

ABSTRACTS

Education and Educational Frameworks in the Jewish and Templer Villages towards the end of the Ottoman Period

Nava Dekel and Naftali Thalmann

Education was of primary importance in the villages of the Jews and the German Templers during the final years of the Ottoman Empire, since they perceived it as the main way of forging a new society they wish to establish. That is why both communities devoted a great deal of thought to educational issues.

This article presents the main aspects of the educational work, undertaken in the Templers' villages, as compared with that carried out in the Jewish ones. The subjects focused on are their educational aims, the way the schools were structured and organized, the curricula, the language of instruction, the textbooks and the teachers. The comparison is based on primary sources, relating to the two communities.

The comparison reveals that the structuring of the educational systems and the design of the Jewish and the Templer schools differed, because they belonged to different national, social and religious entities. Both communities adhered to explicit educational principles, stemming from the ideologies, on which their ways of life were based. In most of the educational domains no evidence of direct mutual influence could be found. The Templers continued to lead their German way of life; as to education, they preserved their homeland's pedagogic and organizational traditions. In the Jewish villages, education was based on a variety of ideologies and practices, ranging from the old traditional approach to philanthropic education, stemming from the values of the Enlightenment and national education.

The article also describes the influence of the theories of European pedagogues such as Froebel and Pestalozzi on the educators in both communities, and highlights the importance of these imported theories, in particular as regards the educational methods implemented by them. In spite of the similarities in this respect, there is no indication of any direct mutual influence generated between

the Jewish and Templer communities, such as did indeed exist in other spheres, and in particular in that of agriculture.

University — or Yeshiva as in Yavne?
Comments and Clarifications regarding Education
in Gadera (1893–1919)

Yosef Lang

The Bilu founders of Gadera were young, imbued with national fervor, guided by a clear social and educational vision. Their encounter with the excruciating reality in Eretz Israel and the social changes that occurred in the colony fundamentally changed that vision, and the initial ideology gave way to a conservative outlook, dictated by the basic need to survive. As a result, their educational ideas could not be implemented, and in view of the lack of financial and intellectual resources, the educational system could not be established. For many years Gadera remained a small village while the Jewish Yishuv was expanding, and therefore education within it did not receive the consideration it deserved; were it not for the Odessa Committee and the involvement of Y. M. Pines, it may not have been possible to keep it going. The parents, who took considerable interest in their children's education and also to some extent participated in it actively, found it difficult to keep on paying the fees to cover its maintenance and the teachers' salaries. Moreover, they sometimes disagreed regarding the framework of the studies and the desirable curricula, and two factions sprang up in Gadera, as in the other villages of the First Aliyah: those calling for a regular scholar, as opposed to Torah education.

Educational-Social Initiatives in Tel Aviv during the
British Mandate

Hagit Klibanski

The article describes the first attempts to establish an education system in Tel-Aviv during the years 1920–1948. The first part of the article deals briefly with the establishment of formal educational institutions and non-formal

organizations. The second part discusses the reasons and factors that influenced the educational policy and management, focuses on the middle class world-view of the Tel Aviv municipality, headed by Meir Dizengoff, the first mayor, and most of the town's residents.

**Shulamit Music School:
Launching Musical Education in Eretz Israel, 1910–1948
Zipora Shehory-Rubin**

On November 1st 1910, at the last years of the Ottoman era, Shulamit Ruppin opened a private school in Jaffa. Ruppin was a music teacher, focusing on voice training of singers. It was the first professional musical institution in this country, and according to its founder, was to provide high-level musical education for the benefit of the country's youth, to develop and enhance the appreciation of classical music throughout Eretz Israel.

Jaffa's residents received the establishment of the musical institution enthusiastically; Yaffo had already become an organized cultural and social center of the new Jewish 'Yishuv', a favorite resort, where people from the villages ('moshavot') liked to gather to spend their vacations. Jaffa's residents, many of whom had come from Europe and were accustomed to a rich cultural ambiance in their countries of origin, enjoyed the musical activities, organized by the school for the wider public, endowing with cultural content the void permeating the country in which they now lived. In the course of time, the institution became firmly embedded within the local community life, turned into "the town's adornment and was considered by Middle Eastern musicians an extremely well organized professional musical institution". The institution succeeded in training generations of music teachers, involved in all fields of music throughout the country, expanded the circle of music lovers and contributed to the development of musical appreciation among Hebrew youth. A year after the foundation of the school in Jaffa, Shulamit Ruppin established a branch in Jerusalem, also warmly welcomed by the city's residents. These two schools are considered the pioneers of musical education in this country, and in 1912, after Shulamit's death in the prime of life, both schools were given her name, The Shulamit Conservatoire.

Thus the aims of the article are to describe the work of the “Shulamit music school”, the first in the country, that laid the foundations of musical education in Eretz Israel; to provide details regarding the motives for its establishment by Shulamit Ruppin; to emphasize its goals and distinct functions during the period of the first and second waves of immigration; to point out the difficulties and dilemmas involved, which were also an inseparable part of musical development in the country; to sum up its contribution to the development of music in Eretz Israel in general and in schools and kindergartens in particular; and to portray the first Zionist music teachers who immigrated in order to teach in the Shulamit Conservatoire.

The Jewish Leadership in the Ghettos during the Holocaust As a Subject Taught in Israeli Schools (1948–2008)

Idit Gil

The Holocaust is the only subject in the Israeli national school curriculum imposed by the 1980 Compulsory Education Law, and consequently a fundamental component of the school history curriculum. Holocaust consciousness has been significantly transformed in both Israeli collective memory and in the way it is enhanced in the education system. Among the various issues pertaining to the Holocaust, the issue of the Jewish leadership in the ghettos has undergone the most revisions. This includes the leaders of the youth movements, the Judenrat (Jewish Councils), the Jewish police and the Aid and Rescue Committee and its representatives, Joel Brand and Israel (Rudolf) Kasztner. The article examines the teaching of each of these leaderships in Israeli high schools' history classes, focusing on the changes that have occurred in the public discourse and the educational programs. It covers 51 textbooks, 3 clusters of summaries and 69 matriculation examinations during three periods, namely the Zionist Period (1948–1977), with the aim of drawing nationalist lessons; the Humanist Period (1977–1999), aiming at promoting humanist values; and the Democratic Period (1999–), wishing to strengthen understanding and empathy. The article sheds new light on four main issues: how teaching about the Jewish leadership in the ghettos during each period reflects the unique characteristics of that period; how the changes in the way of teaching reflect both the changes in public discourse and the Ministry of

Education's goals; how historical research has permeated the teaching of the Holocaust; and the differences between the official textbooks and the actual teaching, by reviewing the content of the textbooks and their terminology, unofficial texts and matriculation exams.

Subjects discussed by Teachers' Organizations — Browsing
through Leading Articles in the Bulletins Hed Hachinuh
and Eye Contact 1980–2003

Nirit Reichel

In Israel, teachers' organizations have an influence on the education system, its aims, and their realization in practice. Ministers of Education are conscious of the need for cooperation with two teachers' organizations, and for according respect to the teachers' representatives.

This article seeks out the main subjects preoccupying the heads of the two professional teachers' organizations, their expectations, and the similarities and differences in the topics they discuss. I carried out the study by browsing through the organizations' bulletins Hed Hachinuh and Eye Contact.

The discussion in this article focuses on the period 1980–2003, on the expanded interpretation of the concept 'statehood' as reflected in education, characterizing the 1980s, and until the appointment of the Dovrat Committee, a public committee, "with the aim to carry out a comprehensive examination of the Israeli education system and to recommend an all-inclusive plan for changes in the pedagogic, structural and organizational spheres, also outlining the steps towards its implementation" (cited from the report).

The study is based on the qualitative paradigm, containing a variety of methods used in the investigation of phenomena and processes, based on the researcher's subjective stance. A historical case study is one of the possible ways of carrying out qualitative-historical research and this is, in fact, the central component of the discussion. The bulletins of the teachers' organizations are a unique tool, reflecting the subjects preoccupying them and their attitudes on these matters. An examination of their attitudes along a timeline, while raising questions regarding definitions, aims and methods of implementation, is related to history as a discipline, focusing on the investigation of education.

In the bulletin Hed Hachinuh I surveyed the editorials (appearing under

various titles) and the leading articles (entitled 'personal talk'), in 200 issues, published during the years 1980–2003. In *Eye Contact* I reviewed "From the Editor's Notebook" (editorial, the editor's column) and "The Editorial" in 131 issues.

The research reveals that there are salient similarities in the main topics preoccupying both professional organizations, and also considerable differences. The most prominent similarity is evident in their perception of the role of the teacher as agent of socialization, whose main responsibility is education for good citizenship. This perception of the role overshadows other perceptions of the teacher's role, prevalent in educational research, in the field and in the declarations of the ministers of Education and the ministry CEOs.

The main difference between the topics raised in the bulletins stems from the range of the various components of the profession they relate to. The heads of the teachers' organizations mainly share with their readers their thoughts about professional expertise and the economic aspects of the profession. The heads of the Teachers' Union (Histadrut Hamorim) discuss in *Hed Hahinuch* a variety of issues stemming from a wider perception of the essence of teaching as a profession, viewing their organization as a truly professional one.

It is noteworthy that in spite of the substantial progress in the social perception of the teacher's role, neither bulletin perceives the role of the teacher as a social one; neither bulletin deals with 'critical education', nor guides their members towards it, and towards social initiatives, activities aimed at radical social change as political agents, in a struggle for specific principles or values.

Various Perspectives in Historiography of Education: Examples from the Haifa University School of Education (1964–1983)

Yuval Dror

The article suggests various possible approaches to the historiography of education for the use of researchers, teachers and students (i.e. the contents and methods — "what?" and "how?"), which can be combined when investigating the history of education. These approaches are presented via examples from research concerning the gradual involvement of the Haifa University School of Education during the years 1964 to 1983, and additional examples from

two articles discussing its expansion. This case study was chosen since it includes academic units of various types, requiring the implementation of various analytical methods. First the article examines the terms 'perspectives', 'approaches', 'aspects', and 'domains' as used in educational and general historiography, and the term chosen is 'perspectives', as the most appropriate terminological framework, complementing the existing historiographical terms.

The body of the articles contains 10 perspectives, exemplified by means of the various units: 1. The institutional perspective (the School of Education at the Haifa University in general, and the experimental school connected to it). 2. The ideological perspective (the training of teachers for the sake of the development of Haifa and the north; the establishment of the Institute for Research on the Arab Education and its Development as affirmative action; the dispute between "the progressive group" and "the conservatives" regarding the experimental school). 3. The dilemma perspective (the dilemma between "academia" and the "field": Haifa University during the first two decades that shaped it, compared to the initial academic institution that preceded it in Haifa, the Hebrew Technion, in the years 1924 to 1948). 4. The curricular perspective (the curriculum department, working in cooperation with the curriculum center at the Ministry of Education and Culture and the programs of the academic departments and the division for in-service training). 5. The methodological-didactic perspective (the teaching and learning laboratories and the journals *Studies in Education*, *Studies in Educational Administration and Organization* and *Reading Circles*). 6. The systemic perspective (the organizational hierarchic structure of the School of Education per se and in its connection with the university and its external systemic links with the Ministry of Education). 7. The community perspective (projects and activities, lectures and programs in academic colleges in the periphery, carried out in Haifa and the north by the community of the School of Education). 8. The population perspective (the Institute for Research on the Arab Education and its Development, 1973–1983). 9. The comparative perspective (the academic courses for the training of principals at the Haifa University compared to those at the Oranim College of Education of the Kibbutz Movement). 10. The personal perspective (the researchers and heads of the School of Education). The appendix contains additional examples of studies in Israel and worldwide, using varieties of the proposed perspectives.

The Education System of Alliance Israélite Universelle in Iran — was it Centralized?

Avraham Cohen

The education system of Alliance (Kol Israel Haverim) established its institutions in many countries in the Middle East and North Africa. While studying the characteristics of this network in any one of these countries, one is likely to come across the a priori hypothesis that it is centralized, that each of its institutions for boys and girls is in the hands of the principal, as mandated by the headquarter in Paris. This hypothesis may well be justified, since the education system in France and in countries under its influence adopted a policy of centralization. We may presume that Alliance also adhered to this policy.

In this article I examine this issue in the Alliance institutions in Iran from 1898 until the beginning of the Second World War. I have found that the network of these schools in Iran was not centralized in the usual way, neither in the organizational sphere, nor pedagogically. The management and the principals in these Alliance schools did not function as though they were merely administrators, implementing decisions made by others, lacking opportunities to use their own imagination and initiative. This phenomenon was due to a variety of factors, mainly to the distinct nature of Alliance as an organization rooted in Jewish solidarity; the tremendous distance from the headquarter; the situation of the Jewish citizens in Iran; the dispersion of the Jews in that country; and the political developments in Iran.

Educational literature dealing with centralization usually describes education systems as controlled by the Ministry of Education, located in the capital of the sovereign state, or by the Federal Government. When the characteristics of the organization of the Alliance schools in the various eastern countries are investigated, the network is likely to appear as an interesting mosaic, centralized neither at the level of the state, nor at the federal level; it will emerge as a **global network**. May this article prove to be the first modest step in that direction.

The Jassi Yeshiva

Yakov Geller

The first yeshiva on a high school level was established in **Jassi**, ‘Mother City of Israel’, the capital of the Moldavian district in ‘Old Romania’. In the year 1930, 35% of the population were Jews, numbering 35,463 residents. The yeshiva was founded by Aharon Weinreich, and bears his name — “**The House of Aharon Yeshiva.**”

At the yeshiva some 100 students studied Torah, the prophetic books and Halacha, and also various science subjects; the final certificate was entitled “**Yeshiva with a High School Course**”. The examinations were set by the Ministry of Education, and therefore the yeshiva received official recognition by the Romanian government. I have found a copy of a rare certificate, dated 18th February 1930, granted by this yeshiva to student Efraim Grinberg from the town of Kishinev, the capital of the Bessarabian region, who studied there for three years, from its founding in 1927 until 1930. It states that the student Efraim Grinberg is well versed in the Old Testament, in the Hebrew language and in Jewish religion. He kept this rare document for 50 years, under the watchful eyes of the communist regime in the USSR, which had annexed Bessarabia, and where anything written in Hebrew aroused suspicions. In 1980 Grinberg immigrated to Israel and worked in the Zionist archives of the Bar-Ilan University. I interviewed him and he gave me a copy of that certificate.

The head of the Yeshiva, **Rabbi Shlomo Yosef Markovitz**, the Chief Rabbi of Jassi, President of the Court of Justice, **Rabbi Haim Rabinovith**, **Rabbi Yoel Ashkenazi**, and the principal of the yeshiva, **Rabbi Yakov Yitzhak Wahrman** examined the graduates and granted them a **teacher’s certificate ‘de jure’**. This article includes the teaching certificates, granted to **Rabbi Yitzhak Zimiring**, **Zalman Hochman and Israel Levanon**.

The following are also graduates of the yeshiva: **Professor Yonah David of Tel Aviv University**; **Professor Menahem Brayer of the Yeshiva University in New York**; **Dr. Yehezkiel Marek** of Bar-Ilan University, who served as Chief Rabbi in place of the late Rabbi M.D. Rosen; **Tzvi Leibovitz**, Rabbi in Bucharest, in Vienna, and principal of a school in Raanana; **Rabbi Eli Taper** in Bnei Brak; **Rabbi Israel Portugal**, Hassidic Rabbi, son of the Hassidic Rabbi of Scoleni, Rabbi **Eliezer Zosha Portugal** of Bucharest and New York, and others.

The graduates of the yeshiva also served as ritual slaughterers and supervisors, and as teachers of Hebrew and Judaism in schools and Talmud Torah in communities.

To sum up: The Jassi yeshiva was the only possible route to teaching for young people in 'Old Romania' — where 300,000 Jews lived between the two World Wars — after the closing of the Buhusi yeshiva, seat of the Hassidic Rabbi of the house, Rabbi Yisrael from Ruzin.

However, the three other regions of 'Old Romania' had the following yeshivot: in Bessarabia yeshivat Kishinev; in Bukovina four yeshivot: in Chernovitz, in Viznitz, Siret and Banila; in Transilvania, the Torah Center in Romania, there were 60 yeshivot with about 4,000 students, providing rabbis, slaughterers and other religious ministrants for the whole country, for the approximately 800,000 Jews residing in it until the Holocaust.