secretary had tentatively suggested Jewish settlement in Uganda (then an East African Protectorate). Herzl was inclined to accept the offer as a temporary shelter, but the Russian Zionists, led by Ussishkin, would not agree to a Zionism without Zion. Weizmann supported them. Herzl's death in 1904 put an end to the Uganda option.

At the Seventh Zionist Congress (1905) Weizmann became a member of the Larger Actions Committee (GAC), the supreme body in inter-Congress periods. In 1906 he moved to Manchester where he became a researcher and lecturer in the

Manchester University. In Manchester he first met Balfour, the British prime-minister, and explained the Zionist idea to him.

In the Eighth Zionist Congress (1907) Weizmann's suggestion of a "synthetic Zionism", a merge of the two schools of Zionism, the political and the cultural oriented, gained ample support.

During the First World War Weizmann understood the new chances it created for the Zionist cause. He contacted leading British members of cabinet, Herbert Samuel (later the first High Commissioner in Palestine) and Lloyd George, and worked towards a British commitment to permit an establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. In 1916 his access to British ministers was facilitated by his successful establishment of a process that would yield acetone, a solvent needed for the production of munitions. Weizmann then moved to London, where it was easier for him to operate. His efforts were brought to a successful consummation with the Balfour Declaration of 1917, which promised the Jews a national home in Palestine.

In 1918 Weizmann was appointed head of the Zionist Commission sent to Palestine by the British Government to advise on the future settlement and development of the country. He then also took an active part in the laying of the foundation stones for the future Hebrew University. When he was elected president of the Zionist Organization in 1920, it was not without an opposition (especially of the American Zionists), who criticized his pioneering approach and centralized character of organization. In 1930 Weizmann resigned after the British abandonment of the obligations toward the Zionists. As he was not reelected, Weizmann then concentrated on his scientific work; he laid the foundations of the Daniel Sieff Institute at Rehovot in Palestine (later burgeoned into the Weizmann Institute of Science).

In 1937 a British Royal Commission agreed, under Weizmann's prodding, to recommend the establishment of a Jewish state in a part of Palestine (the Peel agreement). The Arabs rejected the proposal. After the Second World War, Weizmann's influence both in the Zionist Movement and in the British Government had lessened. Other Jewish leaders were on the political scene during the 1948-1949. When the state was established Weizmann was nominated president (a ceremonial office).

Glossary

Aliyah – Literally, “ascent”; *aliyah* means a return to Eretz-Israel (or Jewish emigration). The act of returning was believed to be a spiritual elevation as well as a physical ascent. *Aliyah* refers to the return of both an individual and an organized group. The first great return ended the exile in Babylon. Mass immigration was renewed in 1882, with the *aliyah* of the Biluim. A practise of numbering the “waves” of immigration was introduced by the immigrants of the Second *Aliyah* in order to distinguish themselves from their predecessors and successors. The numbering usually ends at five with the outbreak of the Second World War: First *Aliyah*, 1882-1902; Second *Aliyah*, 1904-14; Third *Aliyah*, 1919-23; Fourth *Aliyah*, 1924-28; and Fifth *Aliyah*, 1932-39.

Subsequent waves were described either in reference to their sociological and geographical composition (the Youth *Aliyah* or the *Aliya* from North Africa) or in reference to their status (clandestine immigration, also known as *Aliyah Bet*).

Bilu – an acronym of *Beit Ya'akov lechu ve nelcha*: “O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us go” (Isaiah 2:5). The name of a Jewish pre-Zionist organization in East Europe, similar to Hibat-Zion. The Biluyim constituted the First *Aliyah* (see *Aliyah*) and established the *moshavot* at the outset of modern Jewish colonization of Palestine.

Biluim – Members of Bilu.

Diaspora – Jews living in the “dispersion” outside Eretz-Israel; area of Jewish settlement outside Eretz-Israel.

EAC - “*Engere Aktions Comite*”, the reduced executive of the Zionist Organization, also known as **SAC**.

Eretz-Israel – Literally, the “Land of Israel” – the land of the people of Israel.

The term first appears in 1 Sam. 13:9, meaning “the land where the Israelites dwell.” *Eretz-Israel* should not be confused with the kingdom of Israel, or the northern kingdom founded by Jeroboam I (933-911 B. C.). The frontiers of

the land of Israel have changed a great deal over the centuries, from those promised to Abraham to those included in mandatory Palestine in 1922. The Scriptures use a number of terms to describe the country: "the Holy Land", the "land of beauty", "the desirable land", "the land of the Hebrews". The Romans named it Palestine after the Bar Kochba revolt in 135 A. D.

GAC - "Grosses Aktions Komitee", the enlarged executive of the Zionist Organization.

Haddassah – the Women's Zionist Organization of America, the largest Zionist organization in the world, it began as one of several Zionist women's study circles, in scattered regions of the United States, at the turn of the century. In 1912 the Hadassah chapters were formed and in 1916 they were called upon by the World Zionist Organization to organize a medical relief group to deal with the wartime health emergency. Within a few years the organization became known as the Hadassah Medical Organization, an all-pervading medical presence in Palestine offering medical aid to Arabs as well as Jews. Negotiations with the Hebrew University began in 1925, to advance the establishment of a Medical Centre and in 1936 an agreement was achieved which brought about the building of the medical Centre in 1938. In 1960 a new Hadassah-University Medical Centre was opened in Ein-Karem in Jerusalem.

Hibat-Zion – Literally, "the Love of Zion". A Jewish movement of East European Jews who believed in a national revival by settlement of Jews in Eretz-Israel, prior to the Zionist Organization.

Hovevei-Zion – Literally, "lovers of Zion". The federation of "Hibat Zion" movement.

ICA – the Jewish Colonization Association (1900-1924), which later became **PICA**, the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association (1924-1957). ICA was not motivated by the Zionist vision of Jewish settlement in Eretz-Israel. In fact it was an anti-Zionist philanthropic association, interested in a productive solution for a limited number of Jews in Palestine.

KKL (*Keren Kayemet Le'Israel*) or JNF (Jewish National Fund) – Fund for afforestation and reclamation of the land of Israel, originally established as the executive arm of the World Zionist Organization to purchase land on which the national homeland could be created.

The idea was first brought up by Herman Shapira at the 1st Zionist Congress (1897). It suggested that the land to be bought by the Fund could be neither sold nor mortgaged, thus remaining in perpetuity the property of the Jewish people. It was to be leased to Jewish settlers for 49 year periods. Action was taken on the proposal after the 5th Zionist Congress (1901). Contributions began to pour in at once, and that same year two fund-raising tools were established: the blue collection box, many thousands of which were placed in Jewish homes and schools all over the world; and the KKL stamp. Both box and stamp had become important educational vehicles.

During the KKL's early years the struggle between the adherents of the political approach, who opposed settlement efforts and land acquisition until political rights were secured for the Jewish settlers in Palestine, and those who insisted on starting practical settlement work at once, remained unresolved. The 6th Zionist Congress resolved to begin land acquisition, thus taking the first stage in favour of the latter approach.

Menachem Ussishkin (see biographical notes) was chairman of KKL from 1923 up to 1941 (the year of his death). He was the driving spirit of it, lent it prestige and made it a major financial as well as educational factor in Zionist activity.

***Kibbutz* (pl. *kibbutzim*) – Literally, "collective". A large-size commune, a collective settlement in *Eretz-Israel*, originally founded mainly on agriculture.**

***Moshava* (pl. *moshavot*) – Literally, "colony"; a private agricultural settlement.**

The first Jewish agricultural settlements in *Eretz-Israel* were called *moshavot*.

They were founded at the time of the First *Aliyah* (except for Petah Tikva, which was founded in 1876). Most *moshavot* have now grown into towns.

PLDC – Palestine Land Development Co.

World Zionist Organization – founded by Theodor Herzl at the First Zionist Congress in Basel in August 1897. Following is the resolution adopted at the congress which has been known as the Basel Program:

The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law.

The Congress contemplates the following means to the attainment of this end:

1. The promotion, on suitable lines, of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers.
2. The organization and binding together of the whole of Jewry by means of appropriate institutions, local and international, in accordance with the laws of each country.
3. The strengthening and fostering of Jewish National sentiment and national consciousness.
4. Preparatory steps towards obtaining government consent, where necessary, to the attainment of the aim of Zionism".

The World Zionist Organization undertook to defend the Zionist cause before the various governments and devoted most of its financial resources (based on contributions) and energies to promoting Jewish settlement in Palestine and encouraging immigration to the country.

In 1901 the World Zionist Organization established the *Keren Kayemet*, to collect contributions for the rehabilitation of land and reforestation in Eretz Israel. But the main financial institution of the World Zionist Organization (and later of the Jewish Agency, established to represent the Jewish people before the mandatory government) was *Keren Hayesod*, founded in 1920.

Yishuv – Literally "settling", "inhabited area", or "small locality". Also "the Jewish population of Eretz-Israel", a meaning that the immigrants of the First *Aliyah* gave the term. The people of the Second *Aliyah* distinguished between the Old and the New *Yishuv*, that is, between the Jewish population settled in the country before the 1880s and the people who came from the First *Aliyah* on. The word can also signify, depending on its context, "political entity" (the Jews of Palestine) or the historical period from 1882 to 1948.

