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In Need of a New Story: Writing, Teaching and Learning History In Mandatory Palestine

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of D.Phil., The University of Oxford, History Faculty, Trinity Term 2015 By Yoni H. Furas, St. Antony’s College, Oxford

This study looks at history teaching as a reflection of the circumstances and interests that shaped the nature of Palestinian society, Arab and Jewish, in mandate Palestine. It examines the pedagogical and political roots of educational segregation between Arabs and Jews, tracing the causes that turned it into an impervious practice and explores the engagement of both communities with the education of the national other and the reciprocal influence of this engagement on both education systems.

The thesis examines the sociology of particularly Arab, but also Hebrew knowledge, focusing on who wrote history textbooks and why, what were the cultural and intellectual influences involved in this process, and how was history instrumentalised for the creation of a new identity, shedding light on the conscious or unconscious manner in which colonial historiographic paradigms wrote themselves into these textbooks. The juxtaposition of Arabic and Hebrew textbooks underlines the centrality of the conflict in moulding exclusive notions of collectivity and territoriality through the narration of the past.

The second part of the project discusses the institutionalisation of this historiography into an educational policy, through curricula, syllabi and exams. I focus on the colonial logic behind this policy, highlighting its inconsistent educational rationale. By analysing the pedagogic discourse of Arab educators and essays written by students, I argue that a growing community of educators and students countered the British policy, seeking to make sense and find an authentic voice within the contours of colonial reality. The thesis concludes with an examination of the teaching of history beyond the history course, analysing the omnipresence of history in the students’ lives and their interpretation of it, underlying the differences between the Arab and Hebrew communities in their ability to disseminate a shared, historical consciousness. This analysis of Arabic and Hebrew sources discloses the uncanny resemblance between the production of historical education in both communities, which nonetheless contributed in both cases to driving them apart rather than opening any space for commonality.
Abstract

This study looks at history teaching and education as a reflection of the intellectual, social, and political circumstances and interests that shaped the nature of Palestinian society, Arab and Jewish, in mandate Palestine. It tells the story of the emergence of a modern education system and the structuring of a history syllabus under British colonial rule; a complex yet fruitful encounter between colonial education officials, local educators and authors of history textbooks and young students, all operating under the impossibility of Palestine's mandate. These well-intentioned colonial officials sought to spread literacy in general and the knowledge of history in particular, but one that was harmless, benign. Conflictingly, local educators embraced the benevolent gospel of British progress, yet sought to imbue it with their own identities. These educators were in need of a new story; they wrote it, taught it and negotiated its outlines with the British.

The thesis begins with the examination of pedagogical and political roots of educational segregation between Arabs and Jews, tracing the causes that turned it into an impervious, unchallenged practice. Built on this impervious concept of separation, I then move to explore the engagement of both communities with the education of the national other and the reciprocal influence of this engagement on both education systems. A central part of the study is dedicated to the sociology of particularly Arab, but also Hebrew knowledge under British colonial rule, focusing on who wrote history textbooks and why, what were the cultural and intellectual influences involved in this process, and how history was instrumentalised for the creation of a new identity. The close reading of this historiography sheds light on the conscious or unconscious manner in which colonial historiographic paradigms wrote themselves into these textbooks. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of Arabic and Hebrew textbooks underlines the centrality of the conflict in moulding exclusive notions of collectivity and territoriality and the echoes of the conflict over the future of Palestine in the narration of its past.

The second part of the project discusses the institutionalisation of this historiography and its tabulation into an official educational policy, through curricula, syllabi and exams. I focus on the colonial logic behind this policy and highlight its inconsistent educational rationale, a reflection of the inconsistencies that characterised British policy in Palestine. By analysing the pedagogic discourse of history teaching and the increasing production of local history textbooks, I argue that the British policy was countered by a growing community of
educators, primarily in the elite secondary schools, that sought to make sense and find an authentic voice within the contours of the colonial reality. The thesis concludes with the ‘products’ of this community’s pedagogy, the students of the secondary schools. It analyses their quest for authenticity and the role of history within this quest. They were a young generation, born into the colonial experience, lost between historical tropes of superiority and inferiority, East and West, creatively assembling an identity and creating a path that reconciles these cultural-historical tensions.

The variety of sources employed in this study--archival materials, memoirs, school journals, school syllabi and curricula, and interviews--allow its multi-layered analysis. The combination of Hebrew with Arabic sources discloses the uncanny resemblance in the engagement with modern national history between the Arab and Jewish communities. Additionally, the use of sources in both languages illuminates the critical influence the conflict had on the teaching and writing of history on Arab and Jewish communities from the inception of the mandate period. While keeping a safe distance from the national other, the constant peek over the fence shaped both communities’ consciousness of self. This research demonstrates that the process of forging a national narrative cannot be understood without the acknowledgment of this reciprocity.

A chapter of the thesis, “We the Semites”, discussing the adoption of analogous racial categories in Arab and Hebrew textbooks will be published by Berghahn, New York, in 2015 in a volume titled Levantine Chronotopes.
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Introduction

In practical politics the vital thing is not what men really are, but what they think they are. This simple truth, so often overlooked, is actually of tremendous import.¹

Zionists and Great Britain appeal to history to confirm their claim. Because at one period in history the Jews conquered this land and lived in it, hence… they should possess it forever. The Argument contains more of poetry in it than logic. According to it the Arab should claim Spain since once upon a time, they conquered it and there developed a high civilization.²

For over a century Palestine’s past has served as an overly excavated archaeological site, where claims to the rightful ownership of the country’s past have been continuously used as a charter—a Kushan—for current policy.³ The teaching of history in the schools of both the Arab and Jewish communities has played, and continues to play, a fundamental role in this debate, moulding the chaotic past as taught linear national narratives.⁴ This study seeks to trace, elucidate and interpret the grassroots of these national-educational self-portraits.

The thesis looks at history teaching and education in general as a reflection of the intellectual, social, and political circumstances (and interests) that shaped the nature of Palestinian society, among both Arabs and Jews, in mandate Palestine. It tells the story of the emergence of a modern education system and the structuring of a history curriculum and syllabus under British colonial rule, within new epistemic and physical borders drawn after the end of the First World War. The study of education in mandate Palestine unveils the advantages, catastrophes and paradoxes of this new world order, a quasi-nation-state with an elusive raison d’État raised on the ruins of a centuries-old Ottoman superstructure.

---

¹ Lothrop T. Stoddard, “Pan-Turanism”.
² Deputation of Executive Committee of the Haifa Congress before the Secretary of State for the Colonies at the Government House, 28 March 1921, CO, 733/2/60, TNA.
³ Kushan- an Ottoman land-deed.
John Darwin casts light on the intricacy of understanding this order. “Viewed as a political or administrative entity”, Darwin states, "British imperialism remained […] unfinished, untidy, a mass of contradictions, aspirations and anomalies. Defined as the exercise of sovereign power… the British Empire in its heyday was largely a sham” and as an imperial system “had no logic at all”. In the Middle East, the British had “no energy to invest and no capital to send” and their involvement remained “narrow and shallow”.5

An evaluation of this sort is possible only in retrospect. For the history majors at Oxford or Cambridge who chose to pursue a career in colonial education, nothing could be farther from the truth. To the colonial education officers who carried the gospel of the civilising mission in their hearts, training for imperial rule was both the means and the end. As an Oxford professor of colonial history proclaimed in 1910, “Every school building is a citadel of Empire and every teacher its sentinel”.6 The rise of the British Empire was paralleled with the growing significance attributed to the study of history in all levels of education. For both historians and educators, history became the theory of everything, vital for the cultivation of a civic virtue, set as a moral statement of defence for the empire and serving as a documented truth of British technological, constitutional and financial superiority.7 The British brought this pedagogic vocation to Palestine.

The ascendance of history instruction as a means for imparting a collective memory and shared notions of collective identity was not confined to the British Isles or Europe. The seeds of the Nahḍa and Tehiyah, the Arab and Hebrew cultural-national renaissance movements, had already been sown during the nineteenth century. Both movements revived and refurbished their respective languages and history, two inseparable processes, as an articulation of their

---

6 Hugh Egerton, 1910, the first Beit Professor of Colonial History at Oxford, quoted from, Richard Symonds, *Oxford and Empire*, 47.

identity. This intellectual endeavour was primarily dominant in the field of education. Since the late nineteenth century, Ottoman, Egyptian and Jewish schools in Palestine and Europe taught a secularised version of history, a product of the work of Ottoman, Arab and Jewish pedagogues. Although restricted to the schools of small elites, the past was already in the hands of these communities when the new and troubled Middle East was brought to life.

A modernised version of history was there, for the Arabs; but learning it was a privilege of few. Citadels and sentinels were easy to spot in Oxford, but rare in mandate Palestine, where, until the very end of the period, the bulk of the Arab population – about two thirds – remained deprived of minimal education. This was so while the vast majority of Jewish children enjoyed access to elementary education. A governmental report for the 1942-1943 school year, comparing school age population (5-15 years) with attendance in all schools (government and private), contained the following data, illustrating this point:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Total school-age population</th>
<th>School attendance</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>268,000</td>
<td>70,753 (including students under 5 and over 15)</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>26,705</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>91,321</td>
<td>Over a hundred percent, as attendance includes students under 5 and over 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While focusing on colonial educational policy as a whole we should keep in mind the limited attention and meagre financial investment the British actually provided for the development of education in Palestine, compared to other departments in the mandate. Expenditure on education never exceeded 6.4 percent while in most documented yearly budgets it ranged between 4-5 percent, and 3.9 percent in 1944-1945, a share considerably lower than

8 Government of Palestine, Department of Education, Statistical Tables and Diagrams for the Scholastic Year 1942-43, 65.9/1-301, ISA, 33.
expenditure on security or public works (18-31 percent) and only slightly higher than health, for example.⁹

The Palestinian Arab press closely followed this policy. Arabic newspapers during the three decades of the mandate reflected the ambivalence of the Arab attitude to colonial education. Almost every issue published informative and often favourable accounts of the inauguration of new schools and the constructive deeds of educators in general. These were coupled with growing criticism, culminating in the 1940s, of the incapacity of the British to address the country's educational needs and of their depriving thousands of children of basic education. The state schooling system was criticised for its irrelevant curriculum and tendency to distance the students from their national heritage. Especially towards the end of the mandate, the Palestinian national movement demanded the same autonomy enjoyed by the Jews and the freedom to run their own education system.

A “mass of contradictions, aspirations and anomalies” lay at the heart of British educational strategy in Palestine and was evident in all aspects of their policy there. Except for the very limited education budget that practically prevented significant progress in literacy, the Department of Education had to translate the British Imperial educational policy in Palestine, full of contradictions as it was, into a workable educational rationale. The Department was thus forced to balance between securing the establishment of a national home for one of the country's communities and spreading literacy and progress through education amongst the other, majority community, to which the mandate only gave vague and partial promises. At least on the declarative and visionary level, education was meant to help in resolving, or mitigating, these national-political contradictions. Leading British and Zionist educators strongly believed in the power of education in breaking national barriers and promoting

⁹ Jacob Norris, *Land of Progress*, 13–14, 117; Bowman’s criticism on insufficient government support to village education, Ylana N. Miller, *Government and Society*, 159.
understanding between the two peoples. Such beliefs never materialised into action. Rather, education emerged as promoting animosity and prejudice, cementing the walls of communal segregation rather than breaking them. History instruction played a decisive role in this separatist pedagogy.

Under these terms, it is no surprise that Humphrey Bowman, the man who laid the foundations of British education in Palestine and headed the Department from its inception until late 1936, repeatedly tendered his resignation from his post from the early 1920s onward.\textsuperscript{10} “The position has been bad enu.[enough] for me, and for a newcomer it wd. [would] be worse”, Bowman wrote in May 1926.\textsuperscript{11} After every letter of resignation, Bowman was cajoled into staying: “like Moses and Pharaoh... [the High Commissioner told him] I will not let my people go”, he wrote ironically.\textsuperscript{12} The various notebooks of Bowman’s diary are intriguing not only for his (nearly) illegible handwriting, but also because they reflect the complexity of his role. The architect of British colonial education in Palestine simply did not want to be there and reluctantly manoeuvred between the apparent contradictions, until he left on the eve of the Arab Revolt. Nevertheless, he dedicated most of his adult life to the education of Arabs across the empire, for his part remained loyal to his ideals, and established a functioning education system in Palestine.

On the ground, the Arab education system featured a tense encounter between colonial education officials, local educators, authors of history textbooks and young students. Well-intentioned, colonial officials sought to spread literacy in general and the knowledge of history in particular, but one that was harmless, benign. Local educators, for their part, worked in cooperation with imperial rule yet in a volatile equilibrium. The hierarchical structure of the colonial Education Department embodied this equilibrium. While headed by a British man-on-

\textsuperscript{10} Bowman’s diary, 30 December 1923, Bowman files, MECA.
\textsuperscript{11} Bowman’s diary, 13 May 1926, ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Bowman’s diary, 25 July 1934, ibid.
the-spot, the Director of Education (DoE) and a number of British bureaucrats, the Department's officialdom from the highest to the lowest echelons was predominantly Arab. As we shall see, most Arab employees that climbed the occupational ladder in the Department, the leading pedagogues of the Arab community, remained loyal to the government in the best and worst of times. They embraced the benevolent gospel of British progress, while at the same time seeking to imbue it with their own independent vision of identity and nationhood. Thus, the modern instruction of history, a product of this intricate encounter, materialised as an inextricable amalgamation of colonial modernism and nationalism.

Collaborative and embracing as they were, the modus operandi of these local educators was based on awareness of the colonial balance of power and the pedagogic red lines it entailed. Ranajit Guha finds an innate connection between historiography and rule, highlighting the colonial power's hegemonic inclinations involved in writing the history of the subjugated people. In the case of Indian historiography Guha argues that “the alien colonialist project of appropriation was matched by an indigenous nationalist project of counter-appropriation”, thus resulting in a colonial “dominance without hegemony”.13 As we shall see, in Palestine, the appropriation of history was a product of a conscious, and in some cases unconscious, dialogue between leading Arab educators and the Department, and between nationalist and ‘universal’ historiographies, rather than a counter discourse.

Hebrew education in Palestine had a different history and different relations with the Department. The Zionist Organisation institutionalised the Hebrew education system during the early years of British occupation, setting up an education committee (Va‘ad ha-Hinukh) in charge of Hebrew education in the country. From its establishment, the Va‘ad was autonomous in determining its curriculum. At first controlled by the Zionist Organisation, Hebrew education gradually went under the control and supervision of the Yishuv, with a final

13 Ranajit Guha, *Dominance without Hegemony*, 3.
administrative disengagement in 1932. Hebrew education operated in three separate systems that were named trends (zeramim). The "General" trend, the largest, central, non-religious education system was directly controlled by the Va’ad. The other two, the "Mizrahi" trend (Zionist-religious) and the "Labour" trend (Zionist-socialist) were both autonomous in determining their curricula. Theoretically, each trend shaped and taught its own version of history; in practice, as we shall see, the differences were not fundamental.

While some Jewish educators advocated cooperation with the Department and while there was some degree of pedagogic interchange, the dominant educational institutions ardently objected to any kind of British interference in Hebrew education. As opposed to the more cooperative model presented above within the Arab community, the relations between the Education Department and the Yishuv remained of an administrative rather than educational nature.\(^1^4\) The Department appointed two supervisors for the Hebrew system, and even those were refused direct access to schools, as the Va’ad stipulated that all communications with the Department go through the Va’ad, a demand the Department refused. The Va’ad also insisted on Hebrew as the sole language of correspondence, to which the Department acquiesced.\(^1^5\)

With its conceptual roots in Palestine and Europe of the late nineteenth century, Hebrew history instruction was Hebraicized following the ascendance of territorial Zionism, which envisioned the birth of a "new Jew" in Erets-Yiśra’el (the land of Israel). The basic contours of the history course during the mandate period – focusing primarily on periods of Jewish presence in Palestine (the First and Second Temples) while rejecting and belittling the abnormal, de-territorialised Jewish existence in exile – were all laid out by pre-mandate educators, who in many cases led the Hebrew system through the mandate period as well.\(^1^6\) The rapid growth of the Jewish community along with the institutionalisation of Hebrew education

\(^{14}\) Yoav Silbert, “Ha-ma’avak”; Rachel Elboim-Dror, “Memshelet ha-mandat”.
\(^{15}\) Shimon Reshef and Yuval Dror, *ha-Ḥinukh ha-ʿivri*, 154.
\(^{16}\) David Shahar, “Megamoteha”.
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formalised and tabulated these contours. Modernism and nationalism went hand in hand here as well, but in this case, Zionism saw itself as a manifestation of both, a vehicle for national modernity, a Western power-projection. The colonisation of Palestine and the establishment of a ‘new society’ sought to redeem the Jews and the land from their Eastern predicament, an internal and an external colonisation project.

For the Palestinian Arab, modernity, within the colonial context differed in meaning and agency as it was externally imposed, enforcing and co-opting through new social-cultural-intellectual organisational patterns (like the Education Department). "Modernity" here is an existential notion, an experience defined by Talal Asad as “a series of interlinked projects… institutionalizing a number of (sometimes conflicting, often evolving) principles.”17 Keith Watenpaugh articulated the “quintessential ambivalence at the centre of the historical experience of modernity,” where the colonial subject accepts the “underlying logos of western civilisation while asserting the ability of non-westerners to resist the political and cultural hegemony of the West.”18 Still, even within the imposition of colonial modernity, there is still relevance to Marshall Berman’s idealistic nevertheless convincing definition of modernity as “any attempt by modern men and women to become subjects as well as objects of modernization, to get a grip on the modern world and make themselves home in it.” Berman speaks of a ‘modern concern’ moved both by a will to change yourself and the world and by fear of disorientation and disintegration of life.”19 This study seeks a more dynamic definition of the modern experience, constantly moving between imposition and will and in some cases an articulation of both. This study seeks to decipher the mechanism by which this experience translated into the instruction and writing of history and the manner in which the outlines of Western historiography established their hegemony in Arabic and Hebrew historiography. In

17 Talal Asad, Formations of the Secular, 13.
18 Keith David Watenpaugh, Being Modern, 5.
19 Marshall Berman, All that is Solid, 5, 13.
order to do this, I examine how concepts of race, culture and civilization were adopted and reinterpreted in the instruction of history. In other words, how were Arabic and Hebrew history written in Western categories, and how, in this process, did Arabs and Jews write themselves back into history, moving themselves from its margins to its centre as its protagonists since ancient times? Furthermore, I wish to examine how their ‘modern’ historiographies, written within a shared space that both histories sought to appropriate as exclusive property, related to one another and how these narratives reflected or contributed to the conflict that would drive the two communities apart.

One acute requirement of the post-Ottoman education systems in the Middle East was for new history textbooks. These were to address the need not just for learning the community's old-new story, but also for charging it with meaning, morals and ethos. Writing these books was a taxing undertaking, as it entailed an epistemological shift, operating in a new discourse and politics of identity, within new borders. A group of teachers, school principals, and education department officials undertook the heavy burden of writing this story into a methodical course of study. The study focuses on the personal stories of these educators and their motivations in writing history. They wrote history with a specific purpose: as a socialising agent implemented in the history lesson, preparing for the history exam, inculcating a formal version of the past. They wrote the new story, taught it, and negotiated its outlines with the British.

"Relational" and "Dual Society" Theories: a Compromise

Over the last two decades, studies of cultural, economic, administrative and interpersonal relations between Arabs and Jews have become the centre of increasing attention for scholars
of late Ottoman and mandate Palestine. This scholarship deconstructs and reinterprets the history of mandate Palestine, highlighting the encounter, varied relations, and reciprocal influences between Arabs and Jews as the proper prism for understanding the period. In so doing, it contests earlier historiographic paradigms that had interpreted Palestine’s mandate as a binary system of two separate communities, each experiencing its distinct evolutionary processes while having little interaction with, or mutual influence upon, its counterpart.

The sociological perspective of Kimmerling, Shafir and Shalev examines the Zionist movement through parameters of settler colonialism and underlines the conflictual relations with the Arab population over demography, land and labour, showing them to be crucial to the crystallisation process of the Yishuv. These scholars have sought to challenge the dominant trend in Palestinian and Zionist historiography and sociology that had hitherto focused primarily on Zionism through an ideological prism while neglecting the materialist repercussions of its settlement movement beyond the Jewish community, overlooking points of encounter and mutual influence, and usually employing a corpus of sources in one or two languages. Their studies shift the focus away from the political, cultural and economic elites and incorporate new analytical frameworks (new, that is, in relation to these issues), such as cultural history and gender studies, along with accent on lower classes and the social periphery, the Old Yishuv and Arab-Jews. These works have enabled another perspective on Palestinian society as a whole, which stresses the importance and centrality of Arab and Jewish relations.
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20 Klein’s study offers a history from below of Arab-Jewish relations in three mixed cities. Menachem Klein, Lives in Common; Hart has focused on Arab-Jewish relations in Jaffa and Tel Aviv, Rachel Hart, Kerovim-rehokim; To mention only a few; about the widespread cultural ties and shared leisure spaces in, Boaz Lev Tov, “Shekhenim nokhehim,” cultural and political aspects of Arab Jewish relations in late Ottoman Palestine in, Michelle Campos, Ottoman Brothers; forbidden romantic relationships between Jewish girls and Jewish women with Arab men in, Tammy Razi, “Yehudiyot-‘arviyot?,” political and administrative cooperation between Arabs and Jews in the Haifa municipality in, Tamir Goren, Shituf be-tsel ‘imit, 364–365 Goren argues that the development and prosperity of the city of Haifa owed much to Arab-Jewish cooperation and the ability to transcend national rivalries in the city’s municipality.

that transcended national and religious separations.

Yet this scholarship has remained confined to urban space, the social and economic periphery of the mixed cities, and shared spaces of administration. It left rural Palestine – the Arab community's vast majority – non-urban Jewish settlements (Old and New Yishuv), as well as the mainstream social and economic spheres of both communities outside of the picture. Moreover, the majority of Arabs and Jews had minimal or no interaction with each other.\textsuperscript{22} a tiny fraction of Palestinian Arabs spoke or read Hebrew. Arabic speaking Jews, an influential and significant community before the First World War, were overshadowed socially, politically and culturally by the massive influx of European Jews, an overwhelming majority by the end of the mandate.

These postulations were summed up in the Peel Commission report, stating (in an overly quoted, dramatic comment), “There is no common ground between them. The Arab community is predominantly Asiatic in character, the Jewish community predominantly European. They differ in religion and in language. Their cultural and social life, their ways of thought and conduct, are as incompatible as their national aspirations”.\textsuperscript{23} Jacob Metzer’s study supports this overview of the country's bifurcated society. Focusing on economic division during the mandate, Metzer has shown that in 1935 (before the Arab Revolt that further exacerbated national segregation), 96.5 percent of the Jewish labour force either were self-employed (including members of collective settlements) or employed by Jewish institutions and private employers. Only three percent were government employees and “a negligible” 0.5 percent were either employed by or provided professional labour services to Arabs.\textsuperscript{24} Similarly representing the Dual Society outlook, Aviva Halamish’s argument, that “the Yishuv had a clear self-

\textsuperscript{22} Jacob Metzer, \textit{The Divided}; Smith’s study emphasises the role of British colonial policy in creating the economic segregation, Barbara J. Smith, \textit{The Roots}.


\textsuperscript{24} Metzer, \textit{The Divided}, 7.
perception of being a distinct and separate entity and it acted on both the political and the practical levels to make this vision real”, seems equally convincing.25

Rather than raising arguments to support or counter these theories, it would be worthwhile to acknowledge their dialectical coexistence, a coexistence that fits the multitude of paradoxes that stood at the heart of the mandate’s system. Mandate Palestine was simultaneously a space shared by people that interacted as people regardless of their nationality, and as the years went by its society went through accelerated processes of segregation in all fields of life.

The relational-reciprocal model suggested here draws from Baruch Kimmerling’s pioneering argument that “a wide range of mutual relations led to certain processes… within each of the two collectivities, influencing the formation of their crystallization… the particular characteristics of each of the two collectivities shaped the patterns of the mutual relations between them”.26 Following Kimmerling, Zachary Lockman goes further to state that “The Zionist movement and the Jewish society it helped create in Palestine were shaped in crucial ways by their interactions with the Arab society they encountered 'on the ground’”.27 The statement is just as relevant to the Palestinian Arab national movement, shaped as it was in crucial ways by its interactions with the Jewish society. Aware of this dialectic tension, Deborah Bernstein summed up Arab-Jewish relations as follows: “They constantly impacted and impinged on one another. This was part of their everyday reality, whether or not they acknowledged it”.28

In the case of history instruction and education in general, the interaction is less obvious, since to a great extent it was not based on actual “face to face” encounters. In this domain, it is not the encounter but the significance of its absence that will be studied, as “separation is itself

25 Aviva Halamish, “The Yishuv”; Lissak and Horowitz’s research is central in the consolidation of this theory, Dan Horowitz and Moshe Lissak, Mi-yishuv li-medinah.
26 Baruch Kimmerling, “A Model of Analysis”.
27 Zachary Lockman, Comrades and Enemies, 6.
28 Deborah Bernstein, Constructing Boundaries, 3.
a kind of interaction, a dynamic process of response to challenge and threat”.

As the conflict intensified, cultural, political and economic fences grew higher. The higher they grew the greater was the preoccupation with the deeds of the national other. As we shall see, the constant peeking over the fence (spontaneous, subconscious or institutionalised), constantly following the national other’s education system, shaped the self-consciousness of both communities and had a formative role in their nationalist pedagogy. The process of forging a national narrative in the education systems cannot be understood without the acknowledgment of this reciprocity.

The juxtaposition and analysis of Arabic and Hebrew sources disclose the uncanny resemblance in the engagement with modern national history between the Arab and Jewish communities. They also illuminate the critical influence of the conflict on education in general and history instruction in particular in both systems, as well as the manner in which the conflict wrote itself into history from the inception of the mandate period.

**Review of Existing Literature**

This study focuses on the instruction of history while highlighting different aspects of the two education systems. Yet there is no pretension here to offer a comprehensive history of education in Palestine during the mandate period. While such a task is a worthy, monumental project, long overdue for various reasons, this is not it.

Both Arab and Hebrew education in Palestine received the attention of scholars and educators during the mandate years and after its demise. The first wave of scholarship came from within the two systems. The obvious advantage of such studies was the first-hand experience of their authors and their intimate knowledge of the subject at stake. The most comprehensive research on Arab education in Palestine, and by far the most popular source of reference, has been Abdul Latif Tibawi’s *Arab Education in Mandatory Palestine*. If one can
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29 Ibid., 7.
talk about a historiographic tyranny, this book deserves the title, as it has shaped our perspective of Arab education during the mandate for more than half a century. Tibawi (1910-1981), a District Inspector under the mandatory Education Department tells us very little about non-governmental education, although it represented some thirty percent of all schools at the end of the mandate and a still higher share at its inception. Tibawi, who wrote his book while lecturing at an English university, says little about the conflictual nature of working under the British. Instead, he repeatedly stresses the civilizational affinities between Muslims and Christians and the shared civilising mission of the British and Arab educators in Palestine.  

Tibawi’s focus on administration and overemphasis of secondary education left little room for discussing what actually happened in the schools and what the products of this educational system were. An even greater misconception one risks falling into while reading Tibawi stemmed from his scorn for his fellow Arab administrators, educators and pedagogues. Relying almost exclusively on English official sources and on his personal experience, Tibawi gave very little credit, scope, or agency to this emerging group, its influence and authorship. Muhammad Yousuf Abdulqadir – a native of Taybe like Tibawi, who served as a teacher during the mandate and who is mentioned as one of the contributors to Tibawi’s book – offers a more critical and less Anglophile analysis of the system and highlights the pedagogical shortcomings of the British educational policy especially in relation to practical, humanistic and democratic education. However, like Tibawi, Abdulqadir relies almost only on English official sources and Arab agency is missing from his survey as well. This study seeks to write Arab administrators, educators and pedagogues back into the history of Arab education in Palestine.  

Nabil Badran’s later work, published by the PLO research centre in 1969, focuses on the development of education in Palestine through Marxist parameters of anti-colonial struggle,  
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31 Muhammad Yousuf Abdulqadir, “The British Educational Policy”.
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class struggle and the emergence of a nationalist consciousness that led to the Palestinian revolution. The ideological preconception and essentialist analysis of Palestinian society compromise Badran’s contribution.\(^{32}\) Jamil Nashwan’s comprehensive survey of education in Palestine, based primarily on secondary sources, looks at Arab education as a colonialist tyrannical joint rule by the British and Zionists, an education dedicated to the “erasure and the spreading of ignorance (\textit{tajhīl wa-tams}) of the Palestinian people in order to facilitate the future rule of the Zionist movements”. Nashwan argues that the mandate’s syllabus focused on ancient Arabic poetry and negative aspects of Arab and Islamic history, marginalised its heroism and conquests and highlighted topics that were irrelevant to the socio-economic needs of the Arab student.\(^{33}\)

Ylana Miller’s study on British policy in rural Palestine discussed education as intrinsically connected to other subjects. Miller examined the British “rural bias” pedagogy and its shortcomings, primarily the growing demand of villagers to expand and improve rural education which was left largely unanswered.\(^{34}\) Miller argued that the British saw education as a means to maintain law and order and preserve the status quo, rather than utilising it to spread ignorance (\textit{tajhīl}) among Palestinian Arabs. Wary lest the schools be transformed into bases of nationalist anti-colonial indoctrination, Miller claims, the British separated the concepts of character building and citizenship from their cultural-political context of liberal democracy.\(^{35}\) Rural education was inconsistent and fraught with contradictions, as the British “attempted to change attitudes [of the villagers] without touching reality, while the villager hoped to better reality without giving up values”, thus operating in opposite trajectories.\(^{36}\)
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32 Nabīl Ayyūb Badrān, \textit{al-Ta’lim}.
36 Ibid., 108.
In the last decade, with the ascendance of cultural and post-colonial history, the scholarship on Arab education in Palestine has been able to emancipate the historian from strict reliance on official government reports. The incorporation of oral history, newspapers, journals and memoirs enabled a more profound, more complex understanding of Palestinian society.\textsuperscript{37} Thus, Ami Ayalon’s study on literacy had a pioneering role in shifting the historiographical focus, earlier confined to the conflict or to colonizer-colonised relationship, to a thematic sensitive overview of the social-cultural transformations in Palestinian society.\textsuperscript{38} Ela Greenberg’s works incorporated previously unexamined sources and contributed a comprehensive survey of girls’ education. Her nuanced analysis of the role of Islam in education through the focus on the Islamic Girls’ School, and her exploration of the Jerusalem Rawdat al-Ma‘arif school journal, both shed light on pedagogical interlinks in the attempt of these institutions to forge a modern Arab-Islamic identity.\textsuperscript{39} Kamal Moed’s research on the progressive pedagogy of Khalil al-Sakakini, and Thomas Ricks’ study of Khalil Totah’s biography, both contextualize the diaries of two central Palestinian pedagogues and offer comprehensive biographies, a personal angle that at once gives agency to local educators and problematizes our understanding of colonial education.\textsuperscript{40}

Suzanne Schneider’s work deals with religious instruction and the link between religious identity and political action during the mandate in both Arab and Jewish systems. Schneider argues that the colonial administration considered secularism as a peril and sought to depoliticise religion as “a locus of ‘universal’ values that could transcend national turmoil and disavowed any notion of religion tied to a particular political theology”. Schneider rightly

\textsuperscript{37} Swedenburg’s study, for example, refreshed our knowledge on the Arab Revolt through interviews of veteran rebels from rural Palestine, Ted Swedenburg, \textit{Memories of Revolt}.
\textsuperscript{38} Ami Ayalon, \textit{Reading Palestine}.
\textsuperscript{39} Ela Greenberg, \textit{Preparing the Mothers}; Ela Greenberg, “Majallat”.
\textsuperscript{40} Kamal Moed, “Ḥinukh be-btsel”; Kamal Moed, “Educator in the Service”; Thomas M. Ricks, \textit{Turbulent Times}; Thomas M. Ricks, “Khalil Totah”.
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stresses the inherent contradiction in the mandate’s pedagogy, which “desired secular education without secularism, national education without nationalism, religious education without sectarianism”. 41

The teaching of history in the Arab system, however, has been given its due weight only in the pioneering work of John Harte. 42 Harte’s study was the first to explore history textbooks written by Palestinian authors during the mandate on the basis of the mandatory government’s Education Department files. His use of sources has offered a more profound and complex understanding of history instruction than the works that were confined either to textbooks or to official publications of the Education Department. 43 Harte has presented an impressive corpus of sources from the period, which gave this project a most valuable initiation and the opportunity to widen and further scrutinise this corpus.

This project follows Harte’s argument: “Challenging the commonly-held assumption that government schools and their British-imposed syllabuses acted purely as vehicles for the suppression of Palestinian national identity, it argues for a more nuanced model which recognises the multiple phases of mediation through which colonial educational programmes pass before they reach the level of the individual student and the capacity of local educators and students selectively to adopt, modify or reject altogether elements of the formal curriculum handed down to them in the shape of published syllabuses and prescribed textbooks”. 44 A similar analytical point of departure can be found in Schneider’s work, arguing that “Jewish and Muslim educators found points of agreement with the mandatory government over the content of religious education, often so far as to privilege those elements of their traditions that

41 Suzanne Schneider, “The Other Partition”.
42 Harte, “Contesting the Past.”
43 Tarif Khalidi, “Palestinian Historiography; Elizabeth Brownson, “Colonialism, Nationalism”.
44 Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 2.
seemed more compatible with the “universal” values championed by British officials” while rejecting the colonial separation between religion and politics.\textsuperscript{45}

The features of Hebrew education in Palestine, the keystone of the Zionist enterprise, encapsulate the crux of Zionist project. Numerous studies have been dedicated to this topic.\textsuperscript{46} Scholars have produced a wide range of works on the three education trends during the mandate period (especially the "Labour" trend), the history of schools, and the biographies and pedagogy of prominent educators. In general, scholars have given much attention to different aspects of Zionist youth and children’s culture. Similar to the historiography of Arab education, the first generation of authors were senior administrators in the system, “advocates of the Zionist revolution to which they were full heartedly committed,” and their study was put at the service of this revolution.\textsuperscript{47}

During the last three decades, as part of the deconstruction of Zionism’s historiographic paradigms and categories, Hebrew education has received a more critical analysis that suggests alternative historical perspectives. Most beneficial for the present study has been Nirit Reichel’s work, which focuses on the pedagogical controversy in Hebrew education, between the promotion of a narrow provincial nationalist line and the inculcation of universal values and broadened cultural horizons.\textsuperscript{48} So also has been Yuval Dror’s comprehensive multidimensional survey of nationalist education, which has mapped the different agencies operating in the Hebrew system.\textsuperscript{49}

Within the historiography of Hebrew education, the teaching of history during the mandate is discussed as an essential element in the cultivation of a Zionist worldview, highlighting the
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re-invention of the Jewish past and the creation of a "new Jew." David Shahar’s study on the teaching of history until the First World War, when the foundations of Hebrew history instruction were laid, offers an important background to the study of the topic during the subsequent period.50 Ruth Firer’s pioneering study of Hebrew textbooks dealing with Jewish history between 1900 and 1948 (toldot ‘am Yisrael) offers an overview of the trends prevalent in textbooks, but no contextualisation of these texts. Critical questions about the identity of the authors and the reception of the books remain unanswered. Furthermore, the book does not include general history textbooks.51 By contrast, Nirit Reichel’s study, mentioned above, does present a contextualisation of history school books, juxtaposing general history syllabi and those focusing on the history of the Jewish people while highlighting the marginalisation of general history.52 Thus, a systematic exploration of the teaching of history during the mandate period has never been published.

The reciprocal, or relational history discussed above is yet to be applied to the field of education in mandate Palestine. Judith Wolf’s work on Jewish and Arab education systems was a novelty only in name, for although her study contains a general survey of both systems, they are examined completely separately and are, furthermore, exclusively based on English sources.53 Suzanne Schneider’s research is a novelty in the study of mandate education, as it stresses the financial, administrative and legal dependency of the Arab and Jewish education systems on the mandate and its influence on their development. Yet, while Schneider finds some similarities between the two systems in their use of religion in education, she does not examine mutual influences between them but rather, like Wolf, treats them separately.54

50 David Shahar, “Megamoteha”.
51 Ruth Firer, Sokhnim.
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The present study is the first to investigate the reciprocal and ensuing influences of Arab and Hebrew education within a single analytical frame. However, this is not a symmetrically comparative exploration. Contrary to my work on Arabic history instruction, which reviews sources that have either never been mentioned by scholars or have received little analytical attention, the extensive research on Zionist historiography in general and Hebrew education in particular makes it possible to limit myself, on that side, to an overview of the existing scholarship and analytical tools most relevant to this study. This corpus, then, facilitates a more delicate and exhaustive engagement with the Arabic sources and Arab system that stand at the centre of the thesis. The innovation here, in relation to Hebrew education, is the examination through the prism of the reflective effect of the Yishuv’s engagement with the Arab population and Arab education on Hebrew education.

Rosemary Sayigh’s important argument, that “oral histories should not be read primarily as a source of historical ‘fact’ but rather of historical experience and the cultural framework through which it is lived and recollected”⁵⁵, applies to all historical sources and not to oral history alone. Especially in the case of Palestinian historiography, which is still affected by statelessness and diasporic experience, life in constant displacement, and the lack of institutionalised archives, the hierarchical perception of historical sources hardly applies. Instead, in order to put together a description that comes closest to the historical truth, one is forced to use a mosaic of sources to overcome the inconsistencies and scarcity of documentation.

The main arguments and conclusions of this study arise from a dialogue between sources within this mosaic that allow its multi-layered analysis. The imperial perspective is found in the personal documents of colonial officials now held in the Middle East Centre Archives at St. Antony’s College, Oxford, and the files of the Education Department in the Israeli State

⁵⁵ Rosemary Sayigh, Too Many Enemies, 6.
Archive and in the British National Archives. On another level, the Education Archive in Tel-Aviv University, the al-Aqsa Library and the Jerusalem National Library hold invaluable collections of history textbooks and curricula. They also possess a collection of school journals written by students, in which history received central attention. Interviews conducted in Israel and the West Bank with men who had been students during the mandate enable a further angle of analysis. Both the journals and the personal encounters shed light on students’ experiences in the history classes. Finally, the documents of the Shai (the Haganah’s intelligence service) found in the Haganah Archive, Tel-Aviv and in the Central Zionist Archive, Jerusalem, the various memoirs of educators and authors of textbooks, and numerous newspaper articles show the extensive engagement of Arabs and Jews alike with the education of the national other.

The first chapter traces the causes of educational segregation – the separation between Arabs and Jews in education – and elucidates its sustainability through the weakness or failure of those prominent educators who sought another outcome. The second chapter looks into the engagement of both communities with the education of the national other while stressing the importance that Arab and Jewish scholars, publicists, security apparatuses and educators attributed to the manner in which the other community was being educated and the reflective effect of this engagement.

Textbooks represented the "correct" and distilled formal knowledge required by the system. The third chapter focuses on history textbooks authored during the mandate period, tracing the history of their writing and their use in schools. It examines the central themes in these books and their dialogue with Ottoman, Egyptian, Lebanese and Western sources as well as translation mechanisms employed as part of this dialogue. Finally, it scrutinises the loud echoes of the conflict in these texts. The autobiographies of textbooks authors, and the Education Department’s personnel files of a few other authors permit an additional angle of examination, seeking to answer questions such as: who wrote history and why? What were
their motives to do so? The sociological-intellectual affinities between these authors enable their examination as a distinctive group with particular characteristics. The fourth chapter, focusing on the representation of ancient times in textbooks, shows the resemblances between Arabic and Hebrew textbooks regarding their use of concepts of race and the disparities between them regarding territoriality and identity.

The fifth chapter examines the teaching of history through its administrative and pedagogical aspects. It focuses on the historical evolution of the mandate’s curricula and history syllabi and traces its origins. The history syllabus is examined as a complex colonial document that reflects the pedagogic negotiations, negations and oversights in history instruction. A survey of pedagogical aspects in the teaching of history is discussed through pedagogical articles and books published during the mandate period. The chapter concludes with the problematic meeting point between the educational aspirations reflected in the syllabus and the pedagogic discourse of the educational elite with the ‘normal’ or peripheral classroom, and the challenges facing the rank-and-file teachers while trying to comply with both.

The sixth chapter is dedicated to secondary education and the matriculation exam. Although comprising a fraction of the student population, these schools, private or governmental, represented Palestine’s Ivy League. History instruction in these schools, heavily influenced by the Department’s matriculation exam, received ample attention in the discussions of the Palestine Board for Higher Studies (PBHS, in charge of secondary and post-secondary education). This pedagogical attention was unmatched in other aspects of Palestinian education and in no way proportional to its quantitative share in the student population. Examining these PBHS debates and the history syllabi of secondary schools sheds much light on the complexity of this instruction with regard to issues of identity and nationalism.

The seventh chapter completes the analytical framework, which has so far centred on administrators and educators, by delving into the student’s world, seeking to trace his voice as
the product of this system. The first part examines the omnipresence of history beyond the
history classroom, offering an overview of the educational rationale that sought to mould an
historical consciousness through an educational calendar, field trips and youth movements. The
second part focuses on students’ essays in school journals and the internalisation of, and
correspondence with, the material they were taught, underlining history’s centrality and
validity in the formation of identity for these young people.

In closing, I connect the dots that add up to a portrait of a Palestinian society illustrated
through education and history instruction. It is a portrait characterised by multiple actors,
seeking to mould the country's future through education and the manipulation of the past:
networks of educators, bureaucrats, students, intellectuals, politicians and spies, Arabs, Jews
and British. In the final account, it is a society of divergent and simultaneously shared cultures
and knowledge, whose educational system, though controlled by people who often, despite
being in positions of objective political conflict, not only had much in common but sometimes
maintained close, mutually appreciative personal relationships (especially between some
British officials and Palestinian Arab educators). This encounter nonetheless produced and
entrenched two mutually exclusive, closed, equally monolithic, one-dimensional visions of the
past, under a colonial system that, contrary to its own aims and intentions, was as unable to
broker mutual understanding in this sphere as it was in any other dimension of life under the
Mandate.
Chapter One: Roots of Educational Segregation

This chapter, focusing on the roots of Arab-Jewish segregation in education, will examine the entrenchment of this segregation through the failed attempts to challenge it by British, Zionist and Arab educators and senior officials. Segregation here is treated in its wider sense, focusing on physical separation, physically dividing Arab and Jewish students, and conceptual separation, creating an educational barrier between Arab and Jewish students. We shall see how educational segregation, supposedly treated as an unwanted child by prominent pedagogues, in reality became a nurtured son of the education systems.

On 11 April 1948, a few days before the end of the British mandate in Palestine, Sir Henry Gurney, Chief Secretary in the Mandate government wrote, “It is a truism that this separatist system of education has tended to drive the two communities away from each other; but neither would have it otherwise”.

This observation was underlined a decade earlier by the Royal Commission, “The existing Arab and Jewish school systems” it concluded, “are defiantly widening and will continue to widen the gulf between the races”. It also stressed that the “ideal system of education would be a single bi-national system” but it was “virtually impossible under the Mandate”.

This was clearly not a primary objective in Westminster. By 1937, Ormsby-Gore, Secretary of State for the Colonies, had little faith in the Mandate and became a supporter of the partition plan. In an address before the House of Commons in July 1937 while praising the work of the Royal Commission, he noted, “Articles of the Mandate prohibit us from taking the kind of steps which we have endeavoured, in spite of the Mandate, to take to bring Jew and Arab together. Consider the articles governing education. We are not allowed under the mandate to have

1 Henry Gurney, The End, 111.
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mixed schools or to have any common system of education”.

Clearly, this interpretation of the Mandate in 1937 had greater weight than any report or vision.

A few years later, the McNair Commission reached the same conclusions, stressing that “The disturbing aspect of education in Palestine which must strike everyone who examines it is its separatist effect. In most countries education is a unifying force… In Palestine education works the other way… the two systems are in watertight compartments”.

The contradiction between the ‘correct’ educational vision for Palestine and the country’s reality appeared in this report as well. The commission called for further rapprochement of the Jewish and Arab communities but rather than offering an actual plan, was satisfied with stating, “the time may come when it will be possible to unite Jewish and Arab students…” Leon Simon, a British Jewish Zionist and member of the committee, opposed even this feeble statement. He thought that the two separate systems should remain separate as they represented two national movements. Bringing the two peoples together, Simon wrote in the report, was the preserve of statesmanship rather than education.

In the early days of the mandate, Bowman still considered this issue a challenge rather than a fait accompli. “Perhaps R. Storrs’ prophesy may be fulfilled” he noted in his diary, “and this may be the beginning of a new era, in which Jew and Muslim, Catholic and Protestant, Greek Orthodox and Samaritan, Druze and Armenian, Copt and Anglican may not only live together in harmony, but may even come together and unite in the harmonious whole”.

Whether a naive diary entry, a deep personal conviction or both, this vision was shattered by the 1929 riots: “One thing is certain”, Bowman noted, that Palestine cannot be governed “without an armed force… one wonders how long if ever it will be before Jew and Arab can live together again in
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mutual confidence”. The 1929 disturbances caused Bowman’s complete disillusionment: “We have built for 10 years, & it has crumbled in 10 days,” he sadly noted on 4 September 1929. On the very day that passage was written, the principal of the mixed Scots College at Safed asked him whether he should accept Jewish students. Bowman replied that he should go on as before, as that was “the best solution of bringing A. and J. together”.

Bowman’s memorandum to Chancellor after the disturbances expressed a different tone. He called for the partition of Palestine into cantons and stated that the national home was an immoral project that could only be achieved by armed force. Ironically, he wrote, the two peoples were cousins but these ties were long forgotten and in any case, no one would be willing to give away his home, not even for his cousin.

The disenchantment with Arab-Jewish relations continued until Bowman left Palestine. In his testimony before the Royal Commission in 1936, Bowman said he tried bringing the two people together through education but with no effective success. The main difficulty according to Bowman was the insistence on the importance that “both races” gave to their language, especially in Jewish education. Arabs, he thought, had no problem studying in English. Hebrew instruction in Arab schools was also not an option, “I believe there would be almost a revolution if we introduced Hebrew compulsorily... they say it is the business of the Jews to learn their language [i.e., Arabic] and not for them to learn theirs”. Bowman admitted, however, that he had not invested real effort into writing a syllabus that reflected this goal. Only joint sports events and the meetings of the Board are mentioned in his testimony as successful attempts at bringing both communities together. Before he left Palestine, Bowman
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tried to convince his Jewish and Arab friends to do more to “reciprocate understanding”. Before the Second World War, he described a similar vision: “Let us rather strive to encourage a friendly union of Arab states, with a contented and prosperous Jewry within its orbit”.\textsuperscript{14}

This was too little, too late. Within the various battles that he needed to fight as Director of Education, he chose to abandon the front of Arab-Jewish rapprochement through education. As he himself admitted, he failed to produce a syllabus that corresponded to his own belief and presented no initiatives to this end. However, we should also keep in mind Bowman’s limited influence on the mandate’s policy as a whole and that whenever the Department threatened the Yishuv’s autonomy in education; the Yishuv was able to bypass it by directly contacting the High Commissioner. Such was the case in the Kedoorie affair, where Bowman was unable to convince the Yishuv to cooperate in establishing a shared agricultural school using Elias Kedoorie’s funds. To his personal disappointment, Colonel Kich and Samuel sealed the deal over his head. Kich’s ostensible reasons for boycotting the initiative were language issues, the Jewish sabbatical year restrictions, and kosher food—but those never kept Jews from attending non-Jewish schools outside Palestine.\textsuperscript{15} Establishing an all-Hebrew model agricultural school was a Zionist ideal in itself and there was no room for Arabs in it. According to Storrs, Bowman was deeply offended by what he considered as Zionists’ political blindness in this incident.\textsuperscript{16}

Farrell, Bowman’s successor in 1936 and a the most senior official at the Department since his arrival in Palestine in 1924, left no evidence that could imply a personal belief in the role of pedagogy in promoting understanding between the two peoples. If anything, Farrell represented an opposite approach to Bowman’s failed vision and had a recurrently conflictual relationship with the Yishuv’s educational administration. In one report Farrell depicted Zionism as a movement of “racial self-worship” an “inhumane mass selfishness of
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concentrated Jewry” with imperialistic aims without a parallel in history. In another he noted that “the ideological resemblance between Zionism and Nazism is becoming more marked” and would require a reform similar to that which would be necessary in Germany after the war. Farrell sought to abolish the administrative separation of the trend system in Hebrew education and demanded reform and greater control by the Department over the Jewish schools but failed. After more than twenty years in Palestine, he had lost faith in cooperation with the Jews: “There is no common moral and theological ground”, he wrote, “upon which politically organized Jewry and a Christian civilization could stand together in harmony”. His views on Hebrew education were extremely critical as well, depicting it as an incurable fatal virus injected to the youth, a “spiritual corruption” and a “degeneration in the spirit”. These highly charged words are relevant for our examination of Farrell’s pedagogic measures employed to confront the problematic biases he identified in the Hebrew system.

During the violent clashes of the Arab Revolt, MPs criticised the colonial policy of segregation in education. The most vocal and explicit criticism came from Ian Campbell Hannah, the Conservative MP, a former teacher in China and a strong supporter of the League of Nations’ educational vision. Hannah not only criticised the colonial educational policy, but also offered an alternative to it, turning the Hebrew University into a “point of contact” between Arabs and Jews. Furthermore, as an educator and strong believer in the lessons that could be learned from history, he advised the colonial office to “inspire both Arab and Jew with a

18 Farrell notes that the report was drafted before the summer of 1944, before the assassinations attempt of HC MacMichael in August that year. Farrell adds this note so that the reader would not attribute his criticism as triggered by the anti-British violence of the Yishuv, Jerome Farrell, “The Distribution of Educational Benefits in Palestine,” December 17, 1945, Farrell, GB165-0104, MECA.
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20 Cited in, Nachmani, Great Power, 167.
21 Ibid., Farrell, “The Distribution of Educational Benefits in Palestine.”
22 For example, the speech given by Campbell Stephen, a Scottish MP, about the colonial policy of divide and rule in labour unions and in education, Duvar, 5 August 1937.
23 “Palestine Debate in the Commons”, Palestine Post, 23 July 1939.
tremendous enthusiasm to revive the greatness of the work they were carrying on a few centuries ago”. Hannah truly believed that a “restoration of the glories of the days gone by” of Arab-Jewish unity in Spain and Baghdad could be made possible by an educational syllabus that highlighted these periods. To this end, he offered to author special textbooks that would discuss these periods, an offer that was transferred to the Education Department.24

Farrell gave a polite reply, and promised to consider Hannah’s proposal, while at the same time stating that the Department would not engage in the production of such a book. Farrell shelved Hannah’s idea and it never received any attention at the Department. As we shall see later, Farrell completely overlooked or intentionally acted against the possibility of promoting understanding through history instruction in Palestine, a subject he had great influence in shaping through his different roles.

An article published on April 1940 in Hazofe, the Mizrahi newspaper, corresponded with Hannah’s proposal. The writer wrote that there was no need for such a textbook as it already existed. The Jews, it stated, need no advice regarding their relations with the Arabs, for they teach the universal Torah of love (torat ha-ahavah) rather than the Torah of revenge and hatred taught in “other schools” where Hebrew is not taught and teachers “are pushed in a torrent of jealousy and hatred”. The writer also criticised the British failure to spread peace among the people.25

The article reflects a political-pedagogical self-assurance, a conviction that there was nothing to remedy in Zionist education and although Hannah failed in promoting his idea, he had hit the nail on the head in recognising the problem. Arab and Hebrew textbooks’ authors deliberately ignored the virtues of the Arab-Jewish “golden ages” of cooperation and coexistence. While periods identified as the golden ages of both peoples could not be ignored

24 “Muslim Jewish Relations in the Past”, Ibid., 4 April 1940; ibid., 27 July 1939; Davar, 4 April 1940.
25 Hazofe, 8 April 1940.
in the national narrative and received ample coverage in history textbooks, whenever their authors encountered a period of Arab-Jewish coexistence they found a way to question, belittle or overlook it as a central historical source of strength for both peoples. This avoidance of narratives of coexistence is common to both communities’ historiographies. Hebrew textbooks mention such cooperation but emphasise the prominence of Hebrew poetry and depict it as proto-Zionist creation that expresses scorn for diasporic life. While narrating Jewish national history as an essentially separate entity, periods of prosperity and development reflected mutual interests rather than a social or cultural connection. Arab textbooks either overlook or marginalise the Jewish presence in Andalus and did not mention cooperation between the two peoples.

In contrast to pre-mandate history textbooks and historiography in general that gave due weight to an Arab-Jewish shared past, this historiographic ambivalence is a classic example of the conflict writing itself into the history textbook, a phenomenon that shall later be discussed in depth. Zionist and Arab authors minimised, marginalised or erased expressions of unity and cooperation from history textbooks during the mandate.

Hannah’s proposal and its failure is a litmus test that reveals the ingredients of a rather simple pedagogical compound. The British colonial administration, here Malcolm MacDonald, Secretary of State for the Colonies, who heard Hannah’s proposal, was aware of the Peel Commission’s recommendations regarding education, but had neither the interest nor the energy to implement them. The Director of Education refused to engage in peace-oriented education of any kind. Finally, history textbooks, the products of this policy and a physical relic of this compound, reflected the pedagogical lacuna.

It was Farrell who introduced his successor Bernard De Bunsen, a man with no prior knowledge of the country, to Palestine. De Bunsen arrived in the heated, violent summer of 1946 and acted as Director of Education until the last day of the mandate. De Bunsen stated
that “There was a big educational job ahead of us had we been given the time to tackle it. Instead, as the security situation worsened… the job was to keep the schools going and prevent the dissolution of the system”. Regarding the possibility of an undivided Arab-Jewish state he noted, “It was a hope the British, if they ever had it, had long since jettisoned”. De Bunsen believed that separation in education and the nationalist nature of both systems were a done deal.

De Bunsen wrote this analysis in hindsight, decades after leaving Palestine. While in office, De Bunsen still held on to at least a shred of belief in the power of education in Palestine. The last Director of Education warned of a “serious danger” to the future political settlement in Palestine. “If they [Arabs and Jews]”, he wrote, “are going to be brought up in an exclusively national education, based only on their own traditions and aspirations and ignoring, and even hostile to, the traditions and aspirations of the other community, there will be no cooperation”. To defuse this hostility, De Bunsen suggested some control over syllabi and textbooks to prevent indoctrination and encourage the inculcation of positive attitude towards the other community. Aware of the autonomy demanded and deserved by the education systems, De Bunsen advised the establishment of a central educational organization (instead of the Education Department) and a joint Arab-Jewish Advisory Council of educators. These institutions, De Bunsen hoped, would prevent both systems from drifting apart, ensure the adequate study of the language, history and culture of the other community and foster contacts between teachers and pupils from both systems.

De Bunsen was aware of the impracticability of his scheme, unless both systems would be willing to accept it in return for complete administrative autonomy. Indeed, De Bunsen acknowledged the historical moment into which he had landed in Palestine and understood that

27 Bernard De Bunsen, “The Place of Education in the Political Settlement of Palestine”, printed undated report, De Bunsen Papers. I thank Tom Segev for giving me access to De Bunsen’s papers found by his assistant and held by De Bunsen’s widow.
the colonial Department should disengage from both systems. The objectives he drew up for the suggested institutions mark a shift in the role of the British mandate in education administration in Palestine. Since both systems demanded and deserved independence, the role left for the colonial administrator was only in regulating and assuring inter-communal understanding through education. The trajectory De Bunsen suggested was something inconceivable to his predecessors, who saw themselves as the pillars of Palestine’s education while investing little energy in inter-communal understanding. Yet, here as well, like the Hegelian owl of Minerva, by the time these insights were thought of, there was not time, energy or availability to implement them.

Mission Schools and the Sustainability of Mixed Education

Government reluctance to promote mixed education meant that the only space for it was in the Christian mission schools. The Peel Commission favoured the mixed mission schools for their high-standard education and their curriculum, which was broader than that of either the Arab or Jewish systems. The Commission especially appreciated those schools for not encouraging Jewish or Arab nationalism and instead encouraging unity and friendship between their students of mixed races, a unity “more powerful than the political antipathies of the parents”.28 Jewish attendance at Christian schools began in the late nineteenth century29 and saw a gradual increase during the mandate, from 469 students in 1929 to 1504 in 1942 (with a ratio of 60:40 percent advantage to Catholic schools over Protestant). Over the years, amidst the massive growth of Hebrew education, these numbers represented a sharp decrease in the mission’s share of Jewish students out of the whole student population. In most cases, Jewish students represented ten to fifteen percent of an entire school population that was predominantly Arab.30

28 Palestine Royal Commission, Report, 341.
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In 1929, for example, there were 238 students at St. George’s and 25 Jews.31 In 1937, there were 37 Jewish students studying at the Jerusalem Girls’ College out of 249 students and the same number of Jewish students at the Terra Santa College in Jerusalem, out of 306 students.32

While historically accepted by the Muslim elite as worthy institutions, the vast majority of the Jewish community refused to send their children to non-Jewish or non-Hebrew schools and the families that did so were criticised.33 This phenomenon was restricted to the urban elite in the mixed cities. In 1934, for example, 540 students out of 898 studied in Jerusalem.34 These Jewish students were either from religious families, fearful of secular Hebrew education (in many cases old Yishuv Sephardi families),35 from the secular Jewish elite that preferred classic European education to that offered by the Yishuv, and sought language skills that could secure government employment. In some cases, the mission offered free education to children from underprivileged families as well.36

Mixed education, the single existing challenge to educational segregation, survived despite the conflict until the end of the mandate and therefore deserves attention. The personal diary of Susanna Pearce Emery, art teacher at the Jerusalem Girls’ College (1919-1930) and principal of the English High School in Haifa (1932-1948) is an invaluable document for this purpose.

There was certainly a change of heart in Emery’s case. In 1919, she expressed pessimistic views about the mandate’s chances of success. She objected to Jewish immigration and held negative views about her Jewish students, depicting them as clumsy and pushy. Since in her

31 The St. George’s School Magazine 1, vol. 6, Christmas Term, 1929. 23.
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34 A. Arnon, Davar, 20 November 1934.
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opinion, the Jews were lowering the level of the school, their small numbers--22 out of 200 in 1919--seemed preferable.37

In later years, Emery’s diary is laden with descriptions, usually optimistic, regarding the effects of the conflict on the school. After the October 1933 disturbances Emery noted that despite the parents’ panic and difficult conversations at home, the school proceeded just as usual and the staff did not observe any sign of national, religious, or racial ill-feeling among the pupils. She added that the school forbade no conversations and newspapers were read freely.38 During the Arab Revolt, the school also proceeded as usual and while at the beginning, the Jewish students remained aloof, close friendships were quickly established and the students held mutual house visits. The violent incidents did raise alarm but this did not influence the school environment.39 Indeed, friendship between Arab and Jewish students appears in various memoirs of these schools’ graduates.40

Emery was confident that the school’s spirit could overcome the national challenge as “we represent something peaceful and friendly, and it gives them confidence again”.41 This belief contrasted with Emery’s criticism of what she saw as the ultra-nationalist Hebrew education, the overemphasis on speaking Hebrew, and the rebellious nature of the Zionist youth movements. Like other British educators in Palestine, she saw the Hebrew education system as comparable to that of Nazi Germany.42

The diary reflects an Anglican haven of harmony. In late 1938, Emery wrote that the Jewish girls even joined the “leaving prayers” in the school’s hall while all the school was singing, “O
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come all ye faithful” at the end.\textsuperscript{43} After an explosion near the school, she wrote how an Arab girl “flung her arms round the frightened Jewess… [saying] don’t be frightened, Ruth, it’s finished now”.\textsuperscript{44}

The atmosphere in mission schools was not always harmonious. During the final years of the mandate, Emery noted, the numbers of Jewish students in mission schools decreased and incidents of violence between students occurred.\textsuperscript{45} A student could come to school without uniform for fear of other children’s response and in some cases, students left the school after other Jewish children insulted them for studying there.\textsuperscript{46} In the Scots College, many of the Jewish students volunteered in the Hagana and would occasionally skip classes to take arms with “a wink from the principal”. Shmuel Toledano, the son of a Tiberias Rabbi from a Sephardic family, recalls that the dormitories were separate, that true friendships were not common and that there was always suspicion since the students from prominent Arab families were vocal Arab nationalists. Toledano remembers writing to his father that “the Arabs only understood force” and requesting that he send him an “iron” (a gun). This suspicion led to an arrangement with the local Hagana force, by which in case of danger, the students should ring the College bell and they would instantly come. In the early days of the revolt, fearing a deterioration, all the Jewish boarding students clandestinely ordered a bus and at the break of dawn left school with no warning. Toledano never returned.\textsuperscript{47}

Incidents of anti-Semitism also occurred but in most cases these were treated sternly by the principals. On the first day of the Second World War, Haim Steinberg, a student at Terra Santa College in Jerusalem, found to his surprise a poster at the entrance of the school stating, “Jews are not welcomed here”. The schools’ board expelled the students and the teacher
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involved.\(^4\) At the College des Frères in Jaffa, Jewish students did not attend classes or were advised not to come to school by the administration whenever political tension rose.\(^4\)

Challenges such as these did not compromise Emery’s belief that her school was fulfilling the true purpose of the mandate by accepting students of all religions and pursuing a unifying humanistic vision of togetherness. The school emphasised “A right judgment in all things”, giving wisdom to the children by “wise history teaching, and by our point of view in every lesson and in every judgment, criticism, or word of praise we give”.\(^5\) History instruction for Emery, similarly to Hannah, had a pivotal role in establishing the desired humanistic unification at the school.

The mixed schools’ walls, however high they were, could not completely circumvent the Arab-Jewish tension and incidents of verbal and physical violence between students occurred alongside a certain amount of suspicion.\(^5\) However, all these schools weathered the entirety of the mandate period without renouncing their inclusiveness, and Arab and Jewish students continued to study together. After leaving Palestine, Emery proudly stated that although the school was in a real battle zone the same proportion of nationalities kept attending the school.\(^5\)

The idealised reality of coexistence in mission schools, the sole example of mixed education in Palestine, helps elucidate the dominance of segregated reality as an exception that strengthens the rule. Arab Jewish harmony was possible only when Jews represented a small minority in schools that remained the privilege of the urban population. Furthermore, the patronage of a third party such as a church or monastery proved its ability to enable mixed education. This was maintained by the exclusion of Jews and Arabs from senior administrative
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posts, a policy that safeguarded the mission but casted shadows over its sustainability as a wider (braver) local initiative. It left mixed education within the realm of a foreign colonial civilising mission. Tibawi and Antonius’ criticism of the mission for “striking at the root of the Arab national movement” by marginalising Arab culture and Arab nationalism is another case in point.\textsuperscript{53} The circumvention of political and national educational issues, rather than producing a pedagogy that confronted racism and segregation, further questions these schools’ ability truly to offer an alternative to, rather than an avoidance of, the conflict.

Mixed education could have been more than an anecdote, had the Education Department adopted a policy of establishing such schools or strengthening and widening the existing ones. The Jerusalem Law Classes school is a perfect example of a successful British initiative of mixed education, attended by 500 Arab and Jewish students in 1945.\textsuperscript{54} The Education Department failed to initiate such endeavours.

As Al-Haj concludes, “The Arab and Jewish education systems in the mandatory period were totally segregated. Naturally, this fact was affected by the national conflict and by the social and cultural differences existing between the two groups”.\textsuperscript{55} To this, we must add the British support for, or incompetence in challenging, segregation. The two occasions on which a joint educational project was possible, the establishment of a university in Palestine and the establishment of an Arab-Jewish agricultural school, failed to achieve their aims. A Palestinian university was never established and instead of a shared agricultural school, each community opened its own separate school.
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Arab and Jewish education systems were not only physically separated. A profound conceptual separation in education was to become inherent to both national movements as the political conflict intensified before and during the mandate. Nevertheless, within Zionism and the Arab national movement there existed voices that contested this separation and recognised the innate threat it propagated. Previous academic research has given ample attention to this minority group, though it represented merely a symbolic phenomenon. Still, the central role of educators as mediators or contesters of this separation and as advocates of reconciliation and cooperation is worth highlighting.

The earliest questioning of Zionism’s morality in its colonisation project also gave birth to questions about Jewish education in relation to the Arabs and the education of the natives. Educators were first to voice these questions.

In his famous article “The Hidden Question” based on a speech he gave before the Hebrew Association (agudat 'ivriyah), adjacent to the Zionist Congress in 1905, Yitzhak Epstein (1862-1943) criticised Zionism’s deliberate exclusion of the Arab people living in Palestine from the Zionist vision. Epstein protested against the injustice of displacing Arab peasants in the name of Zionism and acknowledged the Arabs’ connection to and love of their homeland. Epstein, an educator and pioneer in the methodology of Hebrew instruction, was not against the colonisation project, but demanded its establishment on terms of equality with the Arabs. He envisioned an enlightened colonisation project, where the natives would join hands with the Jews. As part of a Jewish-Arab alignment, he declared that Jewish kindergartens and schools should gladly accept Arabs and give ample attention to the instruction of Arabic, calling for the establishment of secondary schools for the entire region that could compete with the Christian mission. Pedagogically, Epstein warned against an education based on hatred and
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prejudice and promised, “We shall become the angel of peace, a conciliator” between enemies.\textsuperscript{57} Similar to the educator and visionary Rabbi Binyamin on whom Epstein had great influence,\textsuperscript{58} Epstein speaks of educating and enlightening the Arabs and does not consider them his equals.\textsuperscript{59} During the mandate, Epstein continued to criticise Zionism’s cultural indifference towards Arab culture and protested the insulting exclusion of Arabic-speakers from the inauguration ceremony of the Hebrew University.\textsuperscript{60}

Epstein and other enthusiasts for this vision reflected a kind of colonial humanism similar to the European colonialist discourse of the time. Rather than a cry against colonialism, it was a method, a preferable system to enhance control over territory.\textsuperscript{61} As a school principal in Rosh-Pina, for example, Epstein welcomed Arab students from neighbouring villages.\textsuperscript{62}

Still, the questions raised by Epstein touched the core of Zionist colonisation and came from a famous, leading educator, a man whose textbooks revolutionised Hebrew instruction all over the Jewish world. After obtaining his doctorate in pedagogy from the University of Lausanne, Epstein returned to Palestine to head the Levinski Seminar (a teachers’ training school) and later acted as supervisor of the Zionist Administration’s schools.\textsuperscript{63} These biographical facts are important since as we shall see, other prominent Zionist educators followed his lead.

Epstein’s views had supporters in early mainstream Zionism, a period of greater polyphony of opinions than would later prevail. Victor Jacobson, the Zionist representative in Istanbul before the First World War, spoke of Zionism as a movement incorporated in the revival of the

\textsuperscript{57} The article was published in the journal \textit{ha-shiloah} in 1907 and later reprinted in various editions, Yitzhak Epstein, \textit{She‘elah ne’anamah}, 204–205.
\textsuperscript{58} Pseudonym of Yehoshua Radler-Feldman; for more on his philosophy see page 172.
\textsuperscript{59} Epstein, \textit{She‘elah ne’anamah}, 205.
\textsuperscript{60} Hanan Harif, “Tehiyat ha-mizrakh”, 149–151.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 88–92.
\textsuperscript{62} Yuval Dror, “Bet ha-sefer”.
\textsuperscript{63} Shlomo Haramati, \textit{ha-Morim ha-hulutsim}, 50–60; Shlomo Haramati, \textit{Sheloshah morim}, 144–153.
East. A diplomat, Jacobson believed in, and engaged in, direct dialogue with Arab nationalists. Jacobson articulated the problematic separation between Arabs and Jews in schools. In his address before the Zionist Executive in 1914, he conveyed the willingness of some Arabs to accept immigration but also demanded the opening of Jewish schools for their sons. Considering this possibility as “difficult due to various reasons”, he suggested the establishment of parallel courses for the Arabs at the expense of the Zionist movement.

Some Arabs found this sort of civilising mission appealing. During the early stages of Jewish settlement, the Arab elite considered the Jewish schools, primarily the Alliance Israélite Universelle (AIU), as another European school, an elite institution offering better education. A few central Arab educators and authors of history textbooks such as Ahmad Khalifa and ‘Umar Salih al-Barghuthi, studied in these schools, which often had no problem accepting Arab students.

Still, these were a small minority and questions about the appropriate educational curriculum that would connect the Hebrew student to his surroundings and neighbours remained open. Thus, the importance of Arabic language and culture instruction was a recurrent issue since the inception of organised Hebrew education in Palestine. In 1903, at the meeting of the Teachers’ Union (Asifat ha-morim), educators from across Palestine discussed the option of making it a part of the curriculum. Surprisingly, during the meeting, David Yellin (1864-1941) objected to the idea of instruction of Arabic, stating that Arabic is the business of researchers rather than peasants and students could acquire colloquial Arabic from daily encounters with the Arabs. This historic meeting in the annals of Hebrew education adjourned with the resolution that only one language should be taught while Arabic instruction remained

---

64 Israel Kolet, “ha-Tenu‘ah”.
65 Ahron Cohen, Yišra‘el veḥa-‘olam ha-‘arvi, 109–110.
a “luxury” (motraot). As we shall see later, this privilege remained excluded from primary education and kept on the margins of secondary education until the end of the mandate.

Yellin was a native Jerusalemite, the founding member of the Hebrew Teachers’ Union, co-founder of the Hebrew Language Committee, founder and principal of the Teachers’ Training Seminar, a linguist and a pedagogue. Yellin’s activity and enthusiasm for the renaissance of the Hebrew language should be seen in light of the cultural renaissances he was living through and influenced by. The first renaissance was that of the Ottoman Empire. An unsuccessful candidate for the Ottoman parliament, a member of the Ottoman Jewish Society and member of the Ottoman city council of Jerusalem, the 1908 revolution filled Yellin with hopes of progress and modernism. In 1910, the municipality even sent him to European capitals to study their municipal administration. To use Campos’ terminology, Yellin was part of an Ottoman brotherhood that transcended religions and ethnicities. The second renaissance that fascinated Yellin was the Arabic Nahda, another language reborn, manifested in the intellectual discourse of the Jerusalem elite of his time. This was also thanks to Yellin’s Arabic teacher at AIU, the Arab intellectual Muhammad Effendi Jarallah.

In his scholarly work, Yellin focuses on the study of Arabic as the key to understanding Hebrew. In the Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society, a joint intellectual project for Jews and Arabs, Yellin wrote of the “complete harmony in all the Semitic languages…” Yellin also based his later work on Andalusian Jewish-Arab poetry on the premise that Arabic poetry is the key to understanding Hebrew poetry. Knowing Arabic, Yellin noted in an article published in 1912, could also enable us to understand and respond to the Arab critics of Zionism.
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In the early days of British occupation, Yellin’s knowledge of Arabic and close ties with the Arabs made him and a few other old Yishuv members, mediator-propagandists of the Zionist movement, seeking to find supporters and collaborators with the national home project.\textsuperscript{71} A close friend of Yellin, Yosef Meyuhas, an educator, linguist, Arabic teacher and author, attributed to the Sephardic Jews a capability of understanding and negotiating with the Arabs that the European leaders lacked.\textsuperscript{72}

Sephardic Jews had a personal, intimate contact with their Arab neighbours. Their modus vivendi with the Arabs was at the basis of their vision for the future in Palestine. They knew them as people, members of one community. In a shared reality, they could not overlook their presence or culture. Prior to the Balfour Declaration, when the Sephardic Old Yishuv still contested the European hegemony over the colonisation project, they sought an educational vision that fitted their values. At the 1903 meeting discussed earlier, Eliyahu Sapir, called for the teaching of Arabic, the language of the country. Its instruction, he claimed, could help understand Hebrew and the Spanish Jewish-Arabic literature.\textsuperscript{73} Already in 1903, this was a minority voice.

Sapir, another Jerusalemite pioneer in Hebrew education, called for Jewish integration in Muslim culture and Jewish-Muslim cooperation against Christianity in which, as he saw it, the hatred for the Jews was inherent. Nisim Malul, formerly a professor of Hebrew in the Egyptian University and advocate of Arab-Jewish cultural cooperation, called as early as 1913 for the mandatory teaching of Arabic in Hebrew schools in Palestine. Malul suggested the establishment of an Arab-Jewish teachers’ union, emphasised Semitism as the Jewish

\textsuperscript{71} Yitshak Gil-Har, “Hitargenut ve-hanhaga”, 485–490.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 491–493, 496–497.
\textsuperscript{73} Efrathi, \textit{Mi-leshon yehidim}, 34.
connection to the East and called for the disengagement from Europe. These views were harshly criticised by the Yishuv, accusing Malul and his supporters for promoting assimilation.

Non-Sephardic educators and visionaries shared these ideas as well. Haim Kalvariski (1868-1947), a conspicuous example, believed that direct engagement with the Arabs could persuade them to embrace the Zionist project. In 1919, he offered a mandatory teaching of Arabic and Hebrew in Arab and Jewish schools. Those who were not convinced voluntarily, Kalvariski thought, would be willing to change their minds and even collaborate against the Arab national movement in exchange for material benefits.

Theoretically, the establishment of the Palestine Club and the Palestinian Arab-Hebrew School by Kalvariski in Tiberias in 1919 sounds like a revolutionary venture. In May 1921, Doar Hayom noted that the Club’s activity was satisfactory, teaching Christians and Muslims Hebrew, Arabic and English and working for the promotion of peace and cooperation and that the students would soon perform a play in Hebrew. However, it was clear from the start that Arab cooperation did not depend on good will, but was achieved and maintained through funds and promises of employment. With the acceptance of these benefits, the Club members were utilised as local opposition to the anti-Zionist activity of the Palestinian Arab national movement. Little is known about the Arab-Hebrew school, but it is certain that no Jews attended it. Moreover, by November 1922 the principal appointed by Kalvariski had left Tiberias and closed the school. In a letter to Kalvariski, he wrote that he had lost his dignity and that the Palestine Club members had declared war against him. Most importantly, he wrote,
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the school had failed to achieve its central aim (the spread of Hebrew), as Hebrew instruction ceased, since its students “of no potential” did not know a word of Arabic and had to be taught Arabic first. Stressing his loyalty and honesty, he concluded that the school was a waste of Kalvariski’s time and money.  

Kalvariski’s initiative, matchless in its vision and pretention, uncovers the shortcomings of his actions. The fact that bribes could not spread the knowledge of Hebrew amongst Arabs nor support of Zionism, was clear to the Zionist leadership. Nevertheless, Kalvariski’s network of bribes proceeded with Zionist funding during the mandate. His indefatigable activity was a last resort throughout the years for the Zionist leadership since although they had little faith in Kalvariski, he was the only one offering solutions to the hidden question.

Some Zionist leaders thought that Arab resistance to Zionism emanated from ignorance regarding the historical right of the Jews over Palestine. Yosef Haim Castel, the secretary of the Political Department, suggested remedying this ignorance by teaching the “true” story to the Arabs, as the Europeans had recognised this right, and only the Arab neighbours still had not. Castel advised authoring Arabic literature that described this history. A native Jerusalemite from a Sephardic family, Castel served in the Ottoman Army during the First World War, and worked as Yellin’s secretary in the Teachers’ Seminar. Convinced of the importance of Jewish knowledge of Arab culture, he suggested a huge translation project from Arabic to Hebrew like that undertaken in medieval Spain, to foster the ties between intellectuals from both peoples,

79 Saleh Jaris to Kalvariski, 4 January 1923, ibid. Similar initiatives crafted by Kalvariki or the Political Department met disappointing or tragic results. In the early 1920s, Sheikh Muhammad Adib Ramadan principal of the school in the Great Mosque of Ramla, preached in his mosque sermons against the usage of violence and called for interreligious unity. The SMC dismissed him for receiving money from the Jews. Sheikh ‘Abd al-Rahman al-Khatib, a teacher at the Jerusalem Rashidiyya school and opposition leader against the Mufti, was assassinated in late 1938 by the Mufti’s men, Hillel Cohen, Army of Shadows, 56–57, 130.
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the teaching of Arabic in higher elementary classes, evening courses for adults and mandatory
teaching of Hebrew in Arab schools.\textsuperscript{81}

It seems that the Arab Bureau of the Va‘ad Leumi adopted Castel’s recommendations. A
memorandum from late 1923 called for the opening of Jewish schools for Arab students under
equal terms, especially for the poor population.\textsuperscript{82} This report had no influence on the education
committee (Va’ad ha-Ḥinukh).

It is understood why Kalvariski’s initiatives, recurrently undermined by the Zionist
leadership, or the views of Castel and other prominent Sephardic Jews were overlooked by the
Zionist education system. Conversely, it is intriguing to see how a similar ideology, promoted
by the Director of Va’ad ha-Ḥinukh, reached the same results.

A prolific publicist in Hebrew and Yiddish and editor of central Yiddish periodicals and
journals, Dr. Yosef Luria (1871-1937) was a passionate promoter of Hebrew in Hebrew
instruction (‘ivrit be–‘ivrit, teaching the language while using it as language of instruction).
Luria emigrated from Vilnius in 1907 and instantly became noticeable in the field of Hebrew
education in Palestine. While teaching history at Gymnasia Herzliya he headed the Teachers’
Union. Throughout his career as a central leader of Hebrew education in Palestine, Luria
expressed views about Zionism and the Arabs that were exceptional for a man in his position.
As a delegate to the 1905 Zionist Congress in Basel, together with Epstein he advocated the
need to study Arabic for Arab-Jewish rapprochement in Palestine.\textsuperscript{83} Six years later, in the
Zionist weekly ha-‘Olam (the world), Luria wrote “We must face the truth… we have forgotten
only one people, the people dwelling in the country and firmly attached to it”.\textsuperscript{84}

\textsuperscript{81} Y. H. Castel, A Proposal for a Political Work Plan in Relation to the Arabs Submitted to the Zionist
Executive in London and Jerusalem for the Year, 1923, J1/289, CZA.
\textsuperscript{82} Memorandum from the 20 December 1923, ibid.
\textsuperscript{83} Yonatan Mendel, The Creation of Israeli Arabic, 26.
\textsuperscript{84} Gorni, ha-She’elah ha-’arvit, 52.
After the violent clashes between Rehovot and the village of Zarnuqa in 1913, Luria denounced the use of violence by Zionists and wrote in his diary, “If we have a right to live in the country, it is only in the name of justice”\(^\text{85}\). Luria was almost in his forties, with a PhD in philosophy, a full time job as a teacher and head of the teachers’ union, but was still determined to master Arabic in Palestine. His friend, Adel Jaber, the Arabic teacher at the same school, taught him the language privately. Still, Luria was frustrated with his progress, “I was amazed how difficult the reading was for me”. After four years of studying, Luria confessed in sorrow “five years I am in Eretz Israel and I do not know Hebrew or Arabic”\(^\text{86}\).

At the conference of the Eretz Israel Council held in December 1918, Luria proposed the establishment of elected parliaments for both peoples that would send delegates to one council, with an equal number of delegates. He was alone in his views\(^\text{87}\). An active member of Brit Shalom, Luria articulated in the movement’s journal the need for Arab control over their own education, his appreciation for Arab nationalism, its legitimacy and the need for equality between the two peoples in Palestine\(^\text{88}\). Luria remained loyal to the idea of the national home, but envisioned a binational political system of two equal legislative houses, as “the common interests of both peoples should make room to a wider common action”\(^\text{89}\).

Indeed, for his views, Zionist educators depicted Luria as a true humanist, a liberal and a renaissance man\(^\text{90}\). Yet, there is no indication that Luria voiced these views in his professional work. On the contrary, Luria was also active in scuttling the Kedoorie initiative and refused to voice any criticism regarding the role of Hebrew education in widening the gap between the

\(^{85}\) Yosef Luria’s Diary, 9 August 1913, First notebook, National Library, Jerusalem.
\(^{86}\) 10 June 1913, ibid.
\(^{88}\) Yosef Luria, Sheifotenu 3 (1923): 10–24.
\(^{89}\) Yosef Luria, “Gishatenu la-parlament,”.
\(^{90}\) David Kimche, ed., Nefesh le-dr. yosef Luria, 5–8.
people in his testimony before the Peel Commission. Luria and Yellin, the representatives of the Yishuv in the PBHS (the single Arab-Jewish committee in the field of education) were reluctant and hesitant in their cooperation. Yellin did not attend the first preliminary meeting of the board, although invited, claiming that the soon to be opened Hebrew University would initiate its lectures on subjects covered by the Board. Similar to Yellin’s stand in 1903, when the Board discussed the teaching of sciences he warned of “the prevalent danger in the East of learning too many languages and not paying sufficient attention to science”. Meaning that proficiency in two languages, Hebrew and English for the Jewish students, was enough while again he regarded Arabic as luxury. Yellin was persistent; he expressed the same views almost forty years earlier, criticising the excessive language instruction in Jewish schools that depended on the good will of philanthropists from different countries.

Yellin and Luria did attend the first meetings of the Board as representatives of the Yishuv from its formal inception, but declared their abstention from all discussions not directly related to the exam. Luria and Yellin attended the Board’s meetings with members of the Arab intellectual elite and leading educators such as Khalil Totah, Rafiq al-Tamimi, Is‘af al-Nashashibi, Ahmad Samih Khalidi, George Antonius and others. A neutral encounter under British patronage during a relatively peaceful period, the Board could have been utilised by the two educators to establish a bond with the Arab educators based on their own vision, but it was not to be.
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A few reasonable explanations could interpret these inconsistencies. Yellin and Luria were both enthusiasts for Hebrew education, both zealous fighters in the “War of the Languages” on the eve of the First World War, and any other language instruction could have undermined the vision of its rebirth in Palestine. Their plate was already full and an educational engagement with the Arabs or Arabic was one challenge too many. Moreover, a true commitment to the Board could have undermined the role of the Hebrew University (est. 1925) in determining the trajectory of secondary schooling in Hebrew education. Investing energy in this kind of cooperation always came at the expense of cooperation within the fragmented Hebrew education system, itself brimming with rivalries and tensions. Another political reason could be Yellin and Luria’s fear of jeopardising their own position, status or prestige in mainstream Zionist institutions by challenging the separatist educational paradigm or voicing a pedagogy that would have a detonative impact within the national movement. Instead, they worked within an attainable equilibrium and every so often voiced daydreamer visions which they had little intention of implementing.

Within the Hebrew pedagogic discourse, this was not a rare phenomenon. A relatively open pedagogic discourse enabled advocating educational visions of Arab-Jewish cooperation even within the mainstream public sphere. While they had no actual influence, published articles calling for curricular reform and emphasising the need for Arabic instruction, the need “to know our Arab neighbours and their culture” and the like, acted as a pressure reduction valve. Educators worried about this issue sent their message in a bottle, one that could always remain sealed with the claim that other burning issues took precedence.

---

96 The “War of the Languages” (1913-1914) was the title given to the struggle of Zionist educators in Palestine against instruction in languages other than Hebrew.
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Eliezer Rieger (1896-1954), a senior supervisor in the general trend provides a graphic illustration of this pedagogic paradox. In his comprehensive volume about Hebrew education (published 1940), Rieger raises similar ideas to his Zionist-humanist predecessors, but concludes by warning that instruction in Arabic could lead to the Levantinisation of the Yishuv and that the Yishuv’s schools were still in need of “a period of segregation and seclusion” to establish its unique national culture.99 Since Rieger’s recommendations of Arab-Jewish rapprochement were never seriously discussed, it is clear that they were only intended as lip service. Segregation and seclusion, what Rieger truly aimed at, are digestible to the liberal pedagogue only after a pseudo-humanist preface.

Crossing the Lines

Advocating Jewish-Arab cooperation in Jewish schools rather than journal articles had its price as it meant crossing an unmarked line. Siegfried Lehmann, founder and director of the Ben Shemen Youth Village (est. 1927) and sympathiser with Brit Shalom and Ihud, wrote the most comprehensive book about Hebrew education and the Arabs. In the early 1940s Lehman warned that Jewish life in Palestine inside “a wall-encircled enclave” would lead to a catastrophe like in Europe. Pedagogically, he severely criticised Zionist education for its emphasis on power, complete subjectivity and inclination to emotional propaganda, directed to the lowest common denominators. The youth, Lehman noted, were educated to believe in its almighty strength that could overcome all obstacles, instead of being educated to win the most within the existing conflict of interests.100 Lehman objected to what he saw as religious determinism emanating from the idea of the historic right over the country, an irrational concept that would distance the Jews from compromise. Instead, Lehman offered a political education, based on an objective understanding of reality by examining situations from every possible

100 Siegfried Lehmann, Shorashim, 22–25.
angle, and a subjective empathy to the legitimate feelings of the other people, one that would eradicate prejudice. Political education, maintained Lehman, should be rooted in the acknowledgment that Jewish nationalism was not different from Arab nationalism, “that the Arabs love their land and freedom just as we do”. Lehman acknowledged the rise of pan-Arabism and raised questions like “if we were in their place how would we react?” The love for my people, Lehman argued, derives from the love for justice and decency towards the other.101

History instruction was crucial to this end. Rather than teaching European history, the Hebrew student must learn the history of the Orient, Arab and Islamic history. Rather than travelling to Europe, the Hebrew student must get to know the Orient. A true connection to the homeland, Lehman argued, could only be achieved by merging in the Orient.102

Lehman tried to implement his theories in the agricultural boarding school he directed, the Ben Shemen Youth Village. Arabic instruction, for example, was mandatory and given due weight in the curriculum with frequent mutual visits to the neighbouring villages taking place.103 The school held seminars from its early years promoting these ideas. In one of these seminars in 1931, under the title “For Peace”, the pacifist Nathan Hofshi spoke against the use of force and called the youth to follow Gandhi’s way. The pedagogue Akiva Ernst Simon spoke against Jewish nationalism, depicted as a greater danger than Arab imperialism. Doar Hayom denounced the institution, dominated by the Brit Shalom ideology, for holding such events, and the two speakers for poisoning the hearts of Hebrew youth.104

Shavu‘a ha-mizrah, literally week of the East, was a full week dedicated in Ben Shemen to Arab culture, meetings with Arab youth, exhibitions of Arab music and dance and speeches promoting Jewish-Arab coexistence. These events did not go unnoticed in the Yishuv. The
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1941 exhibition triggered a scandal after it became public that Arab participants sang nationalist songs and an Arabic-speaking girl student whose parents had been murdered by Arabs was chosen to grant a souvenir to the Arab participants, a JNF box on which the Arabic dedication covered its Star of David. The final straw was Simon’s speech in favour of binationalism. An anonymous letter was sent to Moshe Shertok, head of the Agency’s Political Department, accusing Ben Shemen of subverting the foundations of Zionism. The Revisionist *Ha-Mashkif* accused Ben Shemen of crimes against Zionism and called for the immediate resignation of Lehman and his staff, whom it described as national traitors. Even *Davar*, more sympathetic to Lehman’s educational reputation, adopted the conclusions of the Va'ad’s commission of enquiry on the event. The newspaper criticised Lehman for incautiousness and carelessness in administrating the event, for inviting Simon as the only lecturer and for not examining his lecture before it became public.

Simon too dedicated his life to education. Upon his arrival to Palestine, he became a history teacher at Haifa Reali School, then the principal of the Beit-Hakerem High School and from 1939, a professor of education at the Hebrew University. He was a vocal supporter of humanist education for Arab-Jewish cooperation and the recognition of Arabs’ rights in Palestine. In 1931, Simon published a book in German about the instruction of history. In the book, Simon articulated a self-reflective theory of instruction, in which the teacher constantly questions his values and historical interpretation while examining his ideology and the values leading him to his conclusions. Simon warns from suggestion in the instruction of history and instead calls on the teacher to encourage students to criticise his views. This pedagogy obviously influenced his friend Lehman. Simon also called for instruction in colloquial Arabic and stressed the need

---
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for a revision in Zionist education as part of a new political agenda in which “the school is obligated to do everything to break the walls of hatred and educate both peoples to mutual respect”. 109

Simon was severely criticised for preaching his views before the Hebrew youth at Ben Shemen. Revisionist newspapers and Hed-Hahinuch, the official journal of the Teachers’ Union, demanded his resignation and called on readers to “uproot all the Ernest Simons”. Organisations such as the Jerusalem branch of the Teachers’ Union and the university’s Graduate Students’ Union expressed similar views.110 In the Hebrew University, students called for a boycott of his lectures and distributed pamphlets ridiculing him. One of those included an illustration of an Arab riding Simon as a donkey and shouting “Long live Haj Amin and Qawuqi.” Shortly after his lecture in Ben Shemen, on 3 September 1941, a bomb exploded in Simon’s yard and in January, the following year, during one of his lectures, a group of young men burst in, beat him, and forced him to step down from the podium.111

The outrage after the 1941 event symbolically reflects the Yishuv’s stand against Lehman’s pedagogy. The outcry over Arabic letters covering a Star of David, a victim of Arab terrorism granting a gift to Arabs, an expositor of innocent youth to Arab nationalist songs and non-mainstream Zionist ideas, provided cover for deeper fears. Lehman crossed a pedagogic Rubicon for he replaced empty theories about getting to know your neighbours, widely accepted by mainstream educators, with concrete actions in this direction. He problematized central Zionist views and gave presence in his school, not only to Arabic and Arabs, but also to their views. Paradoxically, Lehman’s radical pedagogy against the establishment of a nationalist enclave in Palestine isolated Ben Shemen and turned it into an enclave as well, as it failed to spread its spirit beyond the institution’s walls.
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The initiatives of David Yellin’s son, Aviezer, a pedagogue and head of the Teachers’ Union along with David Avisar, a native Hebronite, educator and activist for the connection of Zionism to the Arab cultural world, further emphasise the existing borders between Jewish and Arab educators. The two were responsible for two delegations of educators and students to Egypt. The first, in March 1926, included 90 participants who visited schools, teachers’ training institutes and universities. The tour was reciprocated in a visit of 112 Egyptian teachers, inspectors and principals to Hebrew education institutes. Dr. Nisim Malul received the Egyptian delegation in Palestine and translated the speeches. Dr. Benzion Mosenson, the principal of the Gymnasia Herzliya who hosted the delegation, declared, “One of the peoples of the East has reached out its hand to us”.

The Palestinian and Egyptian press treated both visits as Zionist propaganda and as an Egyptian official recognition of Zionism. The local Arab resentment triggered an unplanned visit to Arab schools as well. In April 1935, a similar visit was organised with 240 teachers and students. These initiatives of large-scale delegations ended out of lack of interest or support from the Yishuv’s institutions.

In a satirical article, after mentioning an incident in which a Palestinian Arab shouted “Traitors!” at the delegation in Haifa, Doar Hayom cited Khedive Isma’il’s statement that Egypt was no longer African but European, obviously contrasting the backward nature of local Palestinians with the Europeanised Egyptian visitors. For people like Yellin and Avisar, ties with the capital of Arab culture through the exchange of educational ideas was a possible bridge between Zionism and the Arab world and the cooperation of prominent Egyptian educators proved its great potential. However, the same bridge sought to bypass the Palestinian Arabs,
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overlooking them on the reciprocal visit and failing to consider them as possible partners for similar visits. This was perhaps another early example in which the road from Cairo to Jerusalem did not go through Palestine or the Palestinians...

Other visions contesting Zionist particularism came from the margins of the Zionist movement; from the margins, it was easier to voice unconventional opinions and ideologies. Publications of binational movements such as Brit Shalom, Ihud, the League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and the ha-Shomer party, had no problems sacrificing the sacred cows of Zionist education. These various publications demanded similar reforms, such as the translation of textbooks into both languages, emphasis on historical periods of cooperation, the publication of booklets about folklore of both nations, implementing mandatory instruction of language, summer camps in neighbouring settlements, student exchange and more.117

One of the issues of Ihud’s periodical Ba’ayot Hayom mentioned a report submitted by the League to the Jewish Agency discussing the textbooks in use in Hebrew schools, in which there was no mention of the Arabs living in Palestine. One might ask, the writer noted ironically, “did they all convert to Judaism?”118 Another commentary written by B. Eliush119 criticised the focus on heroic figures of war and violence in Hebrew education. The writer offered to counterbalance those with a “new light… a friendly, cordial, vivid description of the Arabs, getting to know their spiritual and material daily life…” instead of “pure Hebrew chapters…poisoning the soul of the Hebrew child and any sprout of a humane approach to his Arab brethren”. The writer even negated the religious rights on the land and its utilisation in the textbook, depicting the hypocrisy of the instrumentalised secular reading of the scripture for nationalist purposes.120
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In another article, Eliush criticised the educational programs sponsored by the JNF, an institution that enjoyed a hegemonic role in the Yishuv’s schools. Eliush invalidated the JNF’s notions of the chosen people proclaimed as an inherited right rather than a moral responsibility and personally criticised a speech delivered by Baruch Ben-Yehuda, the legendary acting principal of Gymnasia Herzliya, in which Ben-Yehuda called for belief in man without explicitly mentioning the Arabs.121

Politically, radical voices for Arab-Jewish cooperation in education came from the Hashomer Hazair party, which from the late 1920s engaged, with a certain amount of ambiguity, with binationalist ideology.122 From the mid-1930s, the movement declared its vision of Jewish-Arab cooperation and appointed a committee to initiate Arabic classes, establishing ties with the Arab population, organising meetings between schools, festivals and medical and agriculture cooperation. Hashomer members were active in the establishment of The League for Jewish-Arab Rapprochement and Cooperation in 1939, a movement with a binationalist vision. The League’s publications stressed the centrality of education in achieving their goals.123 The party’s vision of Arab-Jewish equality and solidarity in the labour market called for the establishment of mixed vocational schools and the teaching of both languages, evening schools for adults and joint youth cultural clubs.124

Having their own settlement movement and an independent political-cultural organisation, this movement also had its own Arabists.125 Ahron Cohen, a prolific Orientalist writer and binationalist visionary and activist, dedicated a book in 1944 to education across the Arab world, the only one of its kind in Hebrew during the mandate. Cohen is critical of Zionist orientalists for their research originating in prejudice and reluctance to use knowledge to
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promote understanding, their manifest destiny. Cohen blames British imperialism and its interest in preserving illiteracy through poor funding of education. Arabs, he stresses, are not “naturally ignorant” and their regimes determine their cultural level. While acknowledging the poor state of Arab education, Cohen is optimistic regarding its trajectory stating “and yet it moves”, marking secularisation as an important trend, the increasing interest in education, the growing press coverage and local investment in Palestinian villages. When Cohen quotes Totah’s statement, “do not think of me as a Zionist, but we have a lot to learn from the Jews”, he seeks to convince his Hebrew readers of the positive aspects of these trends and the role Zionism could have in promoting them. Cohen’s depiction of the high illiteracy rates among Arabs as a catastrophe in comparison to the few thousand illiterate Jews, not only gives perspective but also treats the issue as a shared challenge. Bringing up pedagogic progress in Palestine and citing Palestinian Arab pedagogues reveals the humane aspects of Arab society, enabling the Hebrew reader to get to know the Arabs beyond the existential threat.

The Jewish-Arab war ended two decades of ambiguity in Ha-Shomer’s binationalist vision and proved its fragile nature, outrun by events and the more powerful structural logics at work. Although there were disputes among the party’s leadership regarding Ben Gurion's policy towards the Arabs, the movement’s soldiers, commanders and settlements aligned themselves wholeheartedly with it and posed no opposition to the displacement of Palestinian Arabs. This does not necessarily mean that their radical binationalist educational agenda emanated from hypocrisy. Instead, it sheds light on a political instrumentalisation of education to
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articulate a utopian vision. Utopias serve as moral tranquilizers, as on a declarative level they are always there, even while reflecting the opposite to the lived reality.

The few examples of pedagogical trespassing are exceptions that prove the rule. They highlight the difficulties in producing a counter-educational alternative to the undisputed power of educational segregation. Lehman was able to experiment and create an alternative in his practically private terrain and it is doubtful whether implementing similar methods was possible in the cities or towns under the close attention of parents and supervisors. Similarly, the binationalists were free to establish an alternative pedagogy as long as it stayed on the pages of their journals and away from the youth. Like any other radical opposition, the delegitimisation of these movements distanced their educational vision from practical experience. Binationalist education and an alternative history instruction remained a theoretical abstract, a creed of a few mostly detached righteous men.

Not that there is Anything Wrong with it

There are only a few examples of Arab engagement with Jewish education beyond the political debate. However, similarly to Jewish binationalists, Arab educators were among the central voices that contested the strict separation between Arabs and Jews.

The most famous example is that of Khalil al-Sakakini. Sakakini had a complex relationship with the Jews, as a fervent Arab nationalist and anti-Zionist who maintained friendly relationships with Jews and Zionists alike. In 1914, Sakakini confessed to his Jewish student and friend, a Zionist land purchaser, that his hatred of Zionism was not due to his ambivalence towards Jewish national resurrection. It was because he hated “the principle on which the Zionist movement stands: trying to establish its nationalism on the destruction of

others”. His beliefs did not stop him from teaching Arabic during the war years to Zionists, an encounter that apparently influenced him to join the Free Masons. Sakakini’s education sought to go beyond sectarian separations. As a humanist educator and Arab nationalist, he opened his progressive Dusturiya to all congregations including Jewish students from the prominent families of the Old Yishuv. After the war Sakakini continued his Arabic instruction for Jews and Hebrew instruction for Arabs in evening courses sponsored by the JCA’s (Jewish Colonization Association) initiative “ha-Solel” for Arab-Jewish rapprochement.

Sakakini remained loyal to this humanist approach during the mandate as well. He personally accepted two Jewish students to study at the al-Nahda College, known for its nationalist spirit. When Gideon Weingert, formerly a student at Ben Shemen, asked Sakakini if he could join the school, Sakakini accepted him and asked one of his friends to host him during his years of study. Weingert admired Sakakini and often sat with him at the “Picadilly” café, a friendship that allowed Gideon an acquaintance with prominent Arab notables. Sakakini had no problem being known as having contacts with Jews. In 1944, he even gave a long interview to his friend, Jacob Yehoshua for the journal *Hed-Hamizrah*, in which the author praised the Arab educator and his revolutionary educational methods. Yehoshua, a native Jerusalemite from the old Yishuv, writes in admiration about the old educator, without mentioning a word of Sakakini’s nationalist views. Again, perhaps because Sakakini separated his politics from his pedagogy when meeting his Jewish friends. Perhaps because Yehoshua preferred a de-nationalised Sakakini and intentionally overlooked these characteristics.

---
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Adel Jaber, a friend of Sakakini and a teacher at the Dusturiya, was also in constant contact with Jews and Zionists. Before and during the First World War, Jaber taught Arabic at Gymnasia Herzliya and as mentioned before, he was a close friend of Luria. For a short period, after the British occupation, he became a senior official in the new Education Department.

In 1921, Jaber translated a book by the prominent Zionist leader Max Nordau, and continued to teach Jews Arabic under the supervision of Va‘ad ha-Ḥinukh. After quitting his educational work, Jaber continued to engage in educational issues as a member of the PBHS, gave lectures on various issues at schools and contributed to school journals. In 1940, Jaber was in contact with the Political Department and toured the region, visiting leaders in Transjordan, Egypt and Iraq including Palestinian exiles to examine their views on a future agreement with the Zionists. After his tour, Jaber demanded a concrete program from Moshe Shertok, one that he could present to the Arab leadership. The Zionists never submitted such a program, and Jaber wrote one himself based on the principal of a Semitic federation of autonomous states in which Palestine would be a binational state. Shertok and Ben Gurion refused to authorise Jaber’s proposal as a preliminary document for negotiations. Jaber felt disillusioned after his plan’s rejection and noted to Kalvariski that the Zionists were always willing to talk about peace, but would fail in any real attempt to make it happen.

‘Umar Salih al-Barghuthi, a lawyer, a scholar and the co-author of Tārīkh filāṣṭīn with Khalil Totah, at the time the principal of the Teachers’ Training College, also negotiated with the Zionists on a plan for the future of Palestine. To this end, Barghuthi met with Magnes, Kalvariski and others during the 1930s and 1940s.
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George Antonius served as a senior official at the Education Department until the late 1920s. Since the early 1930s Antonius, a close friend, confidant and neighbour of the Mufti, had been in contact with Magnes and other moderate Zionists and made public visits to Jewish settlements. On the eve of the Arab Revolt Antonius met a few times with Ben Gurion trying to find a way to prevent the anticipated storm of violence. Antonius accepted Zionism as a spiritual movement and acknowledged its achievements in Palestine but rejected it as a political project of displacement of the Arabs. A natural born diplomat, he saw the advantages of dialogue and negotiations over violence. Still, he remained loyal to the Mufti and failed to present an alternative to his way. Trapped in the iron cage between British oppression and uncompromising Zionist vision, Antonius became the spokesperson of the Palestinian national movement.

Sakakini, Jaber, Barghuthi and Antonius are four examples of educators-intellectuals who had close Zionist friends and even engaged in negotiations with the Yishuv regarding a possible Jewish-Arab settlement. These ties were marginalised, omitted or stripped of their importance in their biographies, edited after their deaths, but were known in their circles during their lifetimes. During the mandate, openly advocating Arab-Jewish cooperation was an extremely rare phenomenon that often ended tragically. Particularly in the field of education, there is no evidence to support such views. Thus, if there is any evidence, we could only find it between the lines. The failed attempt to establish an Arab university in Palestine might help us here.

Since the inception of the mandate, the establishment of a university in Palestine was the dream of Palestinian intellectuals and educators. Even Bowman shared this dream and believed that a British university in Palestine could be a fine alternative for the Egyptians and Palestinians who were not satisfied with Egyptian universities. Bowman saw the British

university as another centre of imperial influence, but noted that the plan was dropped after the 1929 disturbances. Tibawi offers further input, mentioning that the establishment of a British university in Palestine, a plan configured already in 1922, three years before the inauguration of the Hebrew University, failed due to lack of cooperation from the Jewish community. The Jews, according to Tibawi, were reluctant to integrate Jewish students in any institute that would not use Hebrew as a language of instruction. Being less united culturally than the Arab society, Tibawi claims that the Jews were afraid of losing their monopoly over the future institute and followed a systematic “tendency to exclusiveness in education” shown also in the Jewish lack of cooperation in the PBHS and the Kedoorie affair.

Tibawi mentions several initiatives to establish a university and the “cosmopolitan” nature of Palestinian Arabs who never objected to the idea. What is not mentioned, but could be inferred from his criticism of the Yishuv, is that the Arab community could have benefited from the Yishuv’s support and cooperation in order to establish such an institute. Moreover, Tibawi fully supported the idea of one Palestinian university with different departments reflecting the academic needs of both communities. Similarly, in the case of Kedoorie and the PBHS, it seems that Tibawi hoped to see a mixed secondary agricultural institution and believed that one examination board could answer the needs of both communities and could have certainly benefitted from Jewish cooperation. These are all, of course, hindsight assumptions.

One Shai report strengthens this assumption. In late 1946, Tibawi met A. L., a Shai agent, whom he had met previously. A. L. probably presented himself as a journalist and Tibawi showed interest in the publication of his views in the Hebrew press and suggested a future

144 Testimony before the Royal Commission 27 November 1936, Private/ Secrete meeting, BM 2/2/97/4-5, MECA.
145 Tibawi, Arab Education, 123.
146 Ibid., 118.
meeting in Jacob Yehoshua’s house. 147 Tibawi, like Sakakini, had no problems meeting Jews even in periods of tension. His personal relations with the Jews could only amplify his disappointment at their reluctance to see him personally or his colleagues as possible partners.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have shown how the strength of educational segregation rested not only in the dominance of those who were committed to it but also in the loneliness, hesitant motivations, and inconsistencies of those who contended with it. Although these educators held unorthodox views about the future of Palestine, they failed to swim upstream against segregation even when convinced of its dangers. This was not because the challenges for Arab and Hebrew education were too many to handle without the conflict. Arab and Jewish educators did the impossible on various fronts. As educators, they were expected to follow the hegemonic discourse rather than re-inventing the wheel. Bowman refused to go against his colonial superiors and mission schools failed to present a sustainable alternative. The Ben Shemen incident and the few cases of Arab collaborators are examples of what happened when educators did cross the lines. As we have seen, educators could speak their minds in articles and personal conversations, but even in this small opposition group, self-censorship kept them from promoting actual educational plans in accordance with their vision. Thus, Arab and Jewish students were spared the perils of mixed education.

The story of these educators also reflects the introspective nature of the educator’s profession and his ability and inclination to ask questions and challenge conventions. Perhaps the everyday encounter with children and youth, people in a constant mode of soul searching and identity molding affected them as well. It was no coincidence that in the few spaces that
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147 A.L, Report on a meeting with Abd al-Latif Tibawi, undated (presumably November 1946), 230/105/159, HA.
enabled the imagination of a different reality, educators and education were key players. That was the source of both their strength and their weakness.
Chapter Two: Peeking over the fence

"The Arabs know very little about the Jews; but the Jews do not know a lot about the Arabs and if there are Jews who think they know the Arabs... this is often derived from prejudice, something worse than not knowing. The interest in the profound layers of the neighbouring people... education and alike, if it even exists is often shared by few individuals, ‘obsessed with knowing’, their interest is mostly for its own sake, without acknowledging their duty to connect the two peoples fated to live together by historic destiny".¹

The authorship and deeds of those few educators who envisaged alternatives or challenged educational segregation were at the margins of a wider ideological, cultural and political engagement with the national other that internalised the segregation and defined itself through it. This chapter will focus strictly on texts in Arabic and Hebrew that deal with the education of the national other, deconstructing the stakes involved in this interest in the national other, its nature and the reciprocal impact of both education systems on each other. Intelligence documents, newspaper articles and books reveal the great interest both communities had in the education of the national other.

During the mandate period, Zionist scholars, authors, politicians and intelligence agents produced numerous works about the Arab community in Palestine. These works, some of which were made public and some that remained clandestine, reflected either academic curiosity, fascination with the oriental, or suspicion and classification of the enemy. Some mirrored a combination of all of the above. Palestinian Arab intellectuals, authors and politicians wrote less on Jews and Zionism during the same period, although in comparison with other topics, Zionism received ample attention.

From the inception of the Zionist movement, Arabs were objects of scrutiny. Paradoxically, as articulated by Krakotzkin and as we shall see in detail later, the Jewish exodus from Europe and colonisation in the East facilitated Jewish integration in the West and the acceptance of the Jews as a European nation. This project also meant the construction of the oriental, the Arab,

¹ Cohen, Ḥaškalah ye-hinukh ba-‘olam ha-‘arvi, 4.
as the ultimate other of the Western Zionist vision. It treated the Orient with ambivalence, as primitive and violent on the one hand and as a role model for authenticity on the other.²

While belittling Arab national aspirations as a vocal political strategy, the engagement of Zionist institutions, especially that of the Political Department and its Arab Bureau, with the inner politics of Arab society, their profound interest in its political, cultural and economic life reflected the opposite. Through its different institutions, the Zionist movement was extremely attentive to the Arab population. Moreover, apart from the scholarly work on Arab and Islamic history published by Jewish Orientalists in Palestine, Hebrew books about Arab society in Palestine and other Arab countries were published and contemporary books were translated from Arabic to Hebrew.³

The institute of Oriental Studies at The Hebrew University was founded in 1926. Its professors, with only one exception, were all of German descent and were all graduates of German universities. Unlike the German model, in the new university, Jewish studies and Oriental studies were separated for obvious reasons; the first discipline was established for the development of a national consciousness defined by its distinctiveness from the latter. The Orientalist paradigm was fully adopted in both institutes, while rejecting the inclusion of Judaism within the Orient.⁴

The Orientalist professors, with their firm belief in distance and closure and strict dependence on the written text, gave very limited academic attention to the Palestinian Arabs.⁵ Eyal argues that Orientalism for German Jews, who suffered from anti-Semitism in Germany,

2 Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, “Oryentayalizm”.
3 The historian geographer Ze’ev Vilnay published a two-volume survey about the history of Palestinian Arabs including contemporary aspects of Palestinian society, Ze’ev Vilnay, Toldot ha-ʻaravim; The orientalist, journalist Michael Asaf published a comprehensive three-volume research, Mikha’el Asaf, Toldot ha-ʻarvim be-erets-yiśra’el; Vilnay was one of the Haganah hikers-archeologists, Shimri Salomon, “Hakarato ve-ti’udo,”; Asaf along with Menachem Kapeliouk an Orientalist and translator of Arabic literature were drafted by Sasson to spread pro-Zionist propaganda in Arab newspapers, “Sasson to Moshe Shertok,” 24 July 1940, 105/378/93, HA; About Kapeliouk see also in, Yoav Gelber, Shorshe, 99.
4 Raz-Krakotzkin, “Oryentayalizm.”
5 Gil Eyal, The Disenchantment, 62–64.
was a form of mediation between East and West. This was their Zionism, and this was also the focus of their academic research - the Golden Age of Sepharad for example. Indeed, most of the professors were either sympathisers or members of Brit Shalom, founded a year before the Institute. Their sympathy for the Arabs did not produce scholarship on the Arabs living in Palestine. Nevertheless, the institute played a crucial role in training a generation of scholars who later followed a different approach.

These students chose to leave the slow and tiring academic career and work for the Zionist institutions, using the knowledge and methods acquired in the university. Students at the Institute such as Reuven Zaslanski, Yaacov Shimon, Eliyahu Eilat and others, became the prominent Arabists of the Yishuv. Eyal depicts a struggle between the different strands of Hebrew orientalism. On the one hand were the academics and their alienation from all that is not scientific, and on the other hand their students, criticising their teachers’ lack of knowledge of colloquial Arabic and focus on esoteric fields. These students employed the philological methods in the field of either intelligence or political action. The texts were also different; newspapers replaced the classical books and the face-to-face encounter with people replaced the text as a sole source.

This approach echoes in Yaacov Shimon’s comprehensive survey on Palestinian Arabs stating that the book does not presume to be of a purely scientific nature as it deals with the Arab present “and this is far closer to us… [than a] dry scientific view”. The sources employed in the works written by these experts on Palestinian society are diverse and all the publications discussed here include an impressive bibliography.

Shimoni (1915-1996), a Jew of German descent, one of the founding members of the Arab
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Shai, an educator and an orientalist who had his own weekly radio show on the sociology of Arab society, shows an impressive proficiency in Arab sources and the local Palestinian press. However, at his disposal he also had the knowledge acquired by the Shai. In the foreword to his book ‘Arve erets-yišra’el (The Arabs of Erets-Yišra’el, 1947), Shimoni mentions a few prominent Arabists of the Yishuv, giving the warmest thanks to Ezra Danin, the citrus farmer and arch-Arabist of the Yishuv. The intelligence sources and the advice given by Arabists are crucial since according to Shimoni “in Arab matters one should not accept the written word as pure facts and a living reality”. The impressive variety of sources, either publicised or collected clandestinely, employed in the book, has made it a relevant textbook for the understanding of Arab society up to the present.

Eliahu Epstein-Elath (1903–1990) is another example of deviation from the classical academic approach of the first generation of professors in the Hebrew University. Epstein, a Jew of Ukrainian descent who had his primary education in the heder, was an enthusiastic Zionist from his early youth. Upon his arrival to Palestine, he dedicated himself to the idea of Hebrew labour and learned Arabic while working as a construction worker with the local Bedouins in Ma‘an and al-Salt, in Trans-Jordan. Epstein was later among the first ten students of the Oriental Institute and combined his studies with volunteering in the Haganah. Epstein left the Hebrew University in favour of the AUB, maintaining that “in the Hebrew University we study Arabic but not the Arabs”, while he was more interested in the sociology of the Arabs rather than their philology. During his studies, he returned to Trans-Jordan as he wished to “be fully rooted, not less than any Arab student, in this living land” and lived with the Bedouins there for a few months, adopting their dress and customs. This research led to the publication of a book on the life of the Bedouins in 1933. While in Trans-Jordan Epstein was
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10 Shai, an abbreviation of sherut yedi’ot, the Haganah’s intelligence service. The Arab Shai was the department in charge of collecting intelligence on the Arab community in Palestine and the Arab world under the Shai.
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asked by the Political Department to file reports on Arab notables he was in contact with. Later, Epstein’s knowledge and ties with Arab intellectuals and leaders in Trans Jordan and Beirut led to his recruitment to head the Near East Wing in the Jewish Agency’s Political Department, a post he held for ten years (1934-1944).12

In his book, Epstein wrote that “almost none of the Bedouins know the shape of a letter” and the authorities’ attempts to establish government schools were received “with no enthusiasm: ‘What need does the son of the desert have in madani (urban) education that would only spoil the youth’s head, giving and adding nothing of use. To excel at riding, to hit the target and to know the desert and its customs, that is the doctrine needed by the Bedouin youth and not a book.’” “I have heard this many times” Epstein writes, describing the dreadful fortune of the teachers sent to the desert. In the Bedouins, Epstein recognises an authentic familiarity with the Jews. While looking at the Bedouins he sees “pictures from the bible being resurrected before us… bringing us back to our ancestors”.13 Like other Orientalists, he mixes appreciation and dismay arguing that the Bedouin has both the “perception of a child” for everything strange to him and a “rich natural intellect” that enables creativity and inventiveness.14

This sort of Orientalism was similar to the scholarship of local urban or urbanised Arab intellectuals. They too “othered” the villagers, fellahin and Bedouins in publications such as the Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society. Hanna Stephan writes, “The oriental mind, abounding in imagination, loathes exactitude and… has no use for abstractions”.15 Taufik Canaan depicts the confrontation between Bedouin and Byzantines as barbarians vs. civilisation.16 Elias Haddad, in his article about the Arab peasants’ methods of education asks,

12 David Tidhar, Entsiklopediah, 2897–2899; Avraham Hayim Elhanani, Be-orah, 164–172.
13 Eliahu Epstein, ha-Bediyim, 9.
14 Ibid., 110, 100–101.
15 Hanna Stephan, “Studies in Palestinian Customs”.
16 Taufik Canaan, “Byzantine Caravan Routes”.
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“When we see the poor fellahin many question arise in our minds. Have they any aim in life, or do they leave everything to fate? Have they any elements of culture?” Haddad colours his survey with superstitious beliefs and violence. It might be, as suggested by Khalidi, that their ethnographic works strive to show the historic roots of the Palestinian native “as an ancient and continuous occupier of the land. A way of life is being threatened… a well-founded anxiety”. They also, however, reflect an attempt of native urban intellectuals, similarly to their Zionist counterparts, to be accepted into a Western circle of scholars. They could only do so by othering those who could be mistakenly identified as identical kin to them.

Likhovski found the same characteristics of othering in the writing of the historian-anthropologist and colonial official, Aref al-Aref, a “native coloniser” in his words. Likhovski argues that the Palestinian national movement (as all other national movements) was an ideological system that engaged in the collection of knowledge and representations of groups in order to justify and consolidate control over them. This justification was made by representing the backwardness of societies such as the fellahin or Bedouins, a state that could be redeemed by a progressive nationalist movement. This legitimisation, Likhovski stresses, was essentially an adoption of the colonial Orientalist discourse.

Works like Shimoni’s and Epstein’s did not, however, have parallels in Palestine’s Arab society. Although the Jewish press was read and its articles were often critically discussed in the Arab press, Palestinian Arabs had little interest in the Jewish community as an anthropological or social object of scrutiny. Arabs did publish works on Zionism, the Zionist movement and Jewish history. Their central aim was to offer counter arguments to Zionist claims and British policy in Palestine, telling a critical history of Zionism, contradicting the Jewish claim of an historical right to the country, criticising the British support of Zionism and

18 Khalidi, “Palestinian Historiography.”
19 Assaf Likhovski, “Kinun gevulot”.
finally, calling for Arab unification to fight Zionism. These works were written as political manifestos and although the authors read the authorship of Zionist thinkers and Jewish historians, none of them incorporated Hebrew sources in his book and it is doubtful if they spoke the language or saw it as a necessity in their struggle against Zionism.\textsuperscript{20} The threat posed by the settler society demarcated their scholarship, confining it to a political rather than an anthropological discourse.

Hebrew education was analysed through this political prism. ‘Isa al-Sifri (1894-1949), who served as a teacher in government schools prior to his publicist work, does not mention any Hebrew sources in his book and dedicated only a short paragraph to Zionist education noting that “pure Jewish administration” dominates it and it pursues strictly Zionist Jewish ends.\textsuperscript{21} Al-Sifri also mentions the utilisation of Jewish sports associations for the inculcation of nationalist zeal and military training.\textsuperscript{22} Mahmud al-‘Abidi, a school principal in Safad, included in his textbook for the sixth year history and civics course a similar, though less critical depiction of Jewish education. The book, first published in 1937 and reprinted in six editions by 1947, was authorised by the mandate’s Education Department for use in its schools. In the chapter discussing the government of Palestine, under the sub-chapter on education, ‘Abidi’s description of Arab education remains rather dry, discussing budget and administrative issues. Jewish education on the other hand is discussed with an emphasis on its independence and educational goals, dedicated to “rooting (\textit{tarassukh}) in the mind of the child” nationalist and patriotic ideals “prior to any other thing”: Jewish tradition, Hebrew language, Jewish history, and “sacrifice and devotion” for the establishment of the Jewish nation in their ancient homeland.\textsuperscript{23} Both al-Sifri and ‘Abidi, dedicated Arab nationalists, merge this criticism of a one
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dimensional, indoctrinating Jewish education, with a sub-textual fear, appreciation and envy towards the apparent conviction and vision of Jewish education in Palestine.

Hebrew education was also utilised as another proof of the government’s discrimination against the Arab community and its support of the Jews. The McNair Commission of Enquiry appointed after the Second World War to examine the situation of Hebrew education, raised anger and suspicion amongst the Arabs. The Arab press depicted the appointment of a commission to focus on Hebrew education as a “Zionist manoeuvre” of deceit; it symbolised the discrimination felt by the Arabs of Palestine.\textsuperscript{24} Arab newspapers were vocal about the need for a similar commission to examine Arab education. The objective of the commission, one article argued, was to take more from the Arab education budget in order to complete the Jewish plan to take over Palestine, protesting the government’s indifference towards and suffocation of Arab education.\textsuperscript{25} A critical article in \textit{al-Ittihad} argued that while the Jews invested all their education on genuine schools’ needs, the Department’s budget was channelled to providing the salaries of its employees.\textsuperscript{26} Jews for their part complained that they were paying the bulk of the taxes while receiving less than the Arabs were.

Another point of comparison was Jewish autonomy in education contrasted with British restriction of Arab education. Towards the end of the mandate, there was a growing demand for the transfer of education to Arab hands.\textsuperscript{27} The demand for autonomy was based, \textit{inter alia}, on the argument that the Arabs were interested in education as much as the Jews were.\textsuperscript{28} One Shai report noted that this Arab initiative to establish an independent system similar to the
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Jewish one was only natural and started a bit late. In order to achieve this autonomy, Arabs were keen on proving to themselves and to the government, based on the extensive investment of various communities in education with limited government support, that the Arabs’ desire to educate their sons was not inferior to that of the Jews. In an introspective al-Difa’ article, the columnist supposedly addressed the Jews while clearly sending a message to his Arab readers, “Are you [the Jews] alone in this country?... Do you alone have a will to educate your children? Have you forgotten that the Arabs were once masters of the West...”. Filastin was more explicit stating, “We want education more than the Jews”.

Hebrew education also appears as a role model and competitor, with its virtues set as an incentive for the development of Arab education. Acknowledging the role of Zionist education in the fulfilment of the Zionist project, al-Difa’ published an article criticising the fact that Palestinian Arabs who travel to study abroad take theoretical courses rather than training for practical professions such as engineering and chemistry. Those, the writer argues, could allow them to compete with the Jews in agriculture and industry.

This utilisation of Hebrew education as an incentive for the development of Arab education is prevalent in Dabbagh’s writing as well. Mustafa Murad al-Dabbagh (1898-1989), as Assistant DIE of the southern district, dedicated a book in 1935 to rural education in which he presents a comparison between literacy in the Arab Muslim and Christian sectors. Dabbagh highlights the fact that Tel-Aviv is the most literate city in Palestine with 93% literacy, compared with 13.7% in Khan Yunis and 12% in Majdal, and superior in that sense over the Jewish communities in Leningrad and Moscow. In other tables, Dabbagh emphasises the inferiority of the Arab population in general and the rural Muslim population in particular in
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Palestine regarding literacy. Dabbagh goes even further and mentions the lower illiteracy rates of Palestinian Jews in comparison with the Jews of Bulgaria, Egypt and Eastern Europe and its superiority over the Balkan countries, Italy and Eastern Europe as well. Furthermore, Dabbagh stresses the low infant death rates amongst Palestinian Jews in comparison with Arab Muslims and other countries. The message here is clear, while the Jewish community was able to establish a modern society of high standards, the Arab population was lagging behind. Dabbagh’s depiction of the village school as a “lighthouse guiding the inhabitants of the entire village” and his use of statistics bears an explicit message of admonition to educators. Their role is to remedy the inferiority of their community and make it rise to the level of its rival.

Dabbagh’s engagement with the politics of the national movement adheres to the role he attributed to education in the conflict over the future of the country. The close surveillance of the Shai over his work, if indeed accurate, noting that as a supervisor he promoted the establishment of secret student associations and firearms training “instead of” education, further emphasises this point.

Spying on Educators: Arab Education through the Eyes of the Shai

The inception of Zionist utilisation of intelligence in Palestine preceded the First World War and since the establishment of the Haganah, agents who worked voluntarily using their connections with the Arabs and the British as sources, engaged with intelligence work.

During the 1930s as violent clashes between Jews and Arabs became more frequent, intelligence about all aspects of the Arab society became a prime necessity. Arabists at the Arab Bureau of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency, for example, began in 1935 to produce near-daily summaries of newspapers from across the Arab world. The Shai was
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established in 1940 with the objective of creating a network sufficiently wide to prevent any sort of organisation without the knowledge of the Haganah. However, most of its budget came from the Political Department of the Jewish Agency and not the Haganah. At the beginning of its work, most informants possessed poor operational knowledge and the intelligence data they supplied was a by-product of their contacts with their neighbours or business associates. The agents mastered colloquial Arabic but had a superficial knowledge of Arab society and written Arabic, which led to mistakes in the intelligence they supplied. An improvement was marked in 1943, when the Shai began reading the daily Arab press, enabling a more profound understanding of Arab society. Agents read the daily press and classified the articles according to their topic, cut them from the original page and then pasted them in the relevant file and sometimes translated or summarised in Hebrew. If the agency had further information on a specific publication, it would be added to the file.

The Shai education files thus include newspaper extracts with information about education, formal government documents on education, reports filed by agents who visited schools or met with educators, and random information about incidents in schools. Informants that supplied some of this data were mobilised with money or other benefits such as jobs. All data was sent to the agency (lishka) and there it was catalogued, creating an historical archive of intelligence. The agency produced a summary report every few days and this data enabled Shimoni to create a comprehensive index of Arab personalities that included over 2000 names in 1945. Shimoni’s important role in the agency was to verify the data sent from the different agents. Since late 1944, further improvement was marked in the work of the agency, and general surveys (skirot ma’ar) were published once a week, becoming more detailed and professional.

37 About the history of the Shai see, Asa Lefen, ha-Shai.
38 Moshe Yegar, Toldot ha-mablakah ha-medinit, 300–301.
40 Ibid., 513–514, 525.
41 Ibid., 516–519.
over time. These surveys included all Arab book publications. The publication of Tamimi’s, Khalidi’s, and other textbooks, for example, were mentioned with a short summary.43

These intelligence reports gained hegemonic prominence in the highest echelons of the Yishuv’s leadership; they knew the Arabs through them and made their decisions according to them. The following section focuses on the Shai’s engagement with Arab education, analyses its perspective and underlines the significance of this engagement.

The Mapping and Classification of Everything: the Village Files

From its establishment in the 1920s, the Hagana invested energies in the mapping and surveying of the Arab village. Volunteers from diverse localities and professions started a systematic documentation of the Arab village. The informal, free-style reports produced by the camouflaged hikers-archaeologists-historians of the first decade of the mandate, turned into more formal and systematic surveys written by armed militiamen or trained agents in the midst of the Arab revolt. However, education and literacy were not documented features in the early versions of the Village Files and were not a category for the early questionnaires that served as a basis for every survey, but were introduced in the later, more comprehensive ones.44

Ezra Danin, the first head of the Arab Shai, made the systematic mapping of the Arab village a central mission for the organisation and added further details to the standard questionnaires.45 Operation Arab Village, the project behind the village files, was initiated in 1940 and lasted until the end of the mandate. The Shai conducted 945 surveys including 620 villages and 86 Bedouin tribes. In total, 65% of the Arab and mixed cities and 75% of Arab villages were surveyed. Two Arab informants, later assassinated for collaboration, authored
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hundreds of these files.

The project combined few of Zionism’s central interests. The data was valuable for the JNF for the purchase of land and valuable for Zionist historiography as it included historical data on sites related to Jewish history and on the historical origins of villagers. The Yishuv’s leadership saw the propaganda potential in proving that various villages were established by foreigners during the nineteenth century and therefore their inhabitants could not be considered as natives. 46 Towards the hostilities of 1947-1948 the maps, photographic surveys and information about weaponry and membership in the ‘gangs’ served the Haganah and the IDF in the first Arab Israeli war. 47 Previous writing on the village files has given no attention to the data related to literacy, schools and teachers although various surveys included data on literacy rate, details about the local school, students and its teachers. By 1947, hundreds of villages were surveyed offering invaluable data on literacy rates and education in general. In some cases, this is the only surviving data about the displaced communities of the 1948 war.

Where known, literacy rates were mentioned. The village of Rehaniya, for example, in the early 1940s had 60 literate people 48 while amongst the ‘Arab Al-Bassa (Wadi Faliq), and ‘Arab al-Zangariyye there were “no literate people”. 49 Where known, the reports also added the availability of newspapers and a radio under the heading of education. In most cases, the availability of both also meant that a government school was built in the village. In An-Nazla al-Gharbiya of the Tulkarm district, there were five literate people, but no newspapers or radios were found 50 while in the village of Sa‘sa’, a radio set could be found in the mukhtar’s house, Filastin and al-Difa‘ were read regularly and there was a government school with two
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In a large village such as Tayibe, there were seven radio sets circa 1942, but newspapers were still purchased in neighbouring Tulkarm. The files also reflect the prominence of the traditional *kuttab* in various villages all over the country in the 1940s, where *kuttab* Sheikhs were paid in wheat. In the village of Beit Liqya in the Ramallah area, the *kuttab* was described as “an old school, a *heder*”.54

Where government schools were found, the teachers’ names, their place of origin, education, political affiliation and influence on the local population were indicated. In various cases, the report plainly mentioned, “an ordinary man” or “neutral” teacher, meaning he had no conspicuous political or national tendencies.55 Some teachers and principals were reported as loyal to the government56 and in various cases, when a clear political tendency was known the reports would indicate whether the teacher had a bias towards the Mufti or the *muʿāraḍah* (opposition). In the village of Safarin, for example, a government teacher was reported to express his hatred to the opposition.57 However, in many cases teachers of both parties worked together at the same school and opposing political views co-existed among the staff.58 Whether neutral or ordinary, the vast majority of teachers were listed as “having no influence” in the village, or simply “useless”. This was probably due to teachers’ “fear of the government” as one report suggested,59 but mostly because village teachers were considered outsiders in the village where in many cases they were posted for only a short time. Thus, noticeable influence of the kind the Hagana was interested in was rare in village schools.

Data on literacy and education completed the general picture of the village needed by the

51 Circa 1041-1945, 105/226/110, HA.
52 105/227/128-133, HA.
53 105/226, 105/227, HA.
54 13 March 1947, 105/95/A, HA.
55 Such were the teachers in Kafr Qara (report filed 23 April 1942), and Kafr 'Abbush, Kafr Zibad, 'Illar, Deir al-Ghusun, Qalansawe, Miska, in the Tulkarm area circa 1942 (105/227, HA) and al-Kalisa, Su'sa',al-Na'ima, Ras al-Ahmar, Hunin and Meiron in the Safad area, 105/226, HA.
56 As in the case of es-Samu' and Yatta in the Hebron area, circa 1941-1943, 105/95B, HA.
57 27 April 1942, 105/227, HA.
58 See reports on Shweiki and Qaqun, circa 1942, 'Anabta, 10 July 1942, ibid.
59 Tirat bani ṣa'ab, 25 March 1947, ibid.
Haganah. Whether the displacement of Palestinian Arabs was a prior historical plan or an outcome of the war, the data thus collected targeted possible threats. Illiteracy or high literacy rates, a traditional kuttab or a modern school, or the presence of an influential nationalist teacher were valuable details for the assessment and classification of a village and the potential challenge it could pose in a violent confrontation.

To conclude, the village files, while considering their problematic aims and collection, offer information on Arab education that was not recorded anywhere else, especially about the villages that were displaced in 1948, and shed light on communities that did not produce any written documentation on their village. In addition, since various villages did not have a government school until 1948, the history of their education is absent from the files of the Education Department and Palestinian historiography.

**Insurgents, Nazis, Communists and Teachers**

Previous affiliation to a gang or familial relation to gang members were of particular interest to the Haganah. The Village Files documented any affiliation to the rebels during the Arab revolt. Based on around 150 village files, there are very few examples of teachers known to have joined the rebels or affiliated to rebel activity. Teachers’ involvement in the Arab revolt can be found under the personal files’ indexes of the Shai, consisting of various biographies of teachers. A teacher in Majdal, for example, “excelled during the bloody days as an agitator and speaker” and was in contact with the Higher Arab Executive.60 Another teacher was dismissed from his post as a government teacher for his activity during the revolt, was later incarcerated, engaged in smuggling and involved in the drawing of swastikas on the walls of Tulkarm and finally reported acting as principal of a Muslim school in Haifa.61

60 Report undated, presumably circa 1941, 105/273/120, HA.
61 Yousef Muhammad Jaber, October 1943, 105/272/156, HA.
Moreover, since the daily press, carefully read by the Shai, published all new appointments made within the Department, agents would report problematic new appointees. Filastin published on 3 September 1944, news of the appointment of Muhammad Taher as Deputy DIE for Samaria. On 4 January 1945, a report was filed stating the origin of Taher, of Lebanese descent and uncertainty as to whether his religion was Druze or Metawali. On 18 January, the previous report was corrected and it became certain that al-Taher was from the Palestinian village of Silat al-Harithiya, and that he was an active member in the gang of his uncle, Yusuf Abu Durra, a central leader during the Arab Revolt. On 29 January, the agent that reported on the Lebanese origin of al-Taher corrected his report and noted that the teacher he referred to in fact taught in Tulkarm. These reports reflect the modus operandi of the Shai, crosschecking public information with intelligence collected by agents and informants on the spot.

Yet, the fact that during the revolt only ninety teachers were reported as having been arrested, and only ten dismissed is a case in point. The few cases of teachers who joined the rebels and engaged in actual fighting were an exception. As in all government jobs, joining the rebels meant jeopardising the job they were trained for and imprisonment in most cases. Indeed, as suggested by Miller, Arab government employees were caught between the rebels, the government, and their own personal interest and safety. In most cases, the latter two had the upper hand.

During the Second World War, the Arab Shai focused on “fifth column” activity, meaning Arab support for the Nazis, especially when Palestine was under the threat of Nazi occupation. The files from the war period are filled with detailed reports on public opinion and anti-British or pro-Nazi activity. Naturally, the deeds and whereabouts of Haj Amin in Germany and the
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Husseinis’ supporters in general are widely covered while educators appear sporadically. The head of *al-Sirat al-Mustaqim* was reported as unifying youth and teachers in Jaffa, supposedly as a peaceful movement but “practically organizing a dangerous movement, for this man is an extremist…according to him the British Empire will soon fall apart. This opinion he acquired from his Nazi friends for whom he holds all his love and loyalty”. Darwish al-Miqdadi, the admired history teacher from the Arab college was also reported as supporting the Nazis, spreading Nazi propaganda from Berlin. Both the Shai and the CID followed Miqdadi, his family and their spreading of Nazi propaganda, and a group of teachers returning from Iraq after Rashid Ali’s coup (in which Miqdadi participated as well) were said to be freely spreading Nazi propaganda. Ishaq Darwish, a schools’ inspector under the Supreme Muslim Council (SMC) was reported as “an ardent pro-German”. A teacher from Tulkarm was said to speak fluent German and depicted as a Nazi supporter. In contrast, one agent reported after a visit in the northern Tulkarm area that the Arabs were reluctant to engage in propaganda and that those spreading it had no influence. In schools, he added, students were not exposed to propaganda either. Based on these reports, it is hard to determine the scale of Nazi support in schools. The sporadic events and the tight British supervision suggest that this support was marginal at most.

As well as Nazi sympathisers, the Shai and the CID targeted communists too. Communism in Palestine, often a joint movement of Jews and Arabs, threatened and challenged the Zionist
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movement while the empire considered Bolshevism as its nemesis. The encounter between communism and the empire is symbolically embodied in the story of Mahmoud al-‘Oda, a drawing teacher from the village of Sanur teaching in the Jerusalem area. Al-‘Oda was reported as drawing on the classroom’s board an illustration of Stalin riding a horse and trampling over Ramsay MacDonald when Bowman entered the classroom and ordered his dismissal. Since then, the teacher had fallen into poverty and became a money collector for the ‘gangs’. British sensitivity to any expression of communist views, an ideology of limited and local influence in Palestine, prevented the employment of vocal communists and led to the dismissal of employees who expressed such views. However, we shall see in the last chapter an interesting attempt made by young communist activists to circumvent British censorship through a student journal.

**Hot Beds of Nationalism**

It is interesting to note that both national movements perceived the other’s education system as being utilised explicitly for the nurturing of nationalist sentiments. For the Arab critics of the Education Department, the pedagogical autonomy given to the Jews to run their schools according to the Zionist ideology contrasted with restrictive, apolitical and anti-nationalist education coerced on the Arab population. The Yishuv usually attached Arab nationalism to extremism and regarded it as perilous.

In his book, Shimoni noted that the learning materials according to the Department were based on Western-European foundations, and included Arabic, Arab history, “nurturing the national Arab sentiment” and Arab literature. Lehmann argues that it was no surprise that
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government education was national, as its teachers were educated at the Arab College, “the fortress of young nationalist intellectuals”, who went on strike every 2 November. Lehmann adds that the “homeland” course was another method to inculcate pan-Arab education and mentions that a parent told him that his children were taught about the bravery and greatness of Arabs in the past and educated to love their homeland and that the Arab people was destined for greatness as in the past.78

For Zionist educators, aiming at creating a generation of Hebrew natives, Arab familiarity with their history and to a greater extent what was perceived as their authentic connection to their religion, land and sites of worship, were all considered sources of inspiration and critical challenges at the same time.

In an article he published after a visit to the Arab village school of Dura, Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, an historian and a prominent Zionist leader, expressed awe at the order and cleanliness of the school. What impressed Ben-Zvi the most were the school’s facilities for agricultural education and its “education not to cherish the homeland alone, but the village, agriculture and environment as well”. Ben-Zvi noted that the school is an illustrative example not only for the Arabs but for Jewish educational institutions as well. Rather than despising the fellahin, Ben-Zvi writes, Jewish teachers should learn from them, visit their schools and learn what “primitive peasants have done in a distant village… but most importantly [learn] about vocational, agriculture and craftsmanship education of the young generation, neglected not only in our cities but in our towns as well”.79 Ben-Zvi’s focus here is not the Arab school, but the lessons it could teach the Yishuv. Agricultural education, the centrepiece of Zionism’s vision, is neglected while the primitive neighbours, their competitors over the cultivated land, are excelling in it.

78 Lehmann, Shorashim, 103–105.
79 Davar, 16 May 1935.
Joseph Klausner, a history professor at the Hebrew University, takes Ben-Zvi’s message further, and articulates the perilous consequences of indifference and lack of internal fire towards the sanctity of the country among the Yishuv’s youth, on whom the future of the nation rests. This indifference, according to Klausner, was due to the marginalisation of Jewish history “written with the blood of our heroes” within the instruction of general history, “a crime with no absolution”. Klausner contrasts this indifference with a story about an Arab scholar who spoke perfect Hebrew, came to the attention of Brit Shalom and was sent by the movement to speak to Jewish students. In Nahalal, the students asked the Arab about his origin, and he answered that he was “from holy Jerusalem”. To this statement he received the retort: What, are you a hypocrite as well? What sanctity is there? Klausner noted that the Arab was amazed and replied, “If Jerusalem and the homeland are not sanctified, why do Jews specifically want the Land of Israel? In what way is it better than another country?” 80

It is no coincidence that Klausner specifically utilised here Rubhi Kemal, an Arab intellectual who had perfect Hebrew and was affiliated to Brit Shalom, to make a point. 81 The Arab was a threat not only because he spoke Hebrew. In his encounter with the Hebrew youth of a model settlement like Nahalal and its famous agricultural school, the Arab with his authentic appreciation of Jerusalem explicitly pointed a finger at secular Zionism. Klausner’s cry for the emphasis on Jewish education is meant to remedy the youth’s deficiency in connectedness to the land. They should be connected to it as much as the Arabs are. While observing Zionist writing on Arab nationalism, this angle should also be taken into account. The acknowledgment of its validity and authenticity was a threat to Zionism as it inherently questioned its own authenticity.

Zionist intelligence gave attention to nationalist tendencies of Arab education from the
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inception of British rule, with the establishment of the Bureau of Information, which operated under the Zionist Commission. While the validity of its reports is not certain, it is clear that these reports were central in reflecting the political atmosphere in Arab circles to the Zionist headquarters in London. One report notes that Is‘af al-Nashashibi stated that he arranged the schools “according to Arab nationalist spirit” and that if the government knew what was being taught “it would surely close our schools”. Nashashibi also advised the students of one school to wear Sharifian hats, and the students did so despite the principal’s objection: a Sharifian flag was raised in St. George’s School. Tibawi’s account seems to approve these sources, noting that in the days of Faysal’s short government, delegations made appearances in schools to spread the idea of Arab unity and that during the 1920 disturbances the schools could not be kept out of the national turmoil.

In these early sources, the Rawda College is mentioned a few times as ultra nationalist. On one occasion in 1920, its students reportedly shouted “Autonomy, unity or death”, referring to Faysal’s government. The school attracted similar attention until the end of the mandate. In 1947, it was said that from the Rawda College, under the control of the Husseinis, “nationalist and gang leaders and criminals graduate”. One report mapped the leading Husseinis in the field of education and their affiliation with the SMC. In general, the Husseinis, considered the most anti-Zionist, were under the open eye of the Shai in the field of education as well. This focus on and surveillance of schools of direct political affiliation and anti-Zionist bias, although those represented a small minority, established a general image of all schools as hotbeds of nationalism.

Some reports reflected a different approach. One report about “the nature of Arab schools”
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noted that the prohibition of any kind of engagement with politics was enforced and that teachers were fearful of losing their jobs or speaking against the “official opinions” and being slandered for doing so. Their students, “how much more so”, were said to know nothing about politics and “all they know about it comes from conversations with idlers and complete bums (yoshve kranot u-baṭlanim mushba‘im). They know that there are Jews and Arabs, Mufti and treasonous panders.”

The only schools that permitted any engagement in politics, in Jerusalem, the agent Beitari reported, were the private schools (Rawda, al-Nahda, al-Umma, and al-Ibrahimiya).

Some reports show an awareness of the restrictions on nationalism in government schools. One report mentioned that graduates of a school in Nablus, when seeking employment at the school, were questioned about the reasons they favoured teaching to other professions. All but one answered that they wished to serve their homeland and all were rejected except the one that showed no political tendencies. Moreover, the files include official circulars and signed forms circulated by the Department prohibiting all communication with the press, political activity or political affiliation to organisations such as the Muslim Brotherhood or al-Najada.

Independent students’ or teachers’ unions were of particular interest, and for that matter all coordinated student activity was under a close surveillance. Information on student unions, their members, organisational hierarchy, and all their published materials, were collected and translated by the Shai. Some documentation revolves around supposedly innocent local societies to fight illiteracy. The agent A. L., for example, personally visited a few youth clubs
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and organizations in Jaffa, spoke with teachers and students and noted that the boys from the “Students’ Committee to Fight Illiteracy” made a good impression.94 Other reports deal with unions that were more vocal, anti-imperialist or anti-Zionist. A pamphlet circulated by The Union of Palestinian Students in Cairo, for example, called for unity amongst Arab students and reform in administrative and education according to the Arab spirit.95 One report mentions a gathering of two thousand students in a Jerusalem mosque during a strike organized by the principals of a number of schools. The principal of St. George’s, who refused to allow his students to strike, was “grabbed in the neck” and was forced to allow his students to strike.96

The various reports on student organisations reflect the widening phenomenon of autonomous student mobilisation amongst Arab students in the late 1940s, part of the social, cultural and political mobilisation in Palestinian society during those years. These reports challenged the Shai’s perception of the chaotic, criminal and gang like characteristics attributed earlier to student nationalist activity.

Surveillance of secondary schools, representing the elite of Palestinian society and educators of the next leadership of the country, produced the most detailed reports. An agent would usually be sent to meet the teachers or principals of an institute for an informal conversation, enter classes, and later file a report to the central office. The level of detail in these reports is impressive and surprising. One agent had managed to put his hands on the entire student register of the College Des Frères and the Bishop Gobat School, detailing the students’ age, religion, place of origin, class and adding other information where known. One student was reported to have a Jewish father and an Arab mother and to pray with the Christians.97
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The agents sent for the mission spoke fluent Arabic and their knowledge of Arabic and Arab and Islamic culture enabled a warm and unsuspecting welcome in the schools they visited. Yizhak Navon (b. 1921), agent Yoram, produced detailed reports on Arab education in Jerusalem. Navon, the fifth president of Israel (1978-1983) was a native Jerusalemite, a student at the Oriental Institute and an Arabic teacher from a prominent old Yishuv family that had strong ties with its Arab neighbours. Along with his familial background, his perfect Arabic made it easy for him to access any Arab institution. A. L., presumably Alexander Lutzki (1911-1971, later Dotan), a Jew of Russian descent, who produced numerous reports on education and personally met Tibawi and other prominent educators, studied Arabic and Islam at the Hebrew University, was part of the research department under the Arab Bureau of the Agency’s Political Department, and maintained contacts with Arab notables across the Arab world. Lutzki’s confidence in his acquired Arabic is noticeable in a comment he made about an Arabic teacher at the WTC, noting that she “was not always punctilious on correct reading”.

Lutzki’s reports resemble those of a school inspector rather than an ordinary spy. In one report written after a visit at the Women’s Training College, after detailing the curriculum, the names of the entire staff and number of students, Lutzki noted that “the craft work is unsatisfactory according to the principal and requires improvement… I visited the history course… they were dealing with Medieval times in Europe according to an English textbook, but the class was in Arabic… the needle work of the third grade seemed infantile…the vice principal… gives the impression of being a talented woman… [Miss] ‘Abdu [the gym teacher] … is also the most handsome… of all teachers, dresses in a Western style and elaborately”.
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Other reports on teachers in elite schools were filed as part of the “Landau Plan”, configured in late 1944 by the Political Department for tightening its ties with the Arab population to minimise its dependence on informants. The plan was to train an agent that would contact a list of Jews who had good contacts with Arabs and to infiltrate Arab circles through them. His cover would be that of a journalist or author interested in the life of Arabs. The Department chose Jacob (Eyal) Landau (1916-1999) for the job. A Jew of Russian descent, Landau had immigrated to Palestine in 1935. An Orientalist and an Arabic teacher in the Hebrew Gymnasium in Jerusalem, he published his first Arabic textbook in 1945, in which he “tried to infuse new light into his subject… [and] avoid the usually tedious study of grammar” making it interesting for the students. These credentials fitted like a glove for the operation.

On 12 December 1944, Landau organised a party at his home. Four young Jews attended the “party”: Landau, Shimoni, Navon and Haim Verpel who also spoke Arabic. Three Arabic teachers also attended the event. They were all teachers in the Rushidiyya or the Arab College, representing the elitist group that was of prime interest to the Arab Department. The party lasted three hours and Landau’s wife was present.

The report includes biographical details, the assessment of character and level of knowledge of the Arab teachers. Ismail Shahed was depicted as “graceful and of great social talent”, of good contacts with notables and while talking “showed proficiency in Ancient and modern Arab literature”. Jamil Saleh, on the other hand, a maths teacher, was said to have “a poorer education than the others” and wished to become a “faranji” (a Westerner) with his elaborate dress, English speaking and presumed knowledge of Western music. Shahed,
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originally from Nablus, a graduate of the Rushidiya and the AUB, stands at the centre of the report, as he “made the impression of strong national consciousness. He severely attacked the Arabs alienated from Eastern music and by that wish to emphasise the European spirit”.

Cultural-religious issues were central in these reports. In another report, based on an interview with a college principal, the agent chose to describe in detail the progress in girls’ education, the social problems involved in it and the shifting over the years from being fully veiled to training and hiking in shorts and short sleeves. However, he noted that the Arab intellectuals showed no support for girls’ secondary education, which caused illiteracy and the preference of male Arab university students for educated non-Arab women.

Gil Eyal’s analysis of the relational nature of identity echoes here, as the Zionist identity becomes Western by definition, negation and exclusion of the Eastern. The learning, classifying and mapping of the Arabs by the Orientalists or agents delineates the borders of the Zionist collectivity and demarcates it from the Easterner. The Arab teacher’s wish to become a Westerner is an object of ridicule and girls’ education, a symbol of progress, is a rare phenomenon disregarded even by the Arab intelligentsia. Arabs can only attempt to become Westerners, but it is a fraudulent attempt, a façade disguising their true oriental essence.

Landau’s party was not free of tension. While browsing through the pages of a book, Shahed found a chapter “of Arab nationalist nature, discussing imperialism in the East and read it aloud… I felt he saw this [the chapter] as a hint for the Jews and was glad to find it and read it before us. We did not comment and moved to other business”. Shahed’s attempt to ruin the party failed. They were there to find connections. Political discussions could have jeopardised Landau’s mission.

Landau’s dedication to Arabic instruction for Hebrew speakers and his genuine interest in
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Arab culture are reflected in the reported conversations revolving around contemporary poets, authors and the Arabic language. Landau spent long hours with these teachers. Shahed came to his house for tea and Wasfi Hijab came to see him teach at the Hebrew Gymnasium after Landau visited Hijab at his room at the Rushidiya boarding school. Hijab spoke Hebrew, studied philosophy at the Hebrew University, and according to Landau wanted to get closer to Jewish society. Hijab’s interest fitted well with Landau’s mission and Landau was obviously impressed with the knowledge and seriousness of Hijab. Still, it was important for him to note that both Shahed and Hijab held a favourable opinion on Jewish education and agreed that it was far superior to Arab education.  

Landau concluded, “I felt that the party was successful and believe it will be followed by an invitation from the Arab side… I hope through them to make contacts with the teachers of the college”. The friendship between Landau and the Arab teachers was, indeed, an “authentic” bridge between educators and between cultures. Landau, with no professional training, showed impressive agent instincts, mastering a perfect camouflage as means for an end. This kind of recruitment was common in the Shai that based its network of agents on volunteers, combining poor resources for intelligence work with decisiveness and commitment to the cause.

Navon also entered Arab schools with the same degree of confidence. He wrote a six-page report on al-Nahda College in Jerusalem with the names of all the teachers, numbers of all the students according to religion and origin, and a short history of the school. Navon wrote that the central aims of the school were “to educate a generation that would resurrect the Arab nation from its ruins and to build it on healthy foundations of pure Arab knowledge unaffected by destructive Europeanisation. To educated a freedom loving generation and unite it around
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the idea of Arab nationalism, its renaissance and unification of the Arab-Muslims and Arab Christians while opening the eyes of the Arabs in the country to what is happening around them”. This was Navon’s own understanding of the school’s aims on the basis of what he saw there, and after hearing the lectures of the principal. This school, Navon reported, “is perhaps the most nationalist school in Jerusalem…the hatred towards the British is noticeable…although the teachers use English as language of instruction”, meaning that one should not be distracted by the use of English which reflected no connection to the British, whom they vocally hate.

The attitude towards Zionism and the study of Hebrew or Jewish history were also given attention in these reports. Navon noted that the Nahda’s “attitude to the Jewish renaissance in the land of Israel is indeed very negative and exceptionally noticeable and frequently the teachers combine nationalism and politics in classes. The young men have vigour but lack an organizational power that could unite them”, adding that the lectures held in the school’s association all revolve around the state of the Arabs, the Arab golden age in history and the study of ancient national poetry.\textsuperscript{112}

The agents wanted the Arabs to learn Jewish history because they thought it would give proof of their historical right to the land, and learn Hebrew to enable co-existence in the country. They considered anti-Zionism an extremely irrational notion; all the Arabs needed in order to remedy that extremism was to study Jewish history, the true one.

The agent A. L noted that in the WTC’s library, there were no books about Jewish history\textsuperscript{113} and that Miss Hacker never visited a Hebrew school and was not acquainted with the Jewish project in the country. The agent then asked, “What do you teach about the Jews?” and was answered that according to the instructions of the Department the matter was overlooked. Anti-
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Jewish influence was due to the “Arab home”, the principal noted, and nationalist enthusiasm was noticeable after vacations. The agent offered to help with her ignorance in Jewish matters and invited her to visit “ha-Bima”, the Hebrew theatre. A. L. also interviewed Willard Jones, the principal of the Friends College in Ramallah, “an ardent anti-Zionist”, in his words. A.L was shocked that after twenty-five years in Palestine, Jones had not paid a visit to a single Hebrew school, the Hebrew University or the National Library. A. L. saw an educative purpose to the meetings, stressing to both principals the importance of Hebrew instruction in Arab secondary schools “just as we nurture Arabic instruction”.

Elitist education, through the eyes of Navon, Landau and A. L., represented a conscious urban class. Contrary to the violent threat posed by the rural population, the educated elite posed an intellectual challenge, a nationalism that could not be dismissed as savagery. Labour Zionism, the hegemonic power in the Yishuv, confronted this elite and its aspirations with a socialist perspective. As argued by Michael Assaf, an Orientalist scholar, a journalist and publisher of the Histadrut’s Arabic newspaper *Haqiqat al-Amr*, in his review of Antonius’ *Arab Awakening: the urban elite’s rhetoric of Arab nationalism was nothing but incitement of the poor and the weak to fight for their own dominance. The book, Assaf adds, was filled with lies, fabrications and the superficial propaganda of a political lawyer, articulates a nationalism of language and culture with complete disregard to the poor and underprivileged Arabs supressed by the Arab elite. Antonius’ acknowledgement of Jewish historical ties with Palestine and support of Zionism as a spiritual project while denying their rights to the land, was the hardest argument to refute. Zionism and Arab nationalism, according to Assaf, are not contradictory, since Arab independence was already accomplished and all the Jews want is Palestine, a small

part of the Arab world. Assaf asks Arab Palestinians to “limit themselves” only in this small land.117

Elite urban secondary schools with their impressive architecture, modern educational work, and above all their staff and students, would not or could not agree to “limit themselves”. Although representing a small minority, they were the symbols of a widening community in Palestine that produced the knowledge, arguments and organizations that threatened Zionism the most. The energy invested in intelligence production on these schools reflects the fear of this growing community.

This fear is reflected in the quotes the agents chose to add to their reports especially regarding Arab views of the Jews. One report noted that while answering an assignment about leisure hours one student replied “I wander around in the street and whenever I see a Jew- I throw stones at him.” In general, the agent concluded, Arab students think that every Jew is a criminal and a terrorist, and the word Jewish is a synonym to dirt, hatred to religion and Arabs… all [Arab] speakers of Hebrew are traitors and the teachers cannot do anything about it”.118 Another report quoted a teacher, “a notable and important personality amongst the Arabs”, stating that the Jews – “a weak people, cowardly, liars, deceitful and perhaps clever” – offer no challenge to the Arabs and could be displaced easily. This teacher, depicted as preaching extreme nationalist ideas, is also said to be “single, and showing homosexual tendencies that distance students from him”.119 In some cases, teachers were plainly depicted as anti-Semitic.120

Descriptions of contempt and scorn towards Arab education, evidently influenced by what they read and thought about the Arabs’ view of them, are various. “Out of a hundred students,
you will find only 8-9 that would study persistently and vigilantly. The main reason for that is that there is no atmosphere of learning and content [Torah] in their schools”. The Arab teachers “are not different in anything from every other Arab… [During recess] they mainly discuss matters of women and prostitution and… politics”. One teacher was quoted as saying that the Arabs are stupid and the agent added in brackets: “I have the impression that he is not wrong”.

Since mundane teaching was not usually recorded, the files usually include outstanding and random stories from the classroom. One agent reported that students stabbed a teacher in Tirah and severely injured him after he gave them bad grades, and another student strangled a teacher in the Arab College after his students left his class protesting his continuous interest in their sisters. Another report told the story of five students who pranked a young teacher. Each of them held a cricket and when the class started, the chirping began as well and the teacher found the “criminals”. The Teacher offered the “leader of the gang” a choice between one hundred lashes or holding the cricket in his mouth for five minutes. The student chose the latter and after concluding the five minutes, started vomiting. “When the news reached the ears of the principal and inspector, they praised the teacher for the courage and initiative he had shown”. Here as well, the selection of events is telling about the Shai’s perspective of Arab education.

The Shai was spying on schools because it considered them as a possible threat. In the files, newspaper articles that mention pedagogical issues or administrative changes were rarely translated or given special attention. The focus was on independent organisation among Arabs, nationalist Arabs, vocal Arabs in general in the field of education and intriguing stories of

121 Beitari, “On the Nature of Arab Schools’ Students.”
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124 13 August 1945, 105/73/177, HA.
125 Yanai, 22 January 1947, 105/315/A/26, HA.
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violence and disgust. The value of this information is its reflection on the way Zionism engaged with its Arab neighbours. If indeed the Zionist leadership saw the Arab population through the eyes of these agents, Arab education emerges as chaotic, violent and primitive. In the case of elite schools, under the façade of Western education, they inculcate extreme Arab nationalism, with indifference or hatred towards the Jews, their history and culture. While former or acting educators wrote some of these reports, no traces of a shared cause or challenges could be found in them. When visiting an Arab school, they chose to report only on different expressions of the enemy’s modes of action, education being merely one of them.

While Arab writing on the Jewish society or Jewish education was limited, it reflected a similar trajectory. Jewish education was another apparatus of the Zionist project and was therefore a threat. However, for some educators and scholars, as we have seen, the development of the Yishuv in the field of education was a role model for the Arab education system. The subtext of highlighting the virtues of your enemy is a form of a threatening conditioning, where those of superior education shall inherit the land.

**Conclusion**

While examining the nature of both education systems, we should keep in mind this discourse of suspicion and fear. Not only because educators often took part in this work of espionage, but because the higher echelons of both communities based their views on these kinds of texts, which later percolated to all institutions and operated in a mirror effect. When under threat, education leaves little room for questions, as decisive answers are needed; extreme nationalism could only be answered with extreme nationalism.

In a prophetic speech before the Twentieth Zionist Congress against the two-state solution offered by the Peel Commission, the Zionist leader Menachem Ussishkin provided a masterly description of the nature of this reciprocity. Ussishkin warned that Arab education under the Jewish state would unavoidably enhance the already existent extremism, and naturally teach
its students that they were living in a Diaspora (*galut*) and must liberate themselves. Today, he stated, they teach that the Jews wish to steal their land, and in the future they shall say it was already stolen. This could only be confronted by a radical Jewish militaristic education, for “there shall be peril after every step we take and we will have to defend ourselves and we shall be in this state for decades… *is this the proper inception of a state?*”
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Chapter Three: Writing History

The previous chapters examined the educational segregation, the engagement of both communities with it and its reciprocal influence on both educational systems. This conscious or unconscious interaction is an essential prelude to the following analysis, focusing on the authorship of history textbooks. The intercommunal relationship was one determining factor in these history textbooks’ process of production. Working within the discourse of sociology of knowledge and the colonial sociology of knowledge, I wish to add further factors and agencies to this process; to explore the particular social, cultural and economic mediations involved, while examining collective representations in this historiography as expressions of conflictual - relationships in colonial society. In other words, contextualising the Palestinian history textbook.

The chapter begins with the history of textbook production in Palestine, demarcating it as the result of a branched historiographic dialogue with regional and Western historiographies. I then zoom in to an examination of the intimate network of educators and bureaucrats that produced educational history texts, tracing similarities between them and elucidating the reasons why they chose to educate and to write history. These historians were not the leading “luminary” historians of the age, re-shaping the discourse and marking its frontiers, but acted as “reproductive historians”, who diffused, in modified form, the common version of history based on the discourse originally articulated by the “luminary” historians.¹ This group of historians wrote instrumental histories that were actually used, read, and gained greater exposure than “proper” history books. These historians wrote history with a specific function, primarily as a socialising agent implemented in the history lesson, preparing for the history exam, inculcating a formal version of the past.

¹ Edward Shils, “Intellectuals”; The distinction between “luminaries” and “reproduction” intellectuals is based on, Israel Gershoni and James P. Jankowski, Egypt, Islam, 89–90.
The chapter then looks at the textbooks and articles written by these authors and their personal story. It seeks to contextualise and problematise the link between these texts, the ideas and themes in them and their authors, employing a cautious tracing of intention, to use Skinner’s term, in order to decipher their specific cultural code in Bourdieu’s words. I then move to focus on how the authors’ criticism of the present and vision for the future shaped their pedagogy and their particular instrumentalisation of the past. The analysis is dedicated, as well, to the presence of the present in the past, focusing on how contemporary views on the national other wrote themselves into the historical narrative.

**Traveling Knowledge: The Production of Arabic Textbooks in Palestine**

Writing a survey on the history of the production of textbooks in Palestine is indeed an exercise in genealogy. It entails the mapping of various roots and historic moments of transitions and evolutions where “[r]ecurrent redistributions reveal several pasts, several forms of connexion, several hierarchies of importance, several networks of determination, [and] several teleologies”. It involves the tracing of the historical process of physical production of textbooks, the presence of printing presses. Moreover, entangled in this process are the ideas and traditions that these printing presses imported and exported and finally the socio-cultural-intellectual dialogue that their products triggered.

A survey on the development of the production of textbooks in Palestine thus requires a relocation of Palestine from its strict physical and conceptual borders into an inclusive, dynamic and flexible one. On the one hand a fragmented society with a multitude of players of different interests within different communities and locations; Greek, Russian, Anglican, French, American and German missions operating distinctively in Haifa, Jaffa, Jerusalem, Nazareth and various other localities, running their own schools, printing their own textbooks
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3 Michel Foucault, *Archaeology*, 5.
and sending their students for training abroad. On the other hand, a community ruled by one
empire with one centre while at the same time a consumer of cultural and intellectual products
from greater urban centres as Cairo and Beirut. While certain examples in the process of
production of textbooks might be seen as directly related to a single linear development of an
idea or concept, this analysis seeks to complicate in order to elucidate this branched field of
action.

Mission and private schools were using textbooks for decades before the British decided
to import textbooks from Egypt overlooking possible starting points and relevant partnerships.
The mission schools in Palestine, similar to the ones operating in Lebanon, Syria and Egypt
pioneered the writing, translating and printing of textbooks in Arabic. Although the emergence
of this textbook production industry in Palestine was an integral part of a greater educational
shift in the entire region, the prominent figures of the Lebanese and Egyptian Nahda
overshadowed the story of the local Palestinian industry. This is a short survey of its inception.

In Palestine, the production of Arabic textbooks for school use dates back to the late
nineteenth century. In the 1880s, Escandar Kazma, a Syrian Arab and graduate of the
Ecclesiastical Academy in Moscow, translated religious textbooks from Russian to Arabic for
the use of the Russian Orthodox schools in the country. Kazma arrived at Jerusalem in 1883,
opened several elementary schools in northern Palestine and taught at the Russian Teachers’
Training Seminar.4 In 1898, Khalil Beidas (1874-1949), a graduate of the Russian Teachers’
Training Seminar, prolific writer, translator and educator, authored two pedagogic books and
two arithmetic textbooks; he also wrote other texts for Arabic and religious instruction prior to
the First World War.5
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4 Hanna Kildani, Modern Christianity, 141–142.
5 Hanna Abu Hanna, Dār al-mu‘allīmīn, 37, 40; Yehoshua Ben-Hananiah, “Le-toldot ha-ḥinukh ha-‘arvi ba-
The Franciscan schools in Palestine were using textbooks printed at the Franciscan press (est. 1846), the most active printing press in Palestine according to Ayalon. Father Didoqsus Snan al-Halabi, a teacher at al-Madrassa al-Qudsiyah and a supervisor of the order’s schools, authored a number of Arabic and arithmetic textbooks in the years 1901-1906, which replaced older books authored by another Franciscan priest circulated in 1898.

The Holy Sepulchre Printing Press under the Greek Patriarchy produced textbooks for its schools as well. Two textbooks designed for the use of the Greek-Orthodox schools, *The Geography of Palestine* and *Holy History*, were published in 1904, both unique as they juxtapose Arabic and Greek script. George al-Khuri Siksik (b. 1878), a teacher and later a supervisor in the Greek Orthodox schools authored prayer books for the Greek schools (1913). Sheikh Fuad al-Khatib, the famous poet and minister in Faysal’s Syrian government, according to Hananiah, was the only Muslim to engage in the writing of an Arabic textbook in Palestine prior to the war. Al-Khatib authored it while he was teaching Arabic at the Orthodox School in Jaffa and published it in the Holy Sepulchre press. The German mission contributed to the production of textbooks as well. Elias Nasrallah Haddad (b. 1882, Zahla), started teaching Arabic in the Teachers’ Seminary of the Syrisches Waisenhaus, Jerusalem (Schneller) in 1904 and the first part of his seven-volume Arabic textbook was circulated in the institution in 1913 (it would appear in 21 editions).

These schools used their own versions of history textbooks in the mission’s language or an Arabic translation, an un-researched corpus of sources that requires further scrutiny. Very little is known about the Ottoman government schools operating in Palestine prior to the mandate,
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6 Ayalon, *Reading Palestine*, 57.
8 *Jughrāfīyat filasṭīn*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Maṭba‘at al-qabr al-muqaddas, 1904); *Tārīkh sharīf* (Jerusalem: Maṭba‘at al-qabr al-muqaddas, 1904).
and even less about the textbooks they used. Therefore, the suggested examination here of the intellectual and historiographic foundations of Palestinian history textbooks during the mandate is based on the bibliographies mentioned in some of the books. These bibliographies, while far from giving us an accurate history of history textbooks, reflect the choices of these authors based on a tradition of writing and reveal the available corpus they had at hand. More than representing the actual sources employed by the authors, these lists represent the author’s sources of inspiration and perhaps his perception of proper sources for the writing of history. Moreover, such lists represent the scope of various historiographic dialogues: Ottoman, American, Syrian, Lebanese, Egyptian, Christian, Muslim, Arab and more. Late Ottoman sources echo the intellectual dialogue between Paris and Istanbul prior to the war. Textbooks written by American missionaries, their students or American historians translated into Arabic by the Syrian Protestant College (SPC) brought another historiographic tradition to the region. Finally, the rapidly developing Egyptian historiography was another dominant source of influence, amalgamating all the other historiographic trends.

The best place to start this investigation of bibliographies is the Torah (Old Testament) and Quran. Both are mentioned as valid sources of history in all the books that deal with ancient history. The Bible was also widely used by western historians as a historical document, with the revelation marginalised and the human story magnified (Myers and Breasted’s textbooks, discussed later in depth, cited and widely used in Palestinian textbooks are examples of this).

The earlier sources mentioned in these textbooks adopted this tradition as well. Yusuf Dibs, mentioned in most bibliographies, a Maronite Bishop of Beirut, uses the Torah as the historical framework in his massive history of Syria. Adopting the biblical framework also meant adopting the biblical story of creation. The prolific historian and author Jurji Zaydan starts the historical narration in his history textbook with Creation and the Flood.10 Harvey Porter (1884)
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in the foreword of his history textbook, authored for the students of the SPC, explains the historical validity of the Torah after scientific scrutiny, only to conclude that there is no contradictory evidence to the Flood.\footnote{Porter adopts the biblical narration of the inception of the human races and peoples, Harvey Porter, \textit{al-Nahj al-qawīm fi al-tārīkh al-qadīm} (Beirut, 1884), 5–6, 185–186.} As we shall see later, the biblical narrative, carrying a political charge in the Palestinian case, would be stripped out of revelation in favour of a nationalist story.

Another corpus of sources mentioned in these bibliographies is the classical Arab historians, such as al-Tabari, Ibn al-Athir and Ibn al-Fida. Although cited and employed in Totah and Barughthi and Husayn Ruhi’s textbooks, the absence of these authors is noticeable in others. There could be a number of reasons for this. The language and style of the classic historians was perceived as archaic for the young student. They were, however, also abandoned for what was considered as a more progressive, trustworthy historiography. The novel writing of Arabic and Ottoman historians based mainly on western sources, clearly overshadowed the classic Arabic historiography even in textbooks of Arab nationalist history such as Miqdadi’s. This was a mechanism of tacit cultural effacement and replacement embodied in the new history textbook, a clear departure from traditional historiography in favour of a lighter, western or modern Arabic literature.

Late Ottoman historiography had already made that shift and was therefore another relevant model for the Palestinian history textbooks. Albert Hourani’s seminal work, \textit{Arabic Thought in the Liberal Age} gave only a marginal space to the developments in late Ottoman intellectual history and in its influence on the Arab world. Focusing strictly on Arab scholars, Hourani’s overview of the history of ideas is a teleological manifesto of the linear process of progress and liberty, where the only point of reference is Europe or the U.S. In this narrative, the Ottoman and non-Arab East are excluded, displaced from their historical role.\footnote{Israel Gershoni argues that Hourani’s history views all the writers as part of one ideological movement. Gershoni, “The Theory of Crisis”} Hourani’s
later works underlined the central role of Ottoman education in the emergence of modern Arabic thought, yet the role Ottoman historiography in this process was not discussed.

The few authors that were included in his short survey were said to be acquainted with the literature of Europe “conversant with its ideas and admirers of its strength and progress, they were still not whole-hearted westernisers”. Hourani argues, in line with his readings of Arab scholars of the time, that these authors sought to remain faithful to the empire and Islam, but wished to see it incorporated in the modern world.13

Gürpınar’s survey of late Ottoman historiography stresses the magnitude of the “epistemological assimilation”, the adoption of Western and primarily French historiography as a paradigmatic hegemonic framework. French history, Gürpınar argues, could be easily accessed through either the knowledge of French or the translation and adaptations of French textbooks by Ottoman pedagogues. Ottoman historical epistemology, Gürpınar claims, “has to be posited within the mechanism of knowledge transmission from the West via intellectual intermediaries” from the Third Republic to the Ottoman sphere. The “optimistic and progressive vision” in European historiography wrote itself into the Ottoman textbooks.14 Fortna is more careful in his assessment of this relation, defining the Ottoman textbook as combining both Ottoman and Western influences and thus creating an “understandably heterogeneous creation”.15

Similar to the Palestinian case, these textbooks were authored by educators and senior administrators from the Ottoman education department. History textbooks were under the severe scrutiny of the Ottoman administration and on a few occasions, it banned books when their political content seemed problematic.16 In the Second Constitutional Period, Ali Reşad's (1877-1929) textbooks dominated the history teaching. Reşad, an educator and administrator,

13 Albert Hourani, Arabic Thought, 68.
14 Doğan Gürpınar, Ottoman/Turkish, 135–137.
15 However, Fortna did not focus on history textbooks, Benjamin Carr Fortna, “Education for the Empire”, 223.
16 Ibid., 218–221, 238.
translated Gustave Le Bon, Charles Seignobos, Edouard Engelhardt and others. Gürpinar marks him as the foremost historical pedagogue of the second constitutional period. Ahmet Refik Altınıay (1881-1937) an Ottoman popular historian also translated Seignobos’ *Histoire de la Civilisation* in 1912. Ottoman scholars spoke about the reign of Seignobos over Ottoman historiography during the second constitutional period, adopting his view of history as civic instruction in the service of the nation.\(^{17}\)

The exclusion of this Ottoman intellectual and cultural developments and its differentiation from the Arabs is well evident in Palestinian sources. In 1946 Dr. Ishaq Musa al-Husseini, an inspector in the Department of Education, noted that the Ottoman period was one of the darkest periods in cultural life. History textbooks mention the Ottomans as savages, tamed and educated by Arabs, who betrayed them and established a corrupt, incompetent, authoritarian regime that left Palestine after 400 years of rule with nothing but the “darkness of ignorance and stupidity”, a commonly emerging trope in Arab nationalist writing.\(^{18}\) Nevertheless, the bibliographies portray another take on this “nothing”. Late Ottoman sources could be found in most of the Palestinian books that offer a bibliography.

Seignobos’ works gained popularity in the Arab (Ottoman) world as well. His influence is another example of a shared (rather than a detached) Ottoman-Arab-European dialogue and exchange of ideas and knowledge. A few of Seignobos’ massive volumes on the history of civilisation (1905-1906) were translated relatively quickly after their publication by the Syrian historian Muhammad Kurd Ali (1876–1953) and the Lebanese historian Jurji Yanni (1854-1936).\(^{19}\) Seignobos’ historiographic methodology continued to take effect later on as well, as he was recorded as a primal source of inspiration for Taha Hussein, the leading Egyptian
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intellectual. However, this shared intellectual sphere was not confined to translations of Western scholarship. Shidyaq’s Arabic textbooks and Zaydan’s scholarship and prose were translated into Turkish and gained popularity at the turn of the century.

The dominant presence of Egyptian sources in all the available bibliographies, both history school textbooks and historical scholarship reflect the influence of Palestine’s elder and literary more mature Arab sister. All Palestinian textbooks that include a bibliography mention contemporary Egyptian history textbooks used at the time in Egyptian schools and pedagogic articles recommended their use in history instruction.

By the time of the British conquest of Palestine, Egypt was already enjoying an established, vibrant academic life with a new generation of Egyptian professors of history trained in Western universities and a growing modern universal education system. Egyptian history textbooks were often authored by graduates of Western (mainly British) universities and in some cases by professional historians who, as in Palestine were directly involved in the Ministry of Education. Mitchell stresses the hegemony of the colonialist mindset in the emergence of this system and argues that Egyptian educators and intellectuals embraced the colonial perception of Egyptians as inferior and backward, features that needed to be remedied through modern education.

Textbooks from the pre-War period emphasised a general direction towards progress, a change of manners and virtues favouring order, organisation, cleanliness and good citizenship, all crucial for the well-being of the state. History textbooks advocated the centrality of the dawla and its state institutions, exalted and legitimised the ruler and his role in the

21 Johann Strauss, “Who Read What in the Ottoman Empire”.
22 Al-haj Ibrahim, “Akhbār ‘amr ibn al-‘āṣ wa-akhlāqihi.”
modernisation of Egypt.\textsuperscript{26} It was a history authored by state officials and educators employed by the state and much engaged in the political scene.

A third of the reading material was dedicated to the 45 years of Muhammad ‘Ali’s reign and ancient Egypt received ample time as well. In secondary schools, ancient Egyptian history received a whole year of study. Similar to the Arab Palestinian and Zionist national quantum leap, from medieval or ancient times to modernity, the syllabus presented a leap from the ancient Egyptian Pharaohs to Muhammad ‘Ali.\textsuperscript{27}

In what Gorman and Piterberg call the Egyptianisation/Misrification of history, Egypt becomes an all-encompassing concept of being: \textit{al-shakhsiyya al-Misriyya} (the Egyptian personality), \textit{al-ḥaḍārah al-miṣrīyah} (Egyptian civilization), \textit{al-thaqāfah al-miṣrīyah} (Egyptian culture).\textsuperscript{28} The common feature in these books was the starting point portraying Egypt as the most solidly civilized realms, “preceding by thousands of years other nations in the domain of progress and civilization”. Ancient Pharaohs appeared as unifiers of the Egyptian nation, Hyksos and the Romans as tyrannical foreign rulers, and the merging and intermarriages of the Pharaohs with Persians as a national peril. A dark Turkish era of foreign rule after 1517 was contrasted with other dynasties presented as Egyptian.\textsuperscript{29}

Most of these features found their way into the Palestinian textbooks and highlight the dominance of Egyptian sources. One source mentions the nationalist spirit manifested (\textit{al-rūḥ al-qawmīya}) while another glorifies the nationalist renaissance movement (\textit{ḥarakāt al-ba’th al-waṭanī}) that helped drive the foreign Hyksos out the country.\textsuperscript{30} Admiration for Muhammad ‘Ali can also be found for the man “sent by God to save Egypt”, founder and builder of modern

\textsuperscript{26} Gorman, \textit{Historians}, 15.
\textsuperscript{27} Salmoni, “Historical Consciousness”, 166–167.
\textsuperscript{29} Salmoni, “Historical Consciousness,” 166–176.
\textsuperscript{30} Al-Sabbagh, \textit{al-Madāniyyat}, 12; Ziadeh, \textit{al-ʿĀlam al-qadīm}, 74; A similar description can be found in, Zubyān, \textit{Zubdat}, 12.
Egypt, loved by Egyptians for his just, egalitarian rule and his son Ibrahim as initiator of the Nahda and occupier of Syria, “an integral part of Egypt”. 1882 is depicted as the inception of “a new era” of considerable prosperity in all fields of life after a great revolution.31

Palestinian textbooks also adhere to Piterberg’s argument of Egypt’s “lock, stock and barrel” adoption of the Orientalist theory of Ottoman decline and stagnation contrasted with a vigorous dynamic Egypt: “Since the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire started its continuous decline towards a bad ending due to the corruption of the government and the tyranny of the Sultans”.32 Piterberg’s concept of Orientalism-through-syntax is illustrated in the Palestinian narrative by its admiration of local Arab contenders of Ottoman (al-attrāk) sovereignty. Dhaher al Omar, ‘Ali Bey and the Lebanese ‘Umara, Fakhr al-Din al-Thani, and ‘Urabi’s “Arab revolution” all symbolised a local Arab resistance against the oppressive bashawāt al-attrāk. The failure of the Ottoman constitution was attributed to Turkification’s disregard for “national sentiments or language”.33

This resemblance to the Egyptian model does not mean, however, that minor adjustments were not made so that the story could fit the Palestinian narrative. The rule of Tuthmosis the Third, for example, is considered as when “real colonialism began”, while Syria, the most important part of the empire refused to Egyptianise and “kept its Semitic nature”.34 Furthermore, after the Syrian rebellion against Ibrahim Pasha, “finally he understood the difference between the obedient ignorant Egyptian fallah and the stubborn Syrian one, with his tendency to freedom and independence”.35 Miqdadi’s description of Muhammad ‘Ali is also

33 Al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 236; al-Sabbagh, al-Madanīyat, 161–166; ‘Anabtawi and Ghunaym, al-Mujmal, 117, 125, 140.
34 Ziadeh, al-‘Ālam al-qadīm, 78.
35 Al-Sabbagh, al-Madanīyat, 171.
opposed to the Egyptian and Palestinian narrative, emphasising his Turkish origins and culture, and stating that while Egypt benefited from his rule, he did it all out of personal interest.  

Books written by Lebanese historians such as Jurji Yanni (1854-1941), Philip Hitti (1886-1978) and Asad Rustum (1897-1965) also appear in these bibliographies. Hitti and Rustum, completing their BA at the SPC and obtaining their PhD in history from American universities, served as professors of history at the AUB; as we shall see, an institution of great importance to Palestine that turned Beirut into Palestine’s second elder sister in the field of education. It is hard to assess the influence of these two professors, especially that of Rustum, a student of Breasted who remained in his post for the bulk of the mandate period. It is certain, though, that the influence of the two Arab historians, rising stars in the local academic world, exceeded the readership of their books.

Finally, Western sources or translated Western sources in Arabic played a key role in the production of textbooks both in form and content. The Arabic translations of Mayer’s *A General History for Colleges and High Schools* and Breasted’s *Ancient Times* are central sources of reference in all books. These books gained prominence although Arabic sources were available. Niranjana explains this preference as follows: “Even when the anglicised Indian [Arab in our case] spoke a language other than English, 'he' would have preferred, because of the symbolic power attached to English, to gain access to his own past through the translations and histories circulating through colonial discourse”.

Occasionally the translation was a declared one, while in most cases, copying of full paragraphs or sentences would be left unreferenced. An early example of the latter is Zaydan’s *General History*, mentioned as a source in Palestinian textbooks, copied almost verbatim from
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Peter Parley’s (pseudonym) *Common School History*, first published in 1837 by Samuel G. Goodrich (1793-1860) an American writer and publisher of numerous children’s books and textbooks for schools.³⁹

For the critical reader of historical texts, Zaydan’s plagiarism (mentioning Parley last in a long list of sources) is noticeable from the very beginning, in his description of geography as something one would see from a hot air balloon, an invention seen by very few Egyptians or Syrians.⁴⁰ In other instances, the text needed to be changed; Zaydan omitted Parley’s description of Isaac’s sacrifice (Abraham’s favourite son) and left the Quranic narration out as well, only adding that Ishmael is the father of the Arab nation.⁴¹ Parley’s depiction of the Arabs as “enemies to the rest of mankind, and mankind enemies to them”, and the belittlement or ridicule of the prophet had to be omitted as well; it did not, however, lead to the abandonment of the source.⁴² Zaydan needed to adopt a far more respectful approach to Muhammad. He relates the Quranic version about the prophet and exalts Islam for bringing Arabs to the “height of glory”.⁴³

Islam and the Arabs receive a problematic treatment in Myers’ book as well, originally translated for the students of the SPC and mentioned as a source for various Palestinian history textbooks.⁴⁴ Sentences stating that “after the Hebrews and the Phoenicians, the [Arabs are the] most important people of the Semitic race”, were plainly re-written to re-place the Arabs as
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equal in importance\textsuperscript{45} and “Arab anarchy” prior to the emergence of Islam became just “anarchy”\textsuperscript{46}. Still, the Arabic translation mostly remains loyal to the Eurocentric English original, depicting the prophet as one of a “deeply stirred” soul who “declared that he had visions” and Islam as “a system unfavourable to social progress”\textsuperscript{47}. Moreover, despite Islam’s articulation of “inspiring truths” it is overall regarded as a backward force, a threat to Europe paralleled to the Huns.\textsuperscript{48} Thus, the conquest of North Africa once “destined to share in the career of freedom and progress” of the West, was “drawn back into the fatalism and the stagnation of the East”\textsuperscript{49}.  

The East as either a threat or destination for conquests is the image portrayed by Rafiq al-Tamimi as well. Similarly to what we shall later see in Miqdadi’s writing, Tamimi preferred working with Western scholarship. In his book about modern European history, Tamimi offers a variety of European sources in French and English and none in Arabic. Dyer and Hassall’s five-volume \textit{A History of Modern Europe} (1901) is one of his sources. Although Tamimi was proficient in Ottoman Turkish, his sources on the orient are classic late nineteenth century orientalist books such as Lane-Pool’s \textit{The Story of Turkey} (1888) and Miller’s \textit{The Ottoman Empire} (1913).\textsuperscript{50}  

For the historian, the bibliography is a professional, cultural and ideological coat of arms. Its analysis captures the sources that were physically available at the time, the languages known to the historian, the intellectual ambit he corresponded with and the historiographic world to which he belonged or wished to belong. The presence of Ottoman, Egyptian, Lebanese, English

\textsuperscript{46} Myers, \textit{A General}, 1906, 364; Myers and Haddad, \textit{al-Tārīkh}, 1912, 220.  
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\textsuperscript{50} Al-Tamimi, \textit{Tārīkh ʻūrūbā ʻal-ḥadīth}, 264.
and French historiographies reflects the rich intellectual world of these authors and the transitional or hybrid historiographic phase Palestine was going through. Their history was not quite Ottoman, Egyptian, Lebanese, English, French or American but an amalgamation of all, a mixture. In it, one recognises the dominance of relatively new sources and the abandonment of the classic or traditional historiography. The next section further scrutinises this dominance.

A Small World Indeed

I suggest that the modern Palestinian Arab historians acted and produced texts within what Deleuze and Guattari referred to as ‘minor literature’, a literature written by minorities in the majority’s language. While addressing books written by Arabs in Arabic, I argue that modern national historiography is in itself a language and that the modern Arab historian is a minority in this realm.\textsuperscript{51} He is the colonized engaging with the language of the colonizer, simultaneously burdened and emancipated: burdened by colonialism, its refusal and negation of his plea, and emancipated by the pathways opened through this new language while “feeling of an irreducible distance from their primitive… territoriality”, the traditional Arab canon and their primitive communities lagging behind in the face of progress. Subsequently, modern national historiography in Arabic is a de-territorialising attempt, effacing and challenging old borders of identity and space seeking “to express another possible community [Arab, Palestinian] and to forge the means for another consciousness”.\textsuperscript{52} Finally, everything in minor literatures is political, unlike major literatures where the individuality and sociality enjoy a “large space”, in minor literature “its cramped space forces each individual intrigue to connect immediately to politics… a whole other story is vibrating within it”, making the personal and familiar inextricable from the ideological, economic and bureaucratic. Finally, minor literature stresses

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{51}{Gilles Deleuze, \textit{Kafka}, 16.}
\footnotetext{52}{Ibid., 17.}
\end{footnotes}
the Gordian knot between the political and the collective where “literature finds itself positively charged with the role and function of the collective, and even a revolutionary, enunciation”. The mapping of this minor literature, its agency, ideas, ideology and interest, built on a thick description of life stories, both mundane and mythical, will be the focus here.

Mandate Palestine witnessed a rapid growth in literacy and print culture led by a burgeoning community of authors and intellectuals. Still confined to the three urban centres of Haifa, Jaffa and Jerusalem, it was a dynamic, vocal and influential, but a fairly small community. I have succeeded in finding twenty-four history textbooks authored by twenty-two authors (see list on page 352). A close look at the biographies of these men (this was a man’s profession) shows what appeared to be, for the most part, an intimate community and intellectual network of writers and educators who knew one another, worked together, studied together, shared the same ideals in most cases and were partners in the same goals. As we shall see, the intimate interrelations within this “cramped” space had a considerable effect on the widening shelf of history textbooks.

The best place to start this discussion would have to be the Arab College. No institute had a greater effect on the writing of history textbooks. To be more accurate, the first six years under Totah’s administration were a hothouse for the most productive group of authors. Totah’s role in nurturing this group was overlooked by recent studies on the College.

Totah might have been a “Palestinian Yankee” in the words of Ricks, for spending half of his adult life abroad, but also one of the few Arab Palestinians “who fully grasped the critical role of education in the liberation and development of Palestine in all that that implied”. Yet, both Ricks and Davis’ studies, which stressed Totah’s inclination to “smooth over the conflicts” with the British, seem to overlook Totah’s realistic Arab nationalism and his ardent
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opposition to Zionism.\textsuperscript{55} The same year as his appointment as Principal, an article he wrote was published in New York by the Palestine Anti-Zionism Society, an organisation established to oppose the formation of the Jewish state.\textsuperscript{56} It incorporated another organisation, The Ramallah Young Men’s Society of New York and organised rallies, demonstration and petitioned the Wilson administration to oppose the Balfour Declaration.\textsuperscript{57} Totah’s pioneering \textit{The History of Palestine} was not only the most comprehensive work on the history of Palestine; authored by a rare cooperation of a Muslim and a Christian Arab, the book reconciled religious strife in a bid for an all-encompassing Arab identity. \textit{The History of Palestine} was not only the most belligerent anti-Zionist textbook, it also openly criticises the re-shaping of the Middle East by Britain and France. It seems that it was the book’s direct criticism of the British rather than its anti-Zionist tone that caused the government to ban it.\textsuperscript{58}

While Totah headed Dar al-Mu’almin (1919-1925), Darwish al-Miqdadi was the institute’s charismatic “inspiring” history teacher, in the words of Mahmud al-‘Abidi. Nicola Ziadeh, an acclaimed Palestinian educator and intellectual, described Totah and Miqdadi as two of the three most influential teachers in the college; real men, patriots and Arab nationalists.\textsuperscript{59} The ties between them would strengthen after graduation, as after their appointment they found themselves again close to each other. Upon his graduation, Ziadeh taught in Acre for ten years (1924-1934) and at the same time as Akram Zu‘aytir, working under Ahmad Khalifa, their district inspector. Ziadeh describes Khalifa as a wise man, fond of reading. Their friendship, Ziadeh remarked, was grounded on their discussions and love for books.\textsuperscript{60} Zu‘aytir was ‘Izzat

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{55} Rochelle Davis, “Commemorating Education”.
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\textsuperscript{58} Tibawi, \textit{Arab Education}, 98–99; The anti-Zionist tone is argued as a reason for its ban, Bernard Wasserstein, “‘Clipping the Claws of the Colonisers’”; Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 157–159.
\textsuperscript{59} The third being George Khamis, Nicola A. Ziadeh, \textit{Ayyāmī}, vol. 1, 28–29; Davis, “Commemorating Education.”
\textsuperscript{60} Ziadeh, \textit{Ayyāmī}, 1:165–166.
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Darwazah’s student in al-Najah; he recalls his teaching of the principles of nationalism, nationalist writing and witnessing Darwazah’s historic plays performed in “nationalist clubs”.61 Darwazah’s principal in his elementary school was Zu‘aytir’s great uncle, Sheikh Muhammad Zu‘aytir, who brought up Zu‘aytir’s father.62 Zu‘aytir and Darwazah later became co-founders of the Istiqlal party. Zu‘aytir and Radi Abd al-Hadi were good friends, as teachers in Acre and Ramleh; they wrote each other letters discussing national issues and initiated mutual visits with their students.63 Similar relations existed between ‘Abidi and Radi, headmasters in Safed and Nablus respectively; both were rebuked after ‘Abidi had collected donations from his students for the benefit of Radi’s school without the permission of the Department.64 Overall, formally and bureaucratically, they were employed and supervised by the Department that served as a hub for co-inspectors such as Ruhi, ‘Anabtawi, Khalifa, or in the meetings of the various committees of the PBHS attended by Tamimi, Totah, Ziadeh, ‘Anabtawi and others.65 Finally, most of the textbooks printed in Palestine were published by two printing presses, Maṭba‘at bayt al-Maqdis and al-Maktaba al-‘aṣrīyah, both established by Anton Shukri Lawrence, an educator, an author of one textbook and for a short while a teacher in the Rushidiya school. It seems certain, then, that almost all authors of textbooks not only knew each other personally, but were also friends, colleagues and partners.

Nablus stands out as a prominent starting point for Palestinian nationalism, but also as a cultural centre. Six of these authors were born in Nablus or its surroundings and attended primary education there. However, what made the difference was the chance they had to leave

62 ‘Izzat Darwazah, Mudhakkirāt, 149.
63 Zu‘aytir, Bawākīr, 33.
64 See correspondence between Radi Abd al-Hadi to DIE, 26 February 1935. Farrell himself had interfered and asked Radi to respect his superiors and correct his behaviour after the incident. Farrell to Radi, 27 February 1935. Farrell’s reproach worked, and Radi submitted a letter of apology to the DIE, he even came to his house personally to apologise, Radi to DIE, 7 March 1935 “Radi Abd Al-Hadi.”
65 Further links between the members of this group can be found in their personal files of the Education Department, “Mahmud Suleiman ‘Abidi,” n.d., 8.0/1-336, ISA; “Radi Abd Al-Hadi”, “Ahmad Eff. Khalifa,” n.d., 8.0/1-227, ISA; see also Ziadeh, Ayyāmī, 81; and “PHBS, History Sub-Committee,” n.d., 2498-67, ISA.
their home town or village in order to pursue their academic studies, an early departure from the village or town to the hustle-bustle of the big city. Darwazah (Nablus), Khalifa (Safed) and Barghuthi (Deir-Ghassaneh), for example, all studied or worked in late Ottoman Beirut. In the words of Tamari, they experienced “a transition from a clear pride in local aristocratic privileges to the adoption of urban nationalist affinities and urban lifestyle”.66 By themselves in the big city, far from the restraints and support of their family, new networks of affiliation came in the place of the traditional ones. This enabled a much broader concept of the self. Rafiq al-Tamimi ceased to be a Nablusi and became an Arab-Ottoman in the Ottoman school, later to become an Arab intellectual in Paris, a member of the secret Arab societies. A good indication of this transformation is the language Tamimi employed to describe the Nablusi elite, of which he was part, when sent to survey the Beirut Vilayet by the Empire. In his account he criticised them for their evil ways and exploitation of the poor.67

It is not by coincidence that Paris, however distant from the Arab world, became the place for the first Arab congress of which al-Tamimi and Darwazah, both from middle-class Nablusi families, were active members. The two co-operated as central figures of al-Fatat. Tamimi’s broad horizons, knowledge and nationalist passion left a deep impression on the less experienced and less educated Darwazah.68

Some went further than Beirut and Istanbul; Totah got his BA in Clark University, Worcester, Massachusetts, Shukri Ḥarami in the University of Indiana, Ziadeh earned his BA from UCL, Tamimi from the Sorbonne, ‘Anabtawi from Cambridge and most others had either graduated from the Arab College or the higher secondary Ottoman schools. Nevertheless, Totah alone held a postgraduate degree while writing his history textbook; he earned his MA in education from the Teachers’ College, Columbia University, New York (Ziadeh obtained

66 Salim Tamari, Mountain against the Sea, 133–134.
67 Avi Rubin, “Palestīn bi-shenot ha-mīlḥamah”.
68 Darwazah, Mīdhakkirāt, 1:161–162.
his PhD from UCL in 1950). Ironically, the most popular textbooks (except Totah and Barghuthi’s *The History of Palestine*), and most discussed in existing literature, were written by Darwazah, a self-made intellectual who did not complete his secondary education.69

A noticeable feature in this group of historians is their central role in the inception of Arab nationalism, as soldiers in Faysal’s army entering Damascus or participating in the battle of Maysalun (Ẓubyān), later even taking part in his government (Tamimi and Darwazah). These three, representing the older generation of authors, wrote their textbooks only after the failure of Faysal and later disenchantment with the collapse of the greater Syria vision. Khalil Totah was not there at Maysalun. However, he served in the Ottoman army for a few months (against his will) before the war. He managed to escape Palestine on the eve of the war, but volunteered to serve with US forces as a YMCA secretary in France.70 Totah sought the defeat of the Ottomans and Germans and was loyal to his American “hosts”, but his primary concern was the future of education in Palestine. Already in 1919, Totah published an article in the book *Reconstruction of Palestine* (Filasṭīn wa-tajdīd ḥayātuhā). The title of the article was “Education”, in which Totah called for emancipation from foreign and missionary education, and for all efforts to be put into the encouragement of nationalist schools (*madrasatuna al-waṭanīyah*).71 Turning to education was their first choice; this preceded their political activism in later years.

The younger generation of authors, being born at the turn of the century or a few years later, experienced the war as either children or young men, witnessing what was for them the old Ottoman house of cards making way for a new one, heralding new possibilities. In the words of Ziadeh, they were the “products of the First World War”.72 They had achieved
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69 In an interview, an acquaintance of Darwazah, a Palestinian Jerusalemite academic, argued that Darwazah’s prolific writing was compensation for this absence of formal education.
70 Ricks, “Khalil Totah: The Unknown Years.”
maturity on the eve of the new order that dominated Palestine, with its centre in London. Like every new reality, adjustment and adaptation were critical for those who wished to improve their relative social positioning. Radi for example, was eight years old when the British entered the country. At some point in his teaching career, he decided to improve his English after his DIE reported to the Department his “ignorance in any foreign language”. He required proficiency in English for two reasons, spiritual and instrumental. The first was his will to become a better teacher and a better author, having mostly English history books as sources of reference. The second was his will to climb up the hierarchical ladder of the Education Department. Knowledge of English was more than a ladder in the colonial administration. It was sometimes a symbol of independence and capability in the face of colonialism. We shall later see how this was employed in the syllabus of the most nationalist schools that were not under the supervision of the Department, yet this knowledge also came with a sort of performativity. Harami, a graduate of the Anglican St. George’s and later the “redoubtable” Headmaster of the Madrasat al-Ummah, resigned his post as a teacher in St. George’s and established the Nation College. Nevertheless, when he addressed his students in public ceremonies, he chose to do so in English and not in Arabic, stating that his school was “run on the lines of an English public school”. For this group, English in particular and education in general meant social mobility.

Mobility was needed since none of these men were directly linked to a rich family, some were even poor. Ziadeh, for example, lost his father during the war and his mother worked as a laundress during the war and was later unemployed. They represented the growing urban

73 See DIE’s Report on Teaching Staff Member, 30 July 1931 and 13 March 1932, “Radi Abd Al-Hadi.”
74 Walid Khalidi, “On Albert Hourani”.
76 Ziadeh, Ayyāmī, 1:59; Darwazah was the son of a shop owner in Nablus, according to him, not rich nor middle-class, but inbetween. However, when he returned to Nablus after the war he owned only a small sum of money. Because he refused to work for the English in the local post office, he tried his luck in commerce. His nomination as principal of al-Najah in 1921, only a year after he initiated his commercial attempt probably implies the failure of that endeavour Darwazah, Mudhakkirāt, 1:46, 48.
middle-class, the advocate of modernity. They wished to pull the old order to pieces, not only because this suited their idea of progress, but primarily because that meant a greater chance of social re-location, where their self-achieved cultural capital would count as much as being wealthy.

Zu‘aytir, who matured to become an ardent Arab nationalist, was an English teacher at the beginning of his career, teaching younger children the language of the occupier. His memoirs begin with the double tragedy of his father’s death. ‘Umar Zu‘aytir was the mayor of Nablus and its representative in the Ottoman parliament, a central political figure. Upon his death, the family had to leave their house due to unpaid debts. Zu‘aytir’s older brother ‘Adel, educated in Paris, later lost the municipal election to Suleiman Tuqan and the Zu‘aytirs lost their political influence and their economic status. Zu‘aytir was only sixteen of age when this story of riches to rags occurred, forcing him to quit his law studies at the AUB in order to become a “simple” teacher under the British. In his memoir, he proudly recalled passing the English exam in order to become an English teacher. He was proud because it meant that he was appreciated by the new regime in which his father’s credentials were no longer valid. It was for this reason, that before he became an Arab nationalist, he repeatedly requested a scholarship from the Education Department that would allow him to study law in England or Scotland.77 Zu‘aytir’s primary glance turned westward, he internalised it as the proper trajectory a decade before he would become an Istiqlalist.

But then again, Zu‘aytir was not genuinely interested in teaching. After being appointed to become a teacher, he recalls locking the door to his room and bursting into tears for his bitter fortune.78 During his short career as a teacher, he kept asking to leave teaching in order to become a lawyer. ‘Abidi had more patience. It took him seventeen years to ask for a transfer
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from direct education responsibilities. In his late thirties, he kept trying to find the loophole that would enable him to escape his predicament. Numerous incidents of slander and conspiracy concocted by the local community made it impossible for him to enjoy his job in Safed. Initially, he attempted to transfer to the Welfare and Probation Service, later to the Welfare Department in Haifa and finally to the Department of Antiquities (a job he took after the Nakba in Jordan).

In fact, all the existing personal files of authors of history textbooks who worked under the Department tell a forlorn story of a group of men who felt used and abused, unappreciated, and most of all lonely in their work. Radi requested permission to teach eight extra hours on Sundays in another school after being denied a pay rise, a request made by an appreciated headmaster of an important school. In his letters to the Department Radi writes about the “golden age” he had brought to the Hebron Secondary School, a belief he shared with his superiors and the Hebron community. In one of his letters, he writes: “[does] not a man who devoted twenty years of his life … and has given full satisfaction to his superiors…” deserve to be paid accordingly?

Considering their unsatisfactory financial situation, publishing textbooks with a wide circulation and reprinted editions might very well be a dominant incentive for writing, although this was usually portrayed as a national sacred cause. As in the case of ‘Abidi: “I saw the libraries devoid of any outline of Arab history, and [...] I saw how impossible [was the situation in which] the Arab student is deprived of a book through which he could study the history of
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his nation, as his loyal teacher desires…” 82 Thus, most books were published by private printing presses and in many cases were connected to local bookshops.

The financial gain was not only the writer’s, but for an entire circle or beneficiaries. Abidi’s book was published in four editions, those of Abd al-Hadi and Khalifa in three, and as Tibawi noted, this was a lucrative deal for the employees of the Department, as the editions would be purchased in bulk by the Department and distributed for free to students. 83 That was why most books declared on their cover their accordance with the Department’s syllabus (even when they were not in accordance with it). In some cases, the mass circulation of textbooks also involved political corruption as mentioned by Ziadeh, when in the late 1920s a history book enjoyed an adorned edition and mass circulation both in Palestine and Egypt because its author served as a personal secretary of the Egyptian Prime Minister. 84

Still, financial gain could not have been the sole reason behind the production of textbooks; it was just not profitable enough. Personal ambition and the quest for cultural capital were probably more lucrative. ‘Abidi was 31 years old when he published his first book, a young and unappreciated principal who, according to his DIE, was a teacher with poor capabilities and as Headmaster “had not the moral courage to point out to his staff their moral defects”. 85 Radi was considered a good teacher, yet the DIE noted his “inclination for noisy patriotism. He likes to make speeches, writes articles about things which he has not a fair knowledge of”. 86 Radi was 26 when his eight notebooks of manuscript were returned to him with Farrell’s refusal to publish his book on The Kingdoms of Western Europe. 87 Thus, publishing a textbook meant
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recognition from the Department, becoming an active part in the production of knowledge within the system.

Perhaps these individuals perceived themselves more as intellectuals, interested in the great chain of being and less in disciplining their teachers who came late for work, or in standing in front of an overcrowded classroom, teaching the same basic courses repeatedly to a reluctant crowd. Indeed, other less reluctant crowds were abundant.

These authors were very successful in finding ways to circulate their newly applied knowledge. Formal education was only one path through which one could hear their ideas. History writing, history teaching, giving lectures, and broadcasting talks and lectures on the PBS (Palestine Broadcasting Service), thus served as a path out of the mundane world of noisy boys and the annoying ringing of bells.

Perhaps the most “modern” form of spreading thoughts and ideas, and possibly becoming a celebrity (within the minority that had access to a radio), was having one’s own radio program. The topics discussed varied, but it was clear that the speakers were focusing on the virtues of Western civilisation, the encounter/clash between East and West and Arab culture, Arab identity and Arab nationalism. 'Anabtawi, Khalifa, and Ziadeh, broadcasted these talks. The three received the warm embrace of the Education Department and were sent on a full scholarship to study in the UK. For them, Europe was much more than a place. It was an idea, a concept, a method worth telling of, and learning from. Broadcasts like “My impressions of the Institution of Education of London University”, “English people as I knew them”, and “Paris, Eye Witness Account”, were aimed at that end. The challenges of this encounter were also discussed in a series of talks under the title “The Arab East and Europe”. Broadcasting could also relate to nationalist topics, but it was dealt with cautiously, not explicitly but through
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an academic filter such as book publications. A radio show on Constantine Zurayk’s *On National Awakening* could be used as a platform to talk about Arab national awakening on British radio.\(^{91}\)

Another important medium were public lectures. Culture, literary, youth and religious clubs flourished as social, cultural and political centres.\(^ {92}\) When opening a newspaper during the mandate, specific columns were dedicated to the different lectures being held in different clubs. These authors were active participants in this endeavour. ‘Abidi asked for permission to be absent from school in order to give a lecture on Salah al-Din al-Safadi (d. 1362) in Jerusalem. Al-Safadi was “discovered” by ‘Abidi who wished to redeem him from oblivion because of his Palestinian origin. Zu‘aytir, while still a teacher, established a Muslim Youth Society in Acre (1928) where parties were held and lectures were given; Radi requested permission to become a member as well, an activity that required the permission of his superiors.\(^ {93}\) Not even Radi’s DIE could authorise his membership. Bowman himself gave a green light after the DIE assured him that the society had “no political aim”. Radi and ‘Abidi’s correspondence with the Department illustrates how formal social engagements were delicate issues in the Department and required sensitive treatment.\(^ {94}\) Radi’s bid worked, and he was later elected secretary of the association.

Upon his return to Palestine from London, Ziadeh was determined to work for the sake of his country; teaching history and geography were no longer enough. The clubs founded by Miqdadi and the vibrant intellectual and cultural experiences in London were sources of inspiration.\(^ {95}\) His personal contribution, according to his memoir, was giving lectures. These

\(^{91}\) Broadcast by Ziadeh, *Palestine Post*, 9 August 1940.

\(^{92}\) Adnan Abu-Ghazaleh, *Arab Cultural*, 91.


\(^{94}\) See correspondence between Radi, his DIE and Bowman on the matter: DIE Southern to Bowman 7 May 1928, Bowman to DIE Southern, 10 May 1928. “Radi Abd Al-Hadi.”

should not be seen as intellectual leisure, but as a central social, political and cultural medium. Lectures were not given from an academic perspective; they put forward a vision, a trajectory for a society on the move. Also, in these lectures, these authors were far from the eye of Department officials. What could not be said in the classroom or under the auspices of the Department was left for these lectures. In a way, this was an unwelcome extracurricular activity, where these authors unmasked their loyal professional persona and for a few hours put their uniform of mediator (between the government and the people) aside, enabling them to stand face to face with their people. This is why the Shai kept open ears to what was said in these lectures. A report issued on ‘Abidi’s lecture titled “Safed 200 years ago” (April, 1945) states that ‘Abidi had marginalised the role of the Jewish community in Safed, depicting them as a worthless minority and adding that ‘Abidi “is known to be an extremist”.

Finally, the most central medium to circulate ideas and especially intellectual concepts was the written press, local and national. Al-Tamimi while serving as Headmaster in Jaffa founded a literary-sports club, The Cultural Athletic Club and served as its chair. This club was used as a proxy by al-Tamimi for the publishing of pamphlets about Arab and Muslim history, western philosophy, Arab-Jewish relations and the devastating effect of Zionism. Anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish ideology was also expressed on the pages of Majallat Rawḍat al-Maʿārif. Taysīr Žubyān (1901-1978), who served as a teacher at the Rawda for a short period, wrote about the Jewish population in Palestine that had increased excessively (fāḥish) during the last period, taking charge of the land’s resources and “managing the government in their hands” as they pleased. The Jews, he claimed, were able to establish schools, colleges and societies all due to their wealth. The Jews inhabiting Arab states, Žubyān adds, have adopted Arab customs and it is hard to differentiate between the Arabs (the natives, al-sukkān al-uṣūliyūn) and them,

96 Arab Shai report, 9 April 1945, 105/73/47, HA.
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meaning that a Jew could not be considered a ‘native’ in any case. This kind of explicit ideological writing was popular and possible for private institutions, not operating under the state. Under governmental supervision a certain delicacy and cautiousness was employed combined with higher standards of academic writing.

Over the years, various articles on the teaching of history, archaeology, geography, Arab, Islamic and European history were contributed to the Arab College’s journal by our authors. This journal was the most prestigious arena in the field of education in Palestine and it is therefore an invaluable source, being the formal journal published under the aegis and scrutiny of the Department representing the highest institution of education (Bowman and Farrell themselves contributed to its issues). The Majalla was the Arab Palestinian parallel to a university journal, a space for its staff and graduates to publish their ideas and research. However, it should also be examined as a space where these frustrated and poorly paid educators expressed themselves and proved to have more in them than administrative skills. The topics that were chosen by our authors highlight their pedagogical perspective, their intellectual influences and worldview. The trajectory employed in their articles will later be seen in their textbook writing in the following years.

Various articles highlight the role of technological, scientific and geographic discoveries. One article recommends reading the National Geographic magazine, describing with awe its colourful photos; another tells the students about British air routes for aeroplanes. British travellers like Captain Cook and Livingstone are exalted as heroes, pursuing a scientific and humanistic calling of discovery, saviours of the poor, bringing advanced European culture to
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the savages. The lifting of the veil (kashf al-ghiṭā) from the terra incognita (majāhil) and wilderness (fayāfī) are treated as the “greatest victories of our historic time” and archaeological excavations in Palestine are admired for exposing new knowledge about the country. While these articles often start with the precedence of Eastern discoveries over the later Western ones, they choose to focus on the latter since they represent the current hegemonic power, and apparently were more attractive for them as scholars. Cook and Livingstone were more relevant role models than ancient Egyptians or even Arab travellers. Although one article articulates the connection between discoveries and imperialism, they are not criticised for representing an imperial interest but venerated for their devotion to science. Likewise, in ‘Abidi’s article about the various foreign archaeological sites in Palestine, they are not portrayed as an imperialist encroachment. Quite the contrary, in one of his pleas to leave the headmastership for the Department of Antiquities, he noted that while touring the sites he wrote a thousand pages of notes. For ‘Abidi, these sites unearthed truths about his country that were hidden for years; he desired to do just that.

In conclusion, this was a geographically small world of interrelations and affinities, an intellectual community of men of similar class and similar training, who tried to make the most of their careers as educators. Yet, the inhabitants of this intimate small world of authors, with their limited means of production, aspired to be men of the big world and find a space for Palestine in it. As educators, writers, broadcasters and lecturers, they aimed as high as they

103 ‘Abidi to Chief Secretary Jerusalem, 18 November 1946, “Mahmud Suleiman ‘Abidi.”
could and did as much as they could in order to bring the big world, the one they thought they knew, closer to their students and community.

Their Jewish contemporaries shared many similarities. Most authors of textbooks did not come from wealthy families, but rather from middle class backgrounds. The Jerusalemite educator Dr. Natan Hakham, for example, almost reached the point of starvation while studying in Vienna as his family failed to support him financially.\(^\text{104}\) The vast majority were of Eastern European descent, not from urban centres, but from relatively small towns. Like the Arab authors, their primary education was traditional; it began at the heder and later in the Yeshiva and continued to secular higher education far from home. Ḥaim Arieh Zuta (Kaunas, Lithuania), Natan Hakham (Bucecea, Romania) and the educator David Tems (b. 1882, Berdychiv, Russia) studied in Berlin, Vienna and Bern.

As in the case of the Arab college, few schools stand out as fertile soil for authors. The Reali School in Haifa, a prestigious institution and one of the few secondary schools in Palestine, was home for Isaac Brawer, Shlomo Horowitz, Nahum Glatzer and Eliezer Rieger who were history teachers. They also worked together in the Yishuv institutions. Isaac Spivak, Baruch Ben-Yehuda and Rieger, for example, were members of the executive of the Teachers’ Union for the INF.\(^\text{105}\) Most writers were ardent Zionists already in the diaspora, leaders and founders of Zionist organisations and movements. Zuta was a pioneer in the Hebrew-in-Hebrew method of teaching in Russia. Rieger, Horowitz and Zvi Likhtinstein (Avineri) were all leaders of the Hashomer Hazair movement in its early days; Rieger was its first president.\(^\text{106}\) Eliyahu Blank was the founder of the Zionist Organization in Hungary.

Similarly to the Arab group, the Jewish authors did not limit themselves to their jobs as educators or bureaucrats in the different education institutes. The classroom or office, as in the

\(^{104}\) Ma'ariv, 14 September 1958.
\(^{105}\) Doar Hayom, 24 May 1927.
\(^{106}\) Davar, 19 April 1954.
Arab case, failed to answer their intellectual and ideological desires. Spivak, for example, translated, co-edited, and wrote numerous volumes of stories and history books as well as publishing articles.\textsuperscript{107} Zuta wrote poetry for children, and the first sex education book in Hebrew (1909).\textsuperscript{108} He had his own publishing press where he published most of his books and like Spivak he edited a series of readers for students.\textsuperscript{109} Rieger edited a journal \textit{The Youth and the Country (Ha-noʿar ve-ha-aretz)} under the INF, for youths and published articles in Hebrew, Polish, English and German.\textsuperscript{110} Hakham published articles and soon after 1948 hosted a weekly radio show focusing on interpretations of the bible on Kol-Israel.\textsuperscript{111} Spivak, Rieger and Dr. Avigdor Tcherikover (1894-1958), one of the founders of the History department in the Hebrew University, also hosted radio shows on Jewish history, education and democracy in the ancient world respectively.\textsuperscript{112}

The mastering of a Western language as key for social mobility was dominant for Eastern European Jews as well. It was German for them, for the academic centres of Germany and Vienna, but also for the rabbinical schools they attended. Their sojourn in German speaking Western Europe was their departure from the old and traditional. The new Jewish diasporic communities established by Russian and Polish Jews in Germany and Austria were beneficial for the absorption of new ideas and ideologies. Similarly to the Arab authors, it was this encounter detached from their childhood surroundings that changed their concepts of the old and traditional.

\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{107} \textit{Yalkut Zioni}, a Zionist anthology about the history of Zionism, its leaders and institutions was co-edited by him in the mid 1940’s, \textit{Davar}, 18 April 1945; for one of his articles see, \textit{Hapoel Hazair}, 22 August 1924.
  \item\textsuperscript{108} Uriel Ofek, \textit{Sifrut ha-yeladim}, vol. 1, 151.
  \item\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 1:150–151; Uriel Ofek, \textit{Sifrut ha-yeladim}, vol. 2, 586.
  \item\textsuperscript{110} \textit{Davar}, 19 April 1954.
\end{itemize}
The most fundamental difference between the two groups was in formal education. While among the Arab authors only Totah held a postgraduate degree while writing his textbook, various Jewish authors held a PhD before writing their textbooks. Moshe Auerbach, a pioneer in Hebrew education in ultra-orthodox schools, won his PhD from Strasburg University (1905), Baruch Ben-Yehuda held his from the University of Brussels (1924). Jacob Katz, who authored textbooks for the Mizrahi trend, and Glatzer took doctorates at the University of Frankfurt (1924, 1931). Tcherikover and Zvi Lichtinstein (Avineri) at the University of Berlin (1925, 1930–), Blank at Budapest University (1913), Hakham, Rieger and Brawer at Vienna University (~1912, 1917, Brawer unknown). Indeed, by the early 1920s, the Jewish community already had its own renowned professional historians, an irreconcilable gap in relation to the Palestinian Arabs during the mandate years.

Nevertheless, similar to the Arab authors, formal education did not necessarily mean popularity. Zuta, Spivak and Dubnow, whose books were widely circulated in schools and libraries, had basic traditional Jewish education with additional informal higher education. Zuta, a prominent educator of Hebrew teachers, had spent only two years as an auditor in the University of Berlin, although being one of the most prolific writers for children in the pre- and post-mandate years (this was a wide phenomenon amongst Jewish scholars who were prevented from entering university under the Numerus Clausus laws).¹¹⁴

The town’s heder and the Yeshiva were still the starting point even for those who continued to non-traditional Jewish institutes. These authors’ heder days are contrasted with their first experiences in the university. Zuta’s memoirs tell an analogous story to Darwazah’s. Both were disenchanted with the traditional heder and kuttab. Zuta sought for other directions after a spiritual crisis he experienced at the age of seventeen, as his “soul was empty”. “The religious

---

¹¹³ Prior to Berlin, Tcherikover worked under the great Russian historian, Robert Iur’evich Vipper in Moscow.
pathos that had filled my heart since I was a child”, Zuta wrote, “had faded away”, driving him to read secular and forbidden Hebrew literature. Darwazah’s description of his kuttab is filled with disdain for the meagre conditions, the dampness, the violence, and above all the “sheikh of limited intellect and knowledge”. For Zuta and Darwazah the Melamed or Sheikh manifested ignorance and confinement in the narrow corridor of tradition. For Zuta, the son of a melamed, this denunciation was a personal act of rebellion. The remedy they both agreed on was a new model teacher who would know his tradition, but never cease his quest for new knowledge. Modern education was therefore the symbolic and aesthetic negative of the kuttab or heder. The dampness and dark rooms had to be replaced with light, wide spaces, the Sheikh or Melamed had to make way for younger more modern educated and dynamic teachers. Both educators, having skipped the steamroller of Western academic education, dedicated most of their authorship to a modern interpretation of traditional literature. It was their way of re-inventing a tradition, more compatible and digestible for their vision of the new school.

Were the two aware of these similarities? As far as the records show, Zuta and Darwazah never met to discuss their similar pasts or shared visions for their peoples’ future. The only recorded encounters between members of the two groups are in the meetings of the PBHS. The protocols of the PBHS are a valuable source for examining the reflective effect of this encounter with the national other. These were formal meetings and as such political matters remained out of the meetings’ protocol. The politics appeared, nonetheless, in the charts presented before the members of the board. The statistics of students’ numbers passing the matriculation exam, where the achievements of Jewish students were juxtaposed with the Arabs’ meant much more than numbers for the central education officials from both

115 Darwazah, Mudhakkirāt, 1:146; more on Darwazah’s kuttab in Ayalon, Reading Palestine, 27–30.
116 Elboim-Dror, ha-Ḥinukh, 2:18; A similar criticism regarding the “ignorant shaykh” taking advantage of the fallah’s ignorance was voiced by the prominent Egyptian intellectual Lutfi al-Suwyid, see Salmoni, “Pedagogies of Patriotism”, 227–228.
117 Haramati, ha-Morim ha-halutsim, 109–112.
communities. These numbers symbolised their achievements, contrasted with the other community, competing over the country by academic merit. But politics sometimes managed to barge in more overtly, too.

At the height of the hostilities between Jews and Arabs, Farrell opened the twenty-second meeting of the PBHS (16 June 1938) commemorating Avinoam Yellin, a Senior Inspector of Jewish Schools, a member of the PBHS, an orientalist and a fluent speaker of Arabic, assassinated in October the previous year at the entrance of the Education Department’s headquarters. Yellin’s father, Prof. David Yellin attended the meeting and so did Ahmad Samih Khalidi and Totah. The contextualised setting of the meeting leaves little room for doubt; the meeting room was charged with tension triggered by over two years of civil strife. Symbolically, the first discussion was about adding the words ‘and Syria’ to the exam on the history of Palestine (a separation Totah strongly objected in his history textbook).  

The board continued to meet to the very last days of the mandate. Rieger and ‘Anabtawi were amongst the members of its last meetings. This is a rare recorded encounter between two writers of textbooks. Already senior officials in their Education Department, both were also members of the History Sub-Committee for the matriculation exams under the board. As late as the summer of 1947, the two were still debating over the required periods that the history matriculation exam would cover. This might suggest their detachment from what was happening outside the Department, thinking that the mandate was there to stay, or rather a preference for business as usual, for they had no other choice. In any case, as we have seen in the first chapter, this technical, instrumental forum never challenged the national separations.

118 PBHS, Minutes of the 22nd General Meeting, 16 June 1938, PBHS, Minutes of General Meetings Vol. III-1936-1940, ISA.
119 Rieger met ‘Anabtawi and Totah a few times in these meetings, see attendance lists, Minutes of General Meetings: 21 July 1942 (all three), 9 March 1944 (Totah and Rieger), 3 September 1946 (‘Anabtawi and Rieger), 11 November 1946 (‘Anabtawi and Rieger), PBHS, Minutes of General Meetings Vol. IV- 1941-1947, 2498/75, ISA. Totah and al-Tamimi attended earlier meetings of the board met notable Jewish educators and senior education officials, PBHS, Minutes of Meetings, 1923-1932, 2498/71, ISA.
120 PBHS meeting, 3 July 1947, PBHS, History Sub-Committee, 2498/67, ISA.
Quite the contrary, the board embraced and furthered these separations, not by oversight but by a face to face encounter with the other. What is interesting in these protocols is the fact that they are not interesting; there were no conflicts or arguments and no profound pedagogic debates, just a banality of bureaucratic boredom.

As we have seen in the biographies of most of these authors, they were loyal nationalists, fully committed to their own national story. Writing it, in a way, also meant living it, finding exclusivities from rather than similarities with other nations. Their biographies, ideologies and historiographies were conceptually linked, but politically they were completely detached. We shall later see how this separation found its way into their writings as well.

‘Anabtawi and Miqdadi’s New Arabs

The calling of these authors was writing the new Arab into history. The new Arab was new in the sense of his denial and rejection of the present day “old” Arab and his perceived feeble, stagnant and lethargic spirit. The subjects of this project were their students; the carriers of this vision. Something fundamental needed to be fixed in order to achieve this goal, for the new Arab was in their view destined to become dynamic, energetic and resourceful; in a word, modern.

Therefore, the reason behind the learning of history derived from the need to learn about the virtues of their ancestors and their greatness, “what was their level of progress in comparison to other peoples, their natural “talents” (mawaheb) given by the lord and those they acquired... With this knowledge we can bring our spirits to imitate the heroism of our forefathers... so we could restore the former glory of the Arabs, and become like the developed/modern peoples (al-shu’ub al-raqiyya)”.

121 In this preface for a history textbook, we

---

121 Salim Ḥadhwah, Tārīkh al-ummah al-‘arabīyah qadīman wa-ḥadīthan (Jerusalem: Maktabat filasṭīn al-‘ilmīya, 1944), 4.
see what Sharkey termed as the struggle to indigenize modernity, to become part of a larger global community of Arabs, Muslims and enlightened people in general while cultivating the particular and locally “authentic” on which national identity must rest.\textsuperscript{122} Our writers perceived the current backwardness and weakness as a temporary disparity that could be remedied. Different educators held different interpretations and concepts regarding the desirable method and content for this therapeutic process in the creation of the new Arab.

Two educators and authors offered strikingly different solutions for this question, not only in their writing but also in their personal careers and biography. Their different paths represent the dialectical nature so inherent in the modernising project of the creation of the New Arab. Wasfi ‘Anabtawi (b. 1903) and Darwish al-Miqdadi (b. 1899) were both influential educators, both born fairly close to the turn of the century to Sunni families. Both obtained their BA in the AUB at the same age (in 1922 and 1926; ‘Anabtawi proceeded to Cambridge where he read History and Geography for his second BA) and both were appointed as teachers in Palestine’s most prestigious schools as teachers of history and geography. Finally, both produced textbooks that were used in Palestine’s schools and the rest of the Arab world.

‘Anabtawi and Miqdadi’s biographies, however, differed dramatically. While the first remained a loyal employee from the onset of the mandate until its dissolution, taught in its prestigious institutions and became a central figure in the Education Department, the latter survived only three years as a teacher in the Teachers’ Training College. Still, Miqdadi’s short and frustrating career as a history teacher did not undermine his remembrance as one of the most influential educators in mandate Palestine, his charisma and dedication during the electrifying first few years of the institute echo in the memoirs of his students and in the annals of the College.

\textsuperscript{122} Heather J. Sharkey, \textit{Living with Colonialism}, 7–11.
Miqdadi resigned from the Department after a dispute over the establishment of an independent Arab scout group in the College. In his letter to Bowman, Miqdadi stressed the need for an Arab Scout group under an Arab flag like in the Jewish schools, one that was not aligned with the English movement of Baden-Powell that according to him was foreign and colonialist in its spirit. Bowman, head of the Palestine Scouts, objected to the idea that in the most important educational institute in the country, a quasi-militant anti-British movement would arise and Miqdadi resigned.123 Miqdadi did not oppose the Scout movement in its essence, quite the opposite, he was enchanted with the ideas of scouting (uniform, flags, hiking and camping), however “foreign” and “colonialist”. But Miqdadi wanted an Arab Baden-Powell and what worried him was the symbolic package of the youth movement; he demanded the autonomy to interpret it.124

Supposedly the pedagogy of ‘Anabtawi and Miqdadi contradicted each other. After all, one was an Anglophile who climbed up the colonial administration and the other revolted against the British. His reluctance to play by the colonialist rules turned him into a fugitive, a nomad, with his ideology uprooted, seeking refuge under distant patrons. Looking beyond these differences could show the ambivalent nature of the modernist discourse mentioned above and expose the similarities and a shared space of analysis, praxis and vision both educators had.

Their pedagogy, to start with, derived from their refusal to limit their gospel to the classroom alone. Miqdadi tried to establish a scout group, used to take the students on long hikes in their spare time, and engaged in informal and spontaneous discussions with them after

123 A copy of the letter was published in al-Itihad al-arabi on 30 April 1926; Muḥammad Yūsuf Najm, Dār al-muʻallimīn, 60–61.
124 Miqdadi was exiled to Iraq and taught at Dar al-Muʻalmin al-ʻAḥliyya (Higher Teachers’ College) in Bagdad until his exile from the country due to his participation in the Rashid Aali al-Gaylani coup d’état. Miqdadi’s scouts were eventually born during his years in Germany (1936-1939) where he finally founded a pro-Nazi Arab Youth movement. According to British intelligence Miqdadi toured Europe with this group in an attempt to mobilise Arab youth in favour of the Nazi cause. Simon, “The Teaching of History in Iraq before the Rashid Ali Coup of 1941”; see also in, Taṣṣīr Jabārah and Saʻīd Bīshāwī, A ṭam min filasṭīn, 107.
teaching hours. While Miqdadi’s pedagogy was holistic, incorporating body and soul, ‘Anabtawi chose to ignite his students’ imagination with his broadcasts on the PBS where he told them at first-hand about Paris-an Eye Witness Account or about the People of the World.\textsuperscript{125} It is no surprise that ‘Anabtawi was depicted as a teacher who “opened amazingly broad spatial horizons”.\textsuperscript{126} Using the methodology they both saw fit, whether by physically exploring their surroundings and getting connected to their country, or by hearing about enchanting distant places, the two sought to shake their students out of their localised comfort zone, the prime cause for the stagnation of the old Arab.

The negative image of the ‘old’ is well illustrated in their writings. Their articles published in the College’s journal are very explicit in this sense. ‘Anabtawi’s articles focus on civilizational progress, emphasising the Ancient East as initiator of this process.\textsuperscript{127} ‘Anabtawi ties both civilisations together, not only ensuring a place for the Arab within the Geist of modernity, but also ensuring the new Arab a space in the revival of what was once his. He therefore sees a connection, rather than rupture between the Arabs and the West, a connection that will be examined in depth later on.

Miqdadi’s writing however, conveys a mournful portrayal of the current reality of the Arab nation, warning that a “desperate, miserable nation despised by its sons is doomed to failure, humiliation and abasement” and stressing that the knowledge of its history of strife, chaos, selfishness and tribal fanaticism is meant to “solve our current problems and the understanding of our society”.\textsuperscript{128} Miqdadi’s Arabs prefer a crawling calmness rather than speed and development, they “want to describe the earth as evolving in tranquillity, as if it did not revolve

\textsuperscript{125} Palestine Post, 29 October, 12 November 1936, 27 January 1937.  
\textsuperscript{126} Jabrā Ibrāhīm Jabrā, The First Well, 162–163.  
\textsuperscript{128} Darwish al-Miqdadi, Tārīkh al-ummaḥ al-‘arabīyah (Baghdad: Maṭba‘at al-ma‘ārif, 1932), i.
around the sun and its axis, but centred on the ox’s horns… we live in the twentieth century BC while they [the West] live in the twentieth century AD”. Miqdadi clearly adopts the colonial patronising gaze on the Oriental, turning him into what could be seen as a “self-hating Arab”. ‘Anabtawi reconciles this so-called gap of 3000 years, by simply overlooking it. In his geography books influenced or directly copied from American or British textbooks, the original protagonists, American or British travellers, simply become new Arabs who go out to discover the world and the gap is bridged by a quantum leap.

Amin is one of those new Arabs in a book co-authored by ‘Anabtawi: a diligent child travelling on a plane with his father the aviator to distant places in the world, so he can learn more about other cultures, all of which are equal as Amin’s father tells him: “Of course my son… their children are like our children, they like what we like and hate what we hate”. Amin flies with his father to discover the world; his first stop is the desert, where he plays with primitive Arab Bedouins. These are not portrayed as his brethren, but as subjects of gaze, he looks at them the same way he will later look at the Sudanese, Pygmy, Eskimos and Indian (native-Americans) children. At the end, Amin mentions that he felt the closest to the Arab children, but no reason is mentioned. Furthermore, the features attributed to the Bedouin Arabs, noble features, hospitality and peacefulness are more anthropological than nationalist.

Amin and his father’s story is a copy of an American geography textbook, the only difference being that in the original version the protagonists are a man accompanied by the moon man. It is interesting though, that the visit to the Arab desert remained loyal to the original. The authors did not even force themselves to change the original version. Adjustments were made however,
to have some kind of Arab pride. A good example is a story told by the Bedouins about a selfish camel, teaching a lesson of selfishness, while in the Arabic version it is used to talk about the generosity of the Arabs, an adjustment that fails to make sense while reading the story.\textsuperscript{133}

Amin and his father

Abu-Amin and a Pygmy man

Miqdadi’s Arabs are unique and carry distinctive features that can be traced to the pre-Islamic era; hospitality, altruism, pride, gallantry, were each featured in a story.134 Yet, for Miqdadi, these features are not mere nostalgia, for they are meant to march the Arabs out of the desert and back into history. Miqdadi’s closing paragraph of The Arab Nation calls for the unity of all Arabs “just like Germany, America, [and] Italy”, that united and achieved independence. The present state of social fragmentation is a feature of primitiveness, with its local traditions, knowledge and politics. Unity is cultivated by rationality, one truth that fits all. Muhammad in this context is not mentioned as a prophet but as an Arab Bismarck, Washington or Garibaldi, who was able to unite the Arab nation.135

The sources employed are another case in point. In ‘Anabtawi’s case, most of his authorship is either comprehensively influenced or directly copied from American or British

---

135 Al-Miqdadi, Tārīkh al-ummah, 520.
textbooks. Miqdadi’s writing, unlike ‘Anabtawi’s, has attracted attention from various writers focusing primarily on nationalist bias. However, no attention was given to the historiographic work beyond the scrutiny of nationalist bias. A close reading of Miqdadi’s book reveals that the framework of his Arab nationalism is delineated by the Orientalist scholarship of the time, rather than classic Arab scholarship. The most basic Islamic or ‘Arab’ ideas are taken from what Miqdadi would call colonialist literature: *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (from which, for example, the description of the tribe of Quraysh is taken), *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Four Centuries of Modern Iraq* (1925), written by a British bureaucrat in Iraq (S. H. Longrigg, who later headed the Iraqi Petroleum Company), and finally the British Colonel Harold F. Jacob’s *Kings of Arabia* (1923).

Miqdadi used Western superlatives to describe the virtues of the Arab nation, citing Philby’s findings in his *The Heart of Arabia*, that the Arab Peninsula was inhabited more then than now, by a civilized nation (*qawm mutahadirūn*). Jurji Zaydan’s *Islamic Civilisation* and *The Arabs before Islam* are Miqdadi’s most widely used sources, more than any other Western source. But Zaydan, although symbolising the Arab Nahda, refused as an historian to base his arguments on the Quran and traditional sources, depended on European orientalists in his works, and was targeted by other Arab scholars for that reason. It is evident that Miqdadi, like ‘Anabtawi felt closer, more confident and secure with modern and secular scholarship.

‘Anabtawi perceived geography as an emancipatory discipline, and mostly wrote about “the world”. In one of his translated geography textbooks, he replaces the travelling group in the American version with an Arab merchant. This is ‘Anabtawi’s role model, who like him, utilises and appreciates his knowledge of a fascinating world. The Arab merchant or the child and his father are already part of modern society, in his literature they are treated as equal to

136 Ibid., 32.
the West. ‘Anabtawi’s scholarship, although being aware of the distance between East and West, locates the Arab student within the right course of progress. Miqdadi chooses to focus on Arab-Muslim warriors as his complete desperate disenchantment from current Arab reality forces him to look a thousand years back; he finds inspiration only in what was long gone.

The Other

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, everything about minority literature is political. Furthermore, writing an apolitical text about Arabs in Hebrew or about the Jews in Arabic, detached from its political charge during the mandate was impossible. Here, the otherness of the Jews or Arabs was a political one, a distinction made in order to delineate, to separate and distance an other that symbolises a current and therefore an historical threat. Therefore, every mentioning of the national other, whether in ancient or modern history should be carefully scrutinised as carrying a message for the present. This section will show how the Zionist-Arab conflict from its very beginning reflected on both Hebrew and Arab production of historical texts and re-shaped its super-structure. In other words, it will engage with the way in which the conflict had literally changed history.

Very little attention has been given so far to the depiction of the national other in history textbooks from the mandate period. Harte and Firer, who conducted the most comprehensive research on the topic, are therefore a good point of departure. Firer dedicates a few paragraphs in her book to the depiction of the Arabs in Hebrew textbooks during the mandate period. Her research, focusing solely on national history textbooks, not only overlooks the general history textbooks, but also the Hebrew writing on Arabs and Islam in places other than Palestine. Firer concludes that the Arab claim to the country and Arab nationalism during the Revolt were considered as fascist and violent and that in general, Arabs were depicted as a menace like the
weather or mosquitoes, or as bandits, as ungrateful and as primitives who conduct vandalism.\footnote{138 Firer, Sokhnim, 127–129.}

Firer’s analysis is helpful for the understanding of the Arab history textbooks as well, arguing that national history textbooks deal with the history of the people rather than the history of the country, producing an ex-territorial historiography, one that is not confined to geography but to what is perceived to be an organic evolving people. It is therefore not enough to analyse intercultural encounters in Palestine alone, but to look for a comprehensive description of the other throughout history.

Harte also dedicates little space to the Arab treatment of Jewish history in textbooks.\footnote{139 Harte does offer a critical reading of Rachel Maissy-Noy’s article about Palestinian historiography. The article is indeed filled with generalisations, bias, treating the Palestinian historians as “they” and overlooking prominent Palestinian historians while writing an article about historiography, Rachel Maissy-Noy, “Palestinian Historiography”; Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 195–196.} Harte argues that in Arab textbooks “there is no attempt to undermine the historical connection between the Hebrews and the Jews… The two terms are in fact used more or less interchangeably, irrespective of period… Indeed on the whole these texts are striking more for their engagement with Palestine's Jewish history than for any attempt to minimise it”. Harte later takes as an example; the favourable treatment of the Maccabean wars as further evidence for what “seems to reflect a complex dialogue between an emerging national group and its ‘Other’”.\footnote{140 Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 197.} This point is further emphasised in Harte’s comparison between Higham’s \textit{Landmarks of History} with its Arabic translation conducted and funded by the Department, arguing that “far from attempting to erase the Jewish presence in historical Palestine, then, the Arab translator-authors of \textit{Ma‘alim al-tarikh} seem determined to engage with it”.\footnote{141 Ibid., 181.} Indeed, in most cases, Jewish history was not omitted from Arab textbooks, but its mere presence means very little, as it is the form and content of this presence that give it meaning. An in-depth
comprehensive scrutiny of these texts could tell much more about these books, rather than plainly labelling anti-Zionist writing as a *waṭani* ‘writing back’, as suggested by Harte.

While celebrating the engagement of Jewish history Harte overlooks the fine but nevertheless important nuances that shed light on this engagement with Jewish history. Harte is right that Nebuchadnezzar’s destruction of the temple, the exile of the Jews and their crying “by the rivers of Babylon” are mentioned in *Ma’alim al-tarikh*. A closer reading of the translation reveals how “Zion was the name of their own holy city” became “Zion is the city that was once named and is still named al-Quds”, and “the Jews who lived in Palestine” turned into “lived in the southern part of Palestine”; the Jewish reference to the Bible, “the sacred book of the Jews and Christians” became “one of the sacred books for the Christians”, while omitting “the Jews wrote a record of all that happened. That is how we know so much about Babylon at this time”. The references for the bible stories are also omitted from the translation. These examples illustrate the ideological impetus and the sensitive awareness of these translators to the political-pedagogic meaning of their work.

Jewish or Hebrew history could not be erased owing to two factors, the first being the Western sources that were used, and the second the Islamic and Christian embrace of the Old Testament as a source book. Not even the conflict could have changed that. It was consequently natural for Ibrahim, Yousef, Talut, Suleiman and others to find their way into all books of ancient history. Furthermore, the unquestionable treatment of the Hebrews as a nation, with Palestine being its homeland appears in all Arab textbooks of the time, but it is the lens employed that makes all the difference. A few examples from these texts might help in evaluating the importance of this lens.

---

A good place to start our survey is Medieval Spain under Arab rule, characterised by long periods of Arab-Jewish cooperation and coexistence. Pre-mandate Hebrew and Arab sources glorified these relations as an alignment between the two peoples (Ha-yehudim ba’alei brit ha-’aravim). These kinds of superlatives or nostalgia were left out of the new textbooks as separate national narratives took their place. Hebrew sources mentioned the cultural and spiritual prosperity in Andalus, but stressed the spiritual and ethnic divisions between Jews and Arabs. The textbooks emphasised the particularities of Hebrew poetry rather than the prolific Jewish authorship in Arabic, as proto-Zionist manifestations against the un-natural (un-historic) diasporic life. In Arab textbooks, Jews are marginal or absent from the Andalusian golden age. When mentioned, the emphasis was laid on Islam as protector of the Jews, contrary to Christian persecution, and as the main catalyst for Jewish prosperity.

The possible educational value discussed in the first chapter was neglected for apparent national-pedagogical reasons. For both narratives, stressing the virtues of cultural assimilation and productive cooperation clearly compromised the exclusive ethnicist paradigms. In the Zionist narrative, a prosperous diasporic community was a contradiction in terms and so was this prosperity’s inextricable connection to the Jewish adoption of the Arabic language. In the Arab narrative, giving weight to the contribution of ‘non-Arabs’ to the zenith of Arab civilisation, might overshadow or challenge the national exclusivity of these achievements.

144 Barukh Ben-Yehudah, Toldot ha-tsya’onut : tenu‘at ha-tehiyah yeha-ge‘ulah be-Yisra‘el (Tel-Aviv: Masadah, 1944), 32-33; Simon Dubnow, Historiyah yehadit li-yeladim, vol. 1 (Tel-Aviv: Dvir, 1936), 23; Zvi Lichtinstein, Shi‘urim be-divre-yeme-yišra‘el, vol. 1 (Tel-Aviv: Dvir, 1939), 14-16.
146 Miqdadi, Tārīkh al-ummah, 403; Mahmud al-‘Abidi, Tārīkh al-‘arab (Safad: Dār al-ṭiba’ah wa-al-nashr al-filaṣṭīnīyah, 1941), 97.
This kind of historic interpretation is common to all national narratives. The contextualisation of these texts exposes further layers in their political and ideological orientations. In this context, Renan stated that “Forgetting, I would even go so far as to say historical error, is a crucial factor in the creation of a nation”. Forgetting or ambiguating periods of Arab-Jewish coexistence or periods of cultural hybridity, fitted the conflicted national projects of both communities in Palestine. Anderson, in his re-reading of Renan, recognised that “in his absolute demand for national amnesia, in the very same breath, Renan names what is to be forgotten, and he names it as the very mark of nationality… paradoxically, the very act of forgetting affirms the national site of memory”.¹⁴⁷ A Hebrew textbook from 1939 masterfully encapsulated this act. After thirty pages of surveying the Jewish achievements in Andalus, the author mentioned in the same paragraph that “The Jewish culture in Spain had reached the apogee of its development” and rhetorically asks: “Were they right, though, in calling this period ‘the golden age’?”¹⁴⁸

This act echoes in other narrations as well. While all the books deal with the founding fathers of the nation, some cast doubt on this connection, claiming the Jews “think (ya’taqidūn) that they are his offspring”, making it a claim rather than a fact. While one text argues that Palestine was “allegedly” promised to the Jews, most sources simply skip the promise and remain loyal to the Quranic narrative or conversely the biblical one with the promise omitted.¹⁴⁹ The historical biblical ties to their founding patriarch and the ones that relate to the Jewish precedence over Palestine as part of a sacred covenant are thus questioned.

¹⁴⁸ Lichtenstein, *Shi‘urim*, vol. 1, 29.
This is contrasted by the Zionist literature that made Abraham its first Zionist, as the forefathers were “attracted in the vision of their hearts to the land of Canaan and only there they envisaged the happiness of their seed”, this covenant unified “the national consciousness, the knowing of God and the knowing of the fatherland in Zion”.\(^\text{150}\) As articulated in Raz-Krakotzkin’s article “There is No God but He Promised us the Land”, “the national consciousness was not based on detachment from the theological perception, but by perceiving nationalism as an exclusive interpretation of this [theological] myth, as a sort of revelation that illustrates its true essence. Secular Zionism, indeed, challenged the Jewish tradition and redefined itself as the utter negation of what was defined as religion, but did so while understanding nationalism itself as the ultimate interpretation of the religious myth, based on the return to the biblical sources”.\(^\text{151}\)

Raz-Krakotzkin’s analysis could be applied to the Arab sources as well. These sources cite entire verses from the Quran and state that it was sent down by God, the revelation (wahi) depicted as a direct message from God, and Muhammad appears as the prophet and master of all times (ṣāḥib al-zamān).\(^\text{152}\) Yet this is a secularised and nationalised prophet, “our national hero” and “founder of our great Arab state”.\(^\text{153}\) The virtues of the Quran are also derived from a modern secular perspective, “consisting of many of the advanced social and moral norms”, and not due to its divine revelation.\(^\text{154}\) While Arab nationalism in this case did not negate “religion” as in the Zionist case, divine revelation was left with only its symbolic role within a greater story of the nation.


\(^{151}\) My translation (originally in Hebrew), Amnon Raz-Krakotzkin, “En elohim aval hu hivtiaḥ lanu et ha-aretz”.


\(^{154}\) Darwazah, *Durūs al-tārīkh al-‘arabī*, 115.
The narration of the Hebrews’ colonisation of Palestine, dealt later in further depth, was another conflictual historical period for obvious reasons. According to the biblical story, the separate Canaanite kingdoms eventually succumbed to what later becomes a Hebrew kingdom, a remnant of Jewish ownership of the land. This “short lived Jewish kingdom” therefore needed to be belittled and marginalised as “small” and “poor”, depicting it as a suzerainty that raised taxes, rather than an independent polity.\(^{155}\) The independence of these kingdoms is contested and Jewish independence in Palestine is contrasted with centuries of its lacking in which the Jews play the role of a fifth column guiding foreign armies to conquer Palestine.\(^{156}\) As such, the destruction of the Jewish temple and Jewish exile by Nebuchadnezzar is attributed to over-deceitfulness in one text, or Jewish treachery and hypocrisy in another.\(^{157}\) In conclusion, these texts tell the story of the Hebrews that dwelled in Palestine and even established kingdoms, but also make it clear that it was a story not worth telling.

In some cases, certain stories remain completely untold on points that contest the teleological flow of the national history especially in relation to the Jews. Darwazah, for example, does not mention the conversion to Judaism of the Himyarites, a pure Arab civilised kingdom in his *History of the Arabs and Islam*. Other texts ignore periods in Jewish history that were probably harder to re-write by the methods discussed earlier. The Holocaust was one of these events as its repercussions had direct influence on Palestine, increasing immigration and strengthening the Jewish claim for a state of their own. Only one Arab textbook on modern times covers the history of the Second World War. Tamimi’s *History of the Present Age*


\(^{156}\) Al-ʿAbidi, *Tārīkh al-ʿarab*, 33; While referring to Jewish reliance on foreign powers or their gods, the authors state, “And I wish to see the day, when they would rely only on themselves”, al-Barghuthi and Totah, *Tārīkh filastīn*, 66, 103.

(1946?) offers a glaring oversight that is self-explanatory in our case; in his detailed narration of the Nazi regime and the Second World War, the word Jew is not mentioned once although the Nazi race theory and nuclear bomb are.\footnote{Rafiq al-Tamimi, Tārīkh al-‘aṣr al-hādir (Jaffa: al-Maktaba al-‘asrijah, 1945), 269–284.} It is clear why Tamimi, an educator and a writer of a few history textbooks and at the same time a central figure in the Palestinian national movement, produced such an overview of the Second World War. The notion of “it’s us or them” certainly echoes in this text: omitting the Holocaust means omitting its supposed historical importance and implications for the Jewish people and Palestine.

Early Jewish-Islamic relations add another layer of conflict, this time of a religious nature tracing the conflict between Jews and Muslims or Arabs to the early days of Christianity and Islam, or even prior to Islam.

Jewish sources mention the Arab presence in the Hijaz and that “Arab culture had an enormous influence on Jewish life: they spoke Arabic, took Arab names and adopted Arab customs… and maintained friendly relations”, making religious belief their only difference.\footnote{Nahum Glatzer, Kitsur toldot yisra’el : mi-ḥurban bayit sheni ’ad yeridat ha-ge’onot, 70-1040 (Haifa: Bet ha-sefer ha-reʿali ha-‘ivri, 1947), 66.} However, these Arabised Jews remain a separate entity in both stories, for in both narratives, the Jews are a nation with its own ethnic essence and therefore described in contrast to the “pure” Arabs.\footnote{Al-Miqdadi, Tārīkh al-ummah, 35.}

This is interesting in view of one of the most cited works in Arab textbooks. Zaydan’s monumental History of Islamic Civilization, stresses that “Jews had an enormous influence on the Arabs of the Hijaz… the Arabs adopted many things from them that they were ignorant about… they taught them some of the stories of the Torah and chapters from the Talmud and spread their traditions and commandments amongst them”.\footnote{Jurji Zaydan, Tārīkh al-tamaddun al-islāmī (Cairo: Matba‘at al-hilāl, 1902), 16.} Miqdadi, who draws heavily from Zaydan’s work, makes an effort to minimise Zaydan’s determinism regarding Jewish influence,
describing the city of Yathrib and other Jewish settlements around it as colonies (mustaʿmarāt),\textsuperscript{162} stressing their foreign, temporary and unjust presence in the Hijaz. In Miqdadi’s co-authored book with Zu‘aytir, the Jews are presented as bitter enemies of the prophet and Islam.\textsuperscript{163} The History of Palestine, also refers to converted Jews who have “entered the Islamic religion to corrupt it and destroy it”, responsible for conspiring in the assassination of ‘Umar and being the “inventors” of the Shia faith and other non-Sunni beliefs that later destroyed the Abbasid empire.\textsuperscript{164}

Hebrew texts, conversely, are usually straightforward in emphasising the amalgamated nature of Islam and the Quran, influenced by Christianity and Persian cultures “and especially by the Hebrew religion” that introduced Muhammad to faith in one God. In Arab sources this influence is marginalized or omitted.\textsuperscript{165} Few Arab sources attribute the same features to Judaism, depicting it as an amalgamation of Babylonian, Persian and other traditions.\textsuperscript{166} Hebrew sources also stress Islam’s inventive nature, depicting Muhammad as a day dreamer, using phrases such as “according to their legend…”. Questioning the authenticity of the other’s religion is an expression of disdain. These cross-cultural influences exist in all cultures. However, in the history textbook this healthy logic appears in the description of all religions but the writer’s. His remains free of criticism and scrutiny.

Violence and cruelty work the same way. Massacres and corruption would only be used to describe the other, while in the national narrative they turn into just retributions under divine providence. Such is the emphasis in Hebrew textbooks on the violent features of Islam, uniting all Arabia “either by the sword or by flattery… [and they] annihilated and killed many of their

\textsuperscript{162} Al-Miqdadi, Tārīkh al-ummah, 36–37.
\textsuperscript{163} See for example the narration of the poisoned goad story, Zu‘aytir and al-Miqdadi. Tārīkhunā, 172-173.
\textsuperscript{164} Al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 105, 107.
\textsuperscript{165} One clear example is the Arab translation of Higham, where “Muhammad often thought about this [the belief in one god] and he heard about the religion of the Christians and the Jews” is omitted from the translation, compare, Higham, Landmarks of World History, 74; compare with Higham, maʿālim, 108; Avigdor Tcherikover, Historyah kelalit, yeme-ha-benayim (Tel-Aviv: Omanut, 1937), 8-9.
tribes”. Other sources offer a detailed description of the massacre conducted by Dhu Nuwas and his attempt to convert (tahwīd) the Arabs. Here, the writer turns the Jewish Arab king into an enemy of the Arabs rather than depicting Dhu Nuwas as acting against Christians, avenging the Byzantine persecution of Jews. To emphasise the cruelty and injustice of the Jewish king, the textbook narrates a colourful story of martyrdom by fire of a woman and child, preferring to burn rather than convert to Judaism. These stories are told as if the other’s cruelty is something natural or inherent. They leave little room for an appreciation or positive evaluation of the other.

Accordingly, the Arab success in their conquests is attributed to their inclination to plunder and conquer, “the normal life for the Bedouins”. Muhammad’s animosity and grudge towards the Jews is grounded in the Jewish refusal to succumb to the Muslim attempt to incorporate them in their new religion, and therefore Muhammad “saw a need to tie his religion in the Arab-National tradition”. Finally, in Hebrew sources the Jews are the victims of the new religion, massacred and displaced while in Arab sources these deeds are justified as a result of the Jewish betrayal, their violation of the pact with the Prophet and “their efforts to spread strife (fitna) and corruption”. Other authors draw parallels between Jewish-Christian and Jewish-Muslim enmity, “just like the Jews rebelled against Jesus (peace be upon him), they stood up against Muhammad (peace be upon him) and wanted to kill him”.

The absence and oversight of Arab and Islamic history should be noted as well. In Hebrew sources, very little is written about the Arabs and their history in comparison to other periods or peoples in history. When they did mention Arabs, the texts were similar to the orientalist

---

167 To stress this point, the questions section asks about the deeds of Dhu Nuwas against the Christians and an example of bravery, Ḥadhwah, Tārīkh al-ummaḥ, 18; Another book mentions the Jewish massacre of 80,000 Anatakia Christians, bought from the Persians and burned as revenge, al- Abidi, Tārīkh al- arab, 33.
168 Tcherikover, yeme-ha-benayim, 6, 10; Eliyhau Blank, Hisṭoryah kelalit, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Yavneh, 1937), 42, 44, 45; Glatzer, Ḋisurṭ, 70-1040, 68.
169 Darwazah, Durūs al-tārīkh al- arabi, 101–104; for the massacres and the selling for slavery of the Jews who survived see, Glatzer, Ḋisurt, 70-1040, 68.
language of the time. One source for example, depicts Arabic literature as having enormous influence on Western culture, but concludes that it remains silent for hundreds of years. In the place of the great Ibn Khaldun and Imru’ al-Qais, came “little people whose hands were short even to impersonate their predecessors” and its cultural revival is channelled to the “nationalist press, which is more boisterous than serious”, concluding that even Khalil Jibran, the greatest Arab poet is nothing but “a stutter of unripe pitiable essence”.\(^{171}\) The Hebrew writer is clearly looking down on Arab culture perceiving himself as a representative of superior culture. Arab cultural inferiority here is contrasted with the Western culture and the renaissance of Hebrew culture.

Similar disdainful criticism describes Arab nationalism: “with meagre powers and noisy plans… [leading a] boisterous politics”, plotting the establishment of a great Arab kingdom, destined to failure due to its reluctance to compromise with Great Britain or France and adhere to post war treaties; this was why Faysal was driven out of Damascus.\(^{172}\) Laying the entire blame on childish, uncompromising Arab politics rather than pointing a finger at the unfairness of the post-war settlements was an easier choice to the Zionist historian.

Hebrew sources depict Arab anti-Zionist activity in Palestine as irrational and vulgar, overlooking Zionism’s considerable contribution to the country, attempts to harm security of people and property and to frustrate the project of the national home. The “bravery, dedication and wisdom” of the Yishuv’s leadership, the textbook states, will be able to overcome these difficulties “not only for the benefit of the people of Israel, but for humanity as whole”.\(^{173}\)

While Arab nationalism is dismissed as harmless with a patronising tone, Zionism, on the other side, is treated as an actual peril. Three sources directly refer to the “Zionist malice” \( (shār al-ṣihyūnīya) \) caused by European persecution of the Jews, derived from the Jewish

\(^{171}\) Eliezer Rieger, Toldot ha-zeman he-hadash (Tel-Aviv: Kohelet, 1924), 239–240.
\(^{172}\) Eliyahu Blank, Historyah kelalit, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Yavneh, 1938), 217; Rieger, Toldot, 272.
“predilection for excessive (fāḥish) [demographic] growth, their desire to monopolize trade and their religious intolerance”. The national home is steered by Jewish “arrogance” and manipulation of mandate rule, preferring Jewish employees, providing them with weapons, enabling the “Judification” of Palestine “as if it was their possession”, “afflicting another catastrophe” (nakabūha nakba thāniyah) on the Arabs of Palestine already under foreign rule. Miqdadi also points a finger at the U.S’s hypocritical role as the “propagandists of liberty and democracy”, refusing to absorb immigration while coercing it upon Palestine. These sources highlight the unsustainable idea of the mandate from its inception, one that the Arabs will never accept, generating strife and bloodshed.

Thus, in most cases, while writing about the history of the Jews, the Arab writer had the Zionist threat in mind, turning Jews into enemies and aliens wherever they went and the Jewish writer, adherent to the Zionist historiography had the Arab national threat in mind. These similar perceptions of the other not only emphasised the never-ending hostility between Islam and Judaism, following Renan’s necessary of oblivion, they re-interpreted important historical periods of positive influence, cooperation, co-existence and similarities between Arabs and Jews. These periods needed to be mentioned, only for the sake of their omission, stressing their impossibility, enabling their oblivion. This not only shaped the way in which history was perceived, but re-wrote the conflict over the land into history, it made it eternal, inevitable.

Ernest Renan, in an ironic definition, defined a nation as “a group of people united by a mistaken view about the past and a hatred of their neighbours”. Antipathy is not enough though. Nationalist animosity needs a reason, an explanation; a history. Palestine during the mandate was anything but short of explanations and reason for this animosity. Since this history, as we

174 Al-Tamimi, Tārīkh al-‘aṣr al-ḥādir, 301; Miqdadi, Tārīkh al-ummah, 515; al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 295–297.
175 Al-Miqdadi, Tārīkh al-ummah, 515.
have seen, was written out of commitment and responsibility to the nation’s future, its current threats had to find their way into the nation’s past.

**Conclusion**

Writing history for students is the same as writing history for adults; it is the pedagogical function of the textbook that make the difference, presenting a cohesive narration of the past, demarcating immaculate boarders and erasing ambiguities. We saw how within the colonial context, this undertaking is problematised as it performs as a minor literature, simultaneously adopting a hegemonic discourse and attempting to emancipate itself from it. Mandate Palestine emerges as a junction of historiographic knowledge and its new history reflects the (un)natural selection mechanism involved, importing valid narrations and revising or omitting problematic ones. Dominant trends in Egyptian, Lebanese and late Ottoman history textbooks, and particularly British and American textbooks are the identifying mark of the Palestinian textbook. The life stories of these educators-historians, their formal education and life experiences make sense of this selection mechanism. Growing up through dramatic periods of transitions in all fields of life, they found a solid ground in history and even though their history remained an expression of these transitions, they nevertheless envisaged through it and utilised it for the creation of a new Arab. The new Arab was empowered and challenged by history; his mission of modernisation and unification of the Arabs was inscribed in it. The encounter with the national other was one of these challenges as well and it was therefore written into the textbook. The following analysis, looking back to the ancient past, further elucidates the inscription methods of these motifs of empowerment and challenge in the history textbook.
Chapter Four: We the Semites- Reading Ancient History in Mandatory Palestine

Throughout the nineteenth century, new archaeological discoveries uncovered ancient Semitic civilizations, and identified their universal heritage and contribution to humankind. The term Semites was a determinist racial label coined within the historicist tradition of the West merged with biological research about the origin of species. “Semitic” scholars, having been labelled as such by Non-Semites, embraced the racial discourse in general and Semitism in particular as a racial relocation to the forefront of human history with an objective of redeeming themselves from a marginalised present. Their Semite ancestors were written back into history not only as the initiators of human culture, but as those who bestowed it upon the West. This provided an historical precedence and a significant connection to a currently “superior” culture that was disenfranchising them politically, economically and socially.

This chapter explores the narration of ancient history in history textbooks written for Arab and Jewish students during the British Mandate in Palestine, focusing on the translation, sociology and movement of historical and Western knowledge. Following Di-Capua, this chapter looks at the modern idea of history as “a form of thought and a habit of mind… bringing with them specific institutions and modes of reasoning” while situating Arab and Jewish historians “at the intersection of modernity and nationalism”.1

I hope to show the essentiality and importance of periodization to the national narrative and how ‘ancient times’, however distant, were considered crucial for these writers as the inception of the national story, another realm in which to stake a claim for their historical rights and to demarcate a cultural and geographical territory. Moreover, I

1 Di-Capua, Gatekeepers of the Arab Past, 5, 338.
will show that the treatment of ancient history in both communities was similar in its basic assumptions, adopted the scientific racial and nationalist historicism, and used the same sources and texts and finally that it reached similar conclusions in relation to their ancient past. The second part of this chapter, focusing on the narration of the colonization of Canaan, is an example of an ancient point of bifurcation from the discussed racial and cultural affinities. We shall see how those are abandoned as the Hebrews enter the Promised Land and the story becomes an historiographical articulation of the conflict over Palestine.

In this classic act of re-writing the nation into the past, Hammurabi becomes an Arab king and false messiahs become the heralds of Zionism. This inherent teleology of national narratives, with its inception at the beginning of times and its eternal spirit, is clear in all nationalist narratives. The reader is guided through a narrative that entails its own distinct essence regardless of its surroundings and the spirit of the nation manifests as a permanent being within an ever-evolving reality. Thus, what happens around the nation gains substance only when viewed through the lens formed by the national path. As the Zionist educators Zuta and Spivak stated in the foreword to their book, *The History of Our People*, “We have integrated the history of the nations into the history of our nation in a restricted and concentrated way, so as not to distract the student from the main part of his study of our people’s history. . . . We have made room for the history of different nations at those junctures in which they came into contact with our nation”.

Studying the nation's history becomes something personal as it deals with what is ours. Salim Ḥadhwa, an Arab priest and the author of a history textbook used by the Latin

---

schools in mandate Palestine, writes about the need to learn the ancestors’ virtues, “so we could restore the former glory of the Arabs, and become like the advanced peoples”. Thus, the study of the nation's past entails an action, a collective calling in the present.

Ḥadhwa’s emphasis on “progress” and “advanced nations” contextualises the exclusive national narrative, as Western categories of modernism are the ones defining and evaluating the nation’s virtues. In this process, as articulated by Asad, the “West” ceases to act as a cultural system and becomes a “vast moral project, an intimidating claim to write and speak for the world”. In this project, “lower civilizations” are forced to become “better than they were”, making the destruction of old and traditional “native” categories and the construction of modern ones, a moral obligation, an object of desire. This chapter seeks also to elucidate and delineate this construction mechanism.

**Becoming Semites**

The term “Semitic” was coined in the late eighteenth century by August Ludwig von Schlözer, a German historian. It was meant to catalogue a group of languages or peoples. The term rapidly gained prominence among orientalists, historians, philologists, and concepts such as “Semites”, “Semitic Languages” and “Semitic Tribes” were adopted as a scientific, descriptive label. Semite civilization was then utilised to describe its negative, the “Aryan” or “Indo-European” peoples and civilization. This terminology later found its way to German-Jewish historians with the inception of Jewish historiography and to Arab scholars who were increasingly exposed to Western knowledge either as travellers or as students in the Anglican and American mission colleges and European universities. “Shem” was a genealogical category in Arab and Jewish texts for many centuries before

---

5 Talal Asad, “Conscripts of Western Civilization”.
6 Jonathan M. Hess, “Johann David Michaelis and the Colonial Imaginary”.
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this process and perhaps its presence in classical texts smoothed its reception. However, it was the secularised-nationalist reinterpretation of this genealogy within this scientific discourse produced under this particular balance of power, which charged it with a new meaning.

Jewish communities in Germany and Eastern Europe were well aware of the progress made in the study of ancient eastern civilizations and the critical reading of the Bible. As early as the 1850s new archaeological discoveries and progress in the field of philology had led to a *Kulturkampf* between the *maskilim* and the rabbinical orthodoxy.\(^7\) For both sides, this was a battle over the essence and true nature of the Jewish religion itself.\(^8\) To the *maskilim*, locating the evolution of Judaism within a wider civilizational context, as an influential but also as an influenced segment of human history, meant a rebirth of Judaism. This Judaism sought to keep its perceived uniqueness, but instead of leading to cultural isolation, its aim was the creation of an open bridge for cultural communication. This bridge also necessitated an epistemic incorporation of the Jewish corpus into the realm of scientific scrutiny. Old texts were now seen under new light and revelation alone ceased to be a satisfying explanation. Jewish scholars sought reference in archaeological discoveries or ‘extra-Biblical’ evidence as well as in the work of Christian scholars and theologians to support and defend the reliability of their Hebrew Bible, which at the time also meant defending themselves.\(^9\)

Thus, race discourse in general and that of the Semitic race in particular, received extensive attention in Jewish writing. Already in the 1860s, Moses Hess (1812-1875) had

---

7 *Haskalah*, enlightenment in Hebrew, was a literary, cultural and social movement of modernist Jews that emerged in late eighteenth century Germany but was still dominant among Jewish communities in late nineteenth century Eastern Europe. A *maskil* is a person following the ideas of this movement, contesting the religious rabbinical hegemony over Jewish society.
8 Jacob Shavit, *The Hebrew Bible Reborn*, 204.
9 Ibid., 200.
maintained that “the Jewish race is an original [ursprüngliche] [race], which… reproduces [itself] in its integrity… [and] always remains the same throughout the course of centuries”. 10 In the Lyck (Eastern Prussia)-based journal Ha-magid, a series of articles were published as an attempt to answer the question “What is a nation?” (ma hu leom?). The writer, probably the journal’s editor David Gordon, a maskil of Lithuanian descent, states that race alone “does not separate the sons of Israel, descendants of Shem, from the German descendants of Yefet”. Only by the Jewish faith have the Jews managed to keep the nation “as a rock in the heart of the seas, as the oil floating upon the water”, while other nations assimilated among their neighbours. 11 Simon Dubnow (1860-1941), an acclaimed historian of Jewish History and a prolific writer of children’s history textbooks, describes the Hebrews as “a branch of the Semitic race”, “Semitic nomads” or “Semitic Shepherds”. The Hebrew people, Dubnow argues, while “moving from the deserts of Arabia in the direction of Mesopotamia and Western Asia, detaches itself clear and distinct from the dim background”. 12

By the turn of the century, Jewish scholars appropriated the scientific discourse of the “Jewish racial question” in search of “a powerful and uniquely modern representation of Jewish identity” towards a “new ‘scientific’ paradigm and agenda of Jewish self-definition and self-perception”. This scholarship was in response to an existing discourse that sought to exclude them as different. 13 The engagement of Jewish scholars, whether supportive or resistant to the racial discourse, amplified identity and political quandaries regarding their ‘diasporic’ existence. Paradoxically, for some Jews accepting the racial difference offered an epistemic solid ground.

10 Mosse Hess, Rome and Jerusalem (1862), 180, 59, as cited by, David Biale, Blood and Belief, 180.
11 “Ma Hu Leom?,” Hamagid, August 17, 24 , 1881.
12 Simon Dubnow, Jewish History, 46–47, 57. This is an English translation of a German translation from Russian, published in 1893. Other examples can be found in Joseph Klausner’s (1874-1958) History of Israel: Lessons in Jewish History (Odessa, 1909).
13 John M. Efron, Defenders of the Race, 4–5.
By becoming Semites, Jews became members of a glorified ancient family. The new outlook on their ancient history became scientific proof of the authenticity of the Jewish canon and located the Jewish people within a glorified past. For Jewish history, this meant the certitude of a distant past; for Zionism this could be channelled into a separatist ethnic evolution of a nation from a familiar civilizational ground. Anti-Semitism triggered a disappointment from the enlightened race discourse, turning Semitism into the embodiment of Jewish social alienation in the diaspora. This transformation echoes in the writings of the Jewish scholar and early Zionist Moshe Leib Lilienblum (1843-1910). Hanan Harif illustrates Lilienblum’s transformation, from his admiration for the Aryan and scorn towards the East and the Eastern, an adherent of the ideas of Gobineau and Renan in the 1870s, to his reckoning in the wake of the 1880s pogroms that “we are strangers by race… the sons of Shem within the sons of Yefet, a Palestinian tribe from Asia in European countries”.14 Zionism’s solution to this strangeness was not fundamentally different from the integrationist vision of the Haskalah; both envisioned a Westernization of Jews and Judaism. The disenchantment with integration in Europe had led to the conclusion that “if Jews cannot become European in Europe, they might as well become European in their own country”.15 Zionism’s embrace of this racial discourse entailed a dialectic tension. Accepting it meant the desired return to history as a nation among nations, while ratifying the exclusive organic difference between the Jewish nation and other nations, between the Jew and the non-Jew.

The adoption of the racial-civilizational discourse in the Arab-Ottoman world operated similarly to the Jewish case as both corresponded with European theories classifying the East as inherently inferior. The concept of an Islamic civilization emerged in the post-

15 Gil Z. Hochberg, In Spite of Partition, 12.
Tanzimat Ottoman world, the age of reform, when the Ottoman Empire intended to reconceptualise itself as “a partner of the West rather than its adversary”.\textsuperscript{16} It emerged as the product of an intellectual dialogue that aspired to refute Orientalist theories of Aryan/Christian supremacy over the Semitic/Islamic civilization,\textsuperscript{17} reflecting a complex mechanism of self-defence within an uneven balance of power and a desire for inclusion in what was considered modern and progressive. For European Zionist Jews, redemption from their otherness meant colonialism outside of Europe. For early Arab nationalists, becoming Semites meant historiographically shaking off a backward Ottoman world in favour of an alignment with modernity and progress propagated by European imperialism. Redemption from their otherness in relation to the West required an epistemic shift.

Several sources discuss the use of the term Semite or Semitic in the Arabic language, focusing on its relation to the formation of an all-encompassing Arab identity, prior to the days of Islam. According to Hurvitz, for the Arab world, this term was charged with new meaning after the First World War where “[t]he ‘Semites’ were no longer a group of extinct peoples, but rather a contemporary political entity which aspired to nationalist goals”. Hurvitz stresses the importance of the employment of Western scholarship by Arab writers in creating an amalgamation of the scientific and the ideological and adopts Dawn’s periodization of the rise of pan-Arab ideology in the interwar period.\textsuperscript{18}

Dawn argues that the theoretical framework of Pan-Arabism was made possible with the Semitic wave theory. According to this theory, the Semitic peoples originated in the Arab Peninsula and later migrated to the Near East, and were the origin of the Eastern civilizations and the Arabs. Dawn stresses the influence of a single book that highlights

\textsuperscript{16} For Ottoman adoption of European categories of progress and stagnation see, Ussama Makdisi, “Ottoman Orientalism”, Especially relevant for our case is Makdisi’s depiction of the Ottoman Orientalization of the Arab provinces.

\textsuperscript{17} Cemil Aydin, \textit{The Politics of Anti-Westernism}, 48–54.

\textsuperscript{18} Nimrod Hurvitz, “Muhibb ad-Din al-Khatib’s”.
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the Semitic wave theory. *Ancient Times* (1916), written by the American Egyptologist J. H. Breasted is in Dawn's view an important source of reference for Arab nationalists utilizing this theory. Dawn marks the culmination of this book’s influence with its translation into Arabic in 1926. In his work, Harte traces the use of the term in the national context, as early as 1923, citing an article from the Jerusalem Arab College’s Journal. This use implies “that teachers at the Training College were already fusing elements of Breasted’s Semitic wave theory with Arab national narratives from the earliest days of British rule in Palestine”. Indeed, Breasted’s book became one of the most important textbooks for the teaching of history in Palestine as it became a central source for the Palestine Matriculation Exam.

However, as mentioned above, modern scholarship on Semitic peoples and languages goes back to the late eighteenth century, and therefore its entrance into Arab scholarship may well be located even earlier and deserves more nuanced scrutiny. Attributing the emergence of an idea to the translation of a single book in the 1920s overlooks almost half a decade of relevant scholarship and expropriates or overlooks the agency of ‘local’ intellectuals. The historiographical debate over the genesis of Arab nationalism has sometimes forcefully attached the history of ideas to the political or social drama, marking an artificial parallel between them, though in many cases they evolve at different rhythms.

The modern connection between ancient Semitic people and an Arab identity could be traced back as far as the second half of the nineteenth century, when this discourse reached the Middle East, either with missionaries or with Arab scholars returning from Europe. An early example is Antonius’ “great figure”, the prolific scholar Butrus al-Bustani (1819–

---

19 C. Ernest Dawn, “The Formation of Pan-Arab Ideology in the Interwar Years”. Similar periodization in usage of the term can be found in Reeva S. Simon, “The Teaching of History in Iraq”.
In 1876, al-Bustani had launched his ambitious project: the first encyclopaedia in Arabic. The entry ‘Shem’ is opened by stating that Shem was the eldest son of Noah and “father of the Arabs” (abu al-‘arab) and the reader is also referred to entries for ‘Semitic languages’ and ‘Semitic Nations’ (al-umam al-sāmiyya). It seems that this use of the term Semitic fits the modern Semitic wave theory and implies that both this knowledge and its translation into Arabic were present in the intellectual world surrounding al-Bustani.

Harvey Porter’s history textbook, authored for the use of the SPC and mentioned as a source of reference in early Palestinian textbooks, was published in 1884. In his book, Porter incorporated the idea of Semite civilization and the direct link between the ancient Arabs and the Semitic civilizations of the ancient world. Another early example is Jurji Zaydan’s al-Tarikh al-‘ām, published in 1890, also mentioned as a source in Palestinian textbooks. Zaydan mentions the group of Semitic languages and the settlement of the three sons of Noah, stating that “the ancient Arabs are descendants of Shem son of Noah”. This book, the bulk of it copied from an American textbook discussed earlier, is one of many examples of Western texts being translated into Arabic and simultaneously entailing an adoption of its terminology and framework. Zaydan discusses the disputes amongst scholars regarding the origins of the Semites already in his History of the Arabs before Islam. This essay traces the Arabs to the cradle of civilization in Iraq and widely uses the

23 This encyclopaedia had reached 115 subscribers in Palestine alone in 1876, and Bustani’s journal al-Jinan probably enjoyed a wider distribution of readers in Palestine, Ami Ayalon, Reading Palestine, 49–50.
24 Harvey Porter, al-Nahej al-qawim fi al-tariikh al-qadim (Beirut, 1884), 186–187. Porter taught history in SPC for a few decades and served as editor of the college’s journal, which in those days published various articles focusing on Syrian nationalism, Fruma Zachs, “From the Mission to the Missionary: The Bliss Family”. As part of this local Syrian nationalism, the focus was on pre-Islamic history of Syria and the ancient civilizations that settled in it, (91-103 in the book).
terms Semites, Semitic, and Semitic languages when discussing the origins of the Arabs. Zaydan dedicated subchapters to answer questions about the identity of ancient personages, with questions such as “Was the state of Hammurabi Arab?” giving proofs of the Arabness of ancient kingdoms. In *Classes of Nations* (1912), about the origin of human races, Zaydan dedicated a chapter to the Arabs “who preserved the original pure [Semitic] features”.

Finally, another important textbook for schools was P.V.N. Myers’ *A General History for Colleges and High-Schools* (1890). The Arabic edition of the book (1912) is mentioned as a source for most of the textbooks dealing with the history of ancient times. The racial division of the human race is set as the inception of human history, and “of all the races, the White, or Caucasian, exhibits by far the most perfect type, physically, intellectually, and morally”. In the chapter about the rise of Islam Myers states that “the Arabs... are, after the Hebrews and the Phoenicians, the most important people of the Semitic race”.

Scholars’ emphasis on Semitism did not necessarily serve an exclusive Arab nationalism or Zionism. A few contenders against this dominant trend in Jewish and Arab historiography did exist. Let us consider two examples. Rabbi Binyamin (Yehoshua Radler-Feldman, 1880-1957) called for pan-Semitism with the local Arab population prior to his arrival in Palestine (1907). In his prophetic poem, *Maṣa ‘arav* (A Vision of Arabia),

---

28 Myers, *A General*, 1889. Prof. Myers gave the rights and funding for the translation to Arabic and the publication of his book to the American mission during his trip to the Middle East in 1905, *al-Tārīkh*.
29 Hussein, 1922, Totah, 1923, Zubyān, 1923, Farah, 1926, Darwazah, 1936, al-Sabbagh, 1944, these were the ones with an included bibliography list.
30 Ibid., 11, 362.
31 A comprehensive overview of pan-Semitism and its advocates can be found in, Harif, “Tehiyat ha-mizraḥ”; other examples of Jewish scientists and scholars who contested the “racial science” can be found in, Efron, *Defenders of the Race*. 
he called for the merger of the two peoples in Palestine “and one species found its own specie and became one”. 33 Binyamin understood anti-Semitism as also anti-Arab and his call for pan-Semitic solidarity and Jewish-Arab brotherhood was his answer to both peoples’ marginalization and a racial defence strategy.

Parallel to the works of Benyamin, similar ideas of kinship, racial, cultural and religious affinities between Jews and Arabs were promoted by the Lebanese Shahin Makaryus (1853-1910) one of the co-editors of al-Muqtataf. For Makaryus, these shared features were a necessary link, as “claiming association to the Jews offered Arabs proof that members of their own race… could be successful and ‘advanced’ as Europeans”. This belief led also to Makaryus’ support of Zionism as a positive civilizing mission in the orient.34 Makaryus’ approach towards the Jews was not different from that of his contemporary Zaydan.35 Their appreciation and respect for Judaism and its ties with Arab-Islamic history also adheres to the diverse, liberal world-view they sought to promote on the pages of al-Muqtataf and al-Hilal.

Yet, this scholarship failed to go beyond a vague vision and words of flattery. Zionist Pan-Semitism remained loyal to the colonialist civilizing mission of the backward East and the ascent of political Zionism along with Arab nationalism overshadowed the scarce Arab scholarship that promoted Arab-Jewish co-existence.

These examples show that the modern concept of Semitism was brought forward earlier than previously perceived and laid the groundwork for a fuller embrace following the First World War. The introduction of these concepts in the Arab and Jewish

33 Binyamin later one of the founders of Brit-Shalom and the editor of its journal, Yaron Peleg, Orientalism, 37; Ehud Ben-ʿEzer, Be-moledet, 10–11.
34 Jonathan Marc Gribetz, “‘Their Blood Is Eastern’.
35 See for example Zaydan’s depiction of Jewish presence in the Arab-peninsula prior to Islam and the Jewish influence on the new religion, Zaydan, Tārīkh al-tamaddun al-islāmī, 6.
educational sphere reflects their hegemonic magnitude and their full acceptance as ‘legitimate knowledge’.

**Adopting racial categories**

In mandate Palestine, all Hebrew and Arabic textbooks of ancient history traced their respective peoples’ lineage to the Semites, or sons of Shem. The people of Israel are mentioned as the descendants of the “ancient family of the sons of Shem”, originating from the Arab peninsula, “the ancient fatherland of this family of peoples” with a high degree of culture and a shared language.36 In these texts, the Semites are treated as the natives of the area, differentiating them from the “foreign peoples” (*Amin zarim*, or, *nokhrim*), or foreign invaders like the Elamites or the Hittites, that were “far in their race from the Semites”.37 Darwazah stresses the alien nature of Persian rule over the region, stating that “after the Semites had ruled over Iraq for a long period, the rule was transferred to the Aryans”. Darwazah characterises Persian rule as colonialism (*isti‘mār*), when the Semites “thought they could get rid of Persian colonialism and rule, and revolted (*thārū*)… [with] desire for freedom and independence”.38

In order to be a part of the Semitic race, one must first accept the division of humanity into races and the affinity between race and physical appearance. This division appeared in history textbooks in Europe, the United States and late Ottoman history textbooks, and was later adopted by Arab and Jewish writers.39

---

38 Darwazah, *Durūs al-tārīkh al-qādīm*, 100.
39 Peter Parley and Myers’ history textbooks earlier mentioned are two of many examples. For late Ottoman educators’ engagement with race see: Salmoni, “Pedagogies”.
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In an early geography textbook, we find the racial separation between the white, yellow, black and red races. Although all said to be descendants of the same mother and father, the white race is said to be the “prettiest and the most developed” of all races.\footnote{Sa’īd al-Sabbagh, \textit{al-Jughrāfiyah al-ibtidā’īyah} (Sidon: Maṭba‘at al-‘irfān, 1924), 24–26.}

Darwazah writes about the “apparent” physical division separating races, including colour, facial features, and height. The white race, for example (Europeans and West Asians), has bright colour and gentle noses and lips, as well as straight hair (the Arabs belong to this subgroup); the black race has flat noses, thick lips and curly hair.\footnote{‘Izzat Darwazah, \textit{Mukhtaṣar tārīkh al-‘arab wa-al-islam} (Egypt: al-Maṭba‘ah al-salafiya, 1925), 11–12.}

Ziadeh, a Palestinian educator and acclaimed academic, divides the white race into three groups different in skull size and the colour of their hair and eyes, mentioning that the “Mediterranean race” and the “Nordic race” share the same skull size but differ in eye and hair colour, possibly suggesting more than a physical familiarity between the two.\footnote{Ziadeh, \textit{al-‘Ālam al-qadîm}, 10.} Meaning that, as far as racial taxonomy is concerned, the Asian Semites are similar to Europeans.

Physical features were then linked to character and cultural progress. Hakham adds that the white race is different to other races in the etymological structure of its language, while with other races words do not change form for the purpose of didactic use.\footnote{Natan Hakham, \textit{Taqtsir shel hisṭoriyah kelalit} (Jerusalem: Darom, 1935), 5–6.} Totah and Barghuthi add in their co-authored book the connection between climate and human character, a geographical determinism that dates back to the writings of Herodotus and Khaldun. In the warm Sudan area, they argue, people have a tendency for laziness and stagnation, sleeping under the shades of their palm trees and in their caves, unlike the inhabitants of the cold areas who are more active.\footnote{Al-Barghuthi and Totah, \textit{Tārīkh filāṣfīn}, 4–5.} ‘Progress categories’ were also attributed to each race, stating that unlike other races, which had remained underdeveloped, the white race was the fertile soil for the nurturing of great nations and a
wide and progressive culture that had influenced the entirety of human history. Humanity is thus divided between the people who have ‘made history’ and those who did not influence history, the nomads and the hunters.

It seems that the adoption of this racial division is an attempt to redeem both Arabs and Jews from their apparent racial hybridity (“white but not quite” in the words of Homi Bhabha) which would leave them hanging in racial in-betweeness. Although this division leaves brown-skinned, curly haired Arabs and Jews out of the equation, it offers a racial comfort zone where Arabs and Jews are made part of the winning party.

But being white is not enough, as Semites bear distinctive characteristics. In Breasted’s book, explicit connections are made between the Semites and their physical appearance, where under a famous Egyptian painting of nomad Canaanites he states: “Notice also the type of face, with the prominent nose, which shows that Hittite blood was already mixed with the Semitic blood of these early dwellers in Palestine”. “The prominent aquiline nose… the mark of the Semite, especially of the Jew, was really a feature belonging to the (non-Semitic) Hittites”. Later in Breasted’s book, illustrations juxtapose a modern Armenian’s profile and an ancient Hittite sculpture: “The strongly aquiline and prominent nose of the Hittites was also acquired by the neighbouring Semites… including the Canaanites”. In Quban’s translation into Arabic this illustration was kept, but while the photo of the nomad Canaanite was omitted, the text describing the Semitic/Jewish “aquiline nose” (al-anf al-aqna) does appear.

46 David Tems, Histpriyah kelalit (Jerusalem: Hoza‘at ha-gimnasia ha-‘ivrit, 1925), 1.
47 James Henry Breasted, Ancient Times (Boston: Ginn, 1916), 197.
48 Ibid., 199.
50 Breasted, al-‘Uṣūr al-qadīmah, 152.
This famous picture of Canaanite nomads also appears in a few Hebrew textbooks. While Dubnow’s description of it seems rather dry, depicting the “nomad Semitic tribes heading south to Egypt”,\textsuperscript{51} the description in Dr. Isaac Brawer’s textbook seems more colourful: “We see the faces of these nomads, with great resemblance to the faces of the Jews from Poland or Russia”.\textsuperscript{52} Brawer also relates to the Hittite nose: “they resemble the Armenians the most and also to many of our people... The common feature in the Hittite face is the grown nose ‘a respectable piece’ that the \textit{goyim} are accustomed to call a Jewish nose, crooked at its end and often has a hunch on its middle... Brawer concludes based on Ezekiel, 16/3: “it is clear to us where we got this nose from, it is an inheritance from our Hittite mothers and Hittite blood mixed in ours”. While Ezekiel’s use of this verse was clearly derogatory, denouncing the assimilation of the Israelites in Canaan, Brawer cites it as an ancient proof of this racial fusion. This also goes to show the physical features of the Jews (whether aesthetic or not) and their connection to the land of Israel, implying that ‘our nose’ that differentiates us today from our current neighbours, is a familiar sight in our homeland.

\textsuperscript{51} Dubnow, \textit{Historiyah}, 9.
\textsuperscript{52} Brawer, \textit{Toldot}, 18; this engagement with the racial origins of the Jewish nose was not uncommon in Zionism, see Etan Bloom, \textit{Arthur Ruppin}, 86–87.
Illustration 4: The strongly aquiline and prominent nose of the Hittites was also acquired by the neighbouring Semites… including the Canaanites”.

Illustration 5: Nomad Semitic tribes heading south to Egypt.

I was able to find only one textbook that refuted the racial-cultural connection, written by Avigdor Tcherikover. Tcherikover states in his textbook for the fifth-eighth grades: “‘People’ (‘am) and ‘nation’ (umah) are cultural and not racial terms, meaning that it is based on a spiritual similarity between the members of the people and not their physical resemblance”. Tcherikover adds that the attempt to explain human characteristics based on race has no scientific value, as pure races do not exist.55 This history textbook is unique as it challenges a variety of racial simplifications in regard to ancient civilizations while remaining loyal to the ‘historical facts’ that were known to Tcherikover. The tone of the book, published in 1935 by a graduate of the University of Berlin, was probably responding to the utilization of race theories in Nazi Germany. Yet, this book might well be the exception that proves the rule; since questioning the inextricable link between race and nation means challenging the foundations of nationalism itself, it was seldom found in the history syllabus or textbooks despite the repercussions of this link in the 1930s and 1940s. Ironically, race categories continued to dominate the taught historical discourse.

**East then West**

Both Zionists and Palestinian educators saw themselves as natural cultural mediators between East and West and, during times of peace, as partners in the British imperial project. Tibawi repeatedly mentions in his book that “the fact that the two cultures shared at least two common origins in Hellenism and Semitic monotheism made the attempted harmony not particularly hard” while referring to the educational goals of the British in Palestine.56 Tibawi's Palestine was “the ancient cradle of civilization” merging Christianity (the West) and Islam (the East), mentioning their Semitic origin but essentially

highlighting the prospects of East-West cooperation.\textsuperscript{57} Eliezer Rieger had a similar approach to British rule over Palestine. He concluded his history textbook for high-school students with the belief that the Balfour declaration was “bringing great honour to the British people”, marking a British acknowledgement that the Jews could act as mediators between East and West, having seen the Jews revive the wilderness.\textsuperscript{58} Educators like Tibawi and Rieger, both educated in the West, perceived their nation as fit for the joint civilizational project for Palestine under the British. One sought to bring the masses westward while the second saw its colonization by Westerners as a solution.

Looking westward while feeling physically or conceptually rooted in the East is understandable when viewed in light of the personal biographies of these authors discussed in the third chapter. Although conceptually they abandoned tradition, they still needed to find a place for it and for themselves in their new history. Their ancient Semites and their ties with the West should also be read through the eyes of these young Easterners struggling for their place in an environment willing to accept them only after they had surrendered to the decree of modernity.

These authors embraced the meta-historical dichotomy between East and West and the historiographic approach that utilised the role played by the Semites in human history. Ancient history was nationalised by the Semites, now reclaiming their achievements from the currently superior West as “While the Aryans were still savage shepherds... the Sons of Shem were living in fairly organised kingdoms.”\textsuperscript{59} In Sa‘īd al-Sabbagh's (1900-1967) words, it was the East that “sparked the light of ancient civilizations and lit the whole world” and Žubyān adds that Egyptians and Phoenicians brought civilization to the Greeks teaching them law, social organization, art and craftsmanship.\textsuperscript{60} The subtext therefore

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 4–5.
\textsuperscript{58} Eliezer Rieger, \textit{Toldot}, 274–275.
\textsuperscript{60} Žubyān, \textit{Zubdat}, 13, 73.
reads, not very subtly, that Eastern progress was not only prior to that of the West, but it was also the source of its spark.

The precedence of Semitic culture does not mean that the ancient Eastern world did not have its flaws. Ziadeh, for example, highlights Greek rationality, as opposed to heavenly moral values “we found in the East” along with principles of freedom of speech and thought and the spread of knowledge between all people.\textsuperscript{61} Hakham adds that the reason for Eastern stagnation was polygamy and tyranny.\textsuperscript{62} Within these juxtapositions, the admiration for Alexander the Great, a Western conqueror of the East, is unique not only because of his genius and resulting conquests, but due to his embodiment of that which the writers had yearned for: the unification of East and West and equality and respect for all races and creeds.\textsuperscript{63}

These ideas bring to mind the problems of ‘historical difference’ explored by Chakrabarty and his call for the “provincialization of Europe”. Chakrabarty marks the moment that historians ceased to see Europe as the sole theoretical sovereign over all histories as the point of departure for the subaltern re-writing of its own history.\textsuperscript{64} Nonetheless, in our case, the sovereignty of the West remains unquestioned and its paradigms, categories and diagnosis remain quite intact. Indeed, as Sheehi has shown, the adoption of the etiology of progress and civilization inescapably located Europe as the teleological endpoint.\textsuperscript{65} However, while aware of Talal Asad’s argument of the inevitable coercion and seduction involved in the transformation from the traditional to the modern, and Walter Benjamin’s irresistible storm of progress, I wish to highlight the historian’s

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{61} Ziadeh, \textit{al-‘Ālam al-qadīm}, 146.
\item \textsuperscript{62} Hakham, \textit{Taktsir}, 5–6.
\item \textsuperscript{63} See in Nadal, vol. 2, 124, al-Barghuthi and Totah, 51 and Hakham, 167. Alexander’s image appears on the cover of Darwazah’s \textit{Durūs al-tārīkh al-qadīm}, and his story receives ample coverage in comparison to other figures.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Dipesh Chakrabarty, “Postcoloniality”.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Stephen Sheehi, \textit{Foundations of Modern}, 147.
\end{itemize}
choice of interpretation of history. I argue, that these writers sought an historical path where East and West co-exist, both recognising the virtues of the other. In other words, theirs was a plea for historiographic equality within a Western discourse, rather than a claim for superiority or even a challenge to the existing historical structure.

We have seen how both Palestinian and Jewish writers adopted racial categories in history textbooks. Instead of contesting the racial paradigm, these texts reflect an adaptation of the Western hegemonic discourse. It also becomes evident that both nationalist narratives chose a similar historical starting point. Nevertheless, this similar ‘imagined ancient past’ was not used in order to write a joint Semite historiography. During the mandate, the conflict between the Arab and Jewish community over the future of Palestine politicised its past and traced the struggle over Palestine far back into ancient history. The struggle between Canaanites and Hebrews over Canaan would be one of many sparks reminding both the Arab and Jewish student that this land was made for him and not the other.

**Colonization of Canaan**

The colonization of Canaan is a significant episode in Palestinian and Zionist historiography. The Biblical narration of the Israelite conquest and the later colonization of the land were essentially used by both national narratives. For the Zionist narration these “triumphs left a great impression in the Israeli tradition” and Joshua is described as a “fierce hero with lofty ideals”. The Israelite tribes fought “in that great spirit of courage, unique to a young people conquering countries.”66 In Zionist historiography the colonization of Canaan was paralleled to the modern return to Zion.

---

Pre-conflict Arab sources remain loyal to the traditional biblical narrative, where the conquest of Palestine by the Hebrews was a triumph “under the grace of God” referring directly to the biblical narration.\(^67\) In contrast, the Arab historians in our case offered a different reading of the biblical source describing it as an ancient clash of civilizations, identifying themselves with the Canaanites. This clash symbolised a Palestinian historicity, territoriality, and a proto-national community and entailed a message in a bottle; it was a story of a civilization that was destined to perish under a foreign occupier.

In all textbooks, except one, the identification of the Hebrews and Canaanites with the modern Jews and Arabs in Palestine seems clear.\(^68\) Although the Hebrews are depicted as a nation returning to their homeland from exile (ghurbah),\(^69\) Palestine was forcefully taken (ightiṣabuhā) as a homeland (mawṭinan lahum)\(^70\) from its native inhabitants (sukkānihā al-uṣūlīyīn). This was an invasion (ghazū), in which the “Israelites flooded (iktsāḥ) their country and destroyed (tadmīr) their cities”, facing a popular mobilization and “strong resistance” (muqāwama).\(^71\) The questions addressed by Darwazah to the students at the end of the chapter emphasise the Hebrews’ colonialism: Was Palestine empty of inhabitants? Why did the people of Palestine refuse to allow the Jews to enter to their country?\(^72\) The ancient drama of the Canaanites was indeed revitalised.

To further the unjust nature of this conquest Ziadeh undermines the Hebrews’ precedence of tawhid, mentioning the building of temples for other Gods, and

\(^67\) Especially relevant are the descriptions of the Israelite wars against the Canaanite coalition, Yusuf Dibs, Kitāb tārīkh sūrīyah, vol. 2 (Beirut: al-Māṭba‘ah al-‘umāmiyyah, 1895), 1, 189–190, 206–207; Bustanī’s entry on the Hebrews is also based on the biblical narration, Suleiman, Najib and Nasib Bustānī, Kitāb dā’irat al-ʿumūmīyah, vol. 2 (Beirut: al-Maṭbaʿah al-ʿumūmīyah, 1895), 190, 207; Bustani’s entry on the Hebrews is also based on the biblical narration, Suleiman, Najib and Nasib Bustānī, Kitāb dā’irat al-ʿumūmīyah, vol. 2 (Beirut: al-Maṭbaʿah al-ʿumūmīyah, 1895), 190, 207.


\(^70\) Zubyān, Zuhdat, 40.


\(^72\) Darwazah, Durūs al-tārīkh al-qadīm, 89.
distinguishes between God and Jehovah worshipped with austerity and simplicity, “a brutal cruel tribal God” (qāsin, jāfīn). While in most Arab textbooks it is agreed that the Jews were the first to believe in one god (tawḥid) and that Musa (Moses) was the first to say "lā ilāhu illa’llah…", this belief is said to be weak and untrue in comparison with that of the Muslims, who did not succumb to idolatry.

Both narratives hold a lesson of unity. It was because of the Canaanite fragmentation that the land was occupied, and it was due to tribal conflicts and lack of cohesion that wars were lost and God was forgotten. In Arab sources, this was clearly analogous to the Arab political schism and partisan rivalry during the mandate, reminding the students that division meant weakness then and now.

Arabic sources emphasise the contrast between the Bedouin tribes of the Hebrews who worshipped their God in a tent and the Canaanites’ “thriving civilization” (madānīya zāhirah) with its comfortable neat homes, high-level administration, industry, commerce, and religion. Later, the Israelites left the Bedouin tents, adopted the national Canaanite language (lughatahum al-qawmīyah) and clothing “until you could not distinguish the Israeli from a Canaanite in anything”. The Hebrews are depicted in jahili characteristics; savage nomads divided by tribal wars. Nonetheless, while nomadism is usually employed as a noble inception of the Arabs, here the contrast between an advanced sedentary civilization and a primitive nomadic culture illustrates the unjust conquest of the land by

73 Ziadeh, al-ʻĀlam al-qadīm, 93–94; for other uses of Jehovah instead of God, Lawrence, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 61.
74 Darwazah, Durūs al-tārīkh al-qadīm, 88; al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 21.
75 Al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 46.
76 Zuta and Sternberg, Kadmoniyot, 36–37.
77 Lawrence, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 19; al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 7–8.
78 Ibid., 49; This description is taken almost word by word from Breasted. Ancient Times, 295. Harami copied this from Breasted as well, but unlike Harami, Breasted does not mention the Hebrews also taking the Canaanite gods.
79 A more refined description of the Hebrews as nomad tribes can also be found in Breasted, Ancient Times, 202–203; Macalister, mentioned as a source in Totah and Barghuthi’s book, depicts Saul as an ignorant superstitious tribal Sheikh, Robert Alexander Stewart Macalister, A History of Civilization in Palestine (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), 63.
a people who simply did not deserve it. In the ancient days of Canaan, the natives were the advanced ones, and the Hebrews were the savages.

The danger of assimilation and racial or cultural impurity is a prominent notion in earlier and later periods in Jewish history. In Zionist historiography, racial and cultural purity meant national cohesion. The sign of cultural superiority and Canaanization of the Hebrews is interpreted in the Hebrew texts as a source of peril for the Hebrews who “stopped minding their racial purity”.80 This was contrasted to Egypt, where the Hebrews “did not assimilate (*hitbolel*) with the Egyptians… because their strong racial sense and the ancient traditions of the free Semites…”81

Intercultural ties are also portrayed as perilous, whereas any kind of cultural dialogue is considered as an abandonment of the genuine essence of the people in favour of a fake and foreign culture. Such is the portrayal of the close ties between Jews and Non-Jews in Germany in the time of Jewish emancipation. The “court Jew”, one of the symbols of Jewish relations with the European polities, is depicted as a conflictual spirit of a marginalised Jew with a desire to rule. The teacher Zvi Lichtinstein even directs the reader to Feuchtwanger’s *Jew Süss* (published in 1925 in German and in Hebrew in 1929) in order to understand the nature of this wealthy, powerful Jewish community.82

The most vocal criticism of what was perceived as the exclusive racial propensities of the Jewish people can be found in Totah and Barghuthi’s account of the relations between the Israeli king Ahab and the Tyrian (Phoenician) princess Jezebel. Stating that this relationship survived despite the will of Ahab’s people and the religious prohibitions against merging with other peoples since “they are the chosen people of God according to their claim and the rest are gentile nations (*umam*) and this I swear is the culmination of

---

81 Simhoni, *Divre yeme yiśra’el*, 19.
82 Zvi Lichtinstein, *Sh’urim be-divre-yeme-yiśra’el*, vol. 2 (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1942), 150–153.
extreme racism” (*mutanāḥī al-ta‘ṣṣub al-jinsi*). However, the authors of *Tārīkh filasṭīn* also add that without their patriotic solidarity they would be extinct. This interpretation of the Jewish prohibition of intermarriage is a recurrent anti-Semitic theme, targeting the Jews as the ultimate other. Yet here, this criticism might also be interpreted as a manifesto set out by the colonial subject, stressing that it is not he who is backward and anti-liberal, but rather the ones who claim to speak in the language of modernity and tolerance, the Jews.

Finally, in contrast to the shared racial beginnings, the colonization of Canaan in history textbooks marked an ancient inception of the conflict over Palestine, a mirror image of the current reality. As such, it was stripped from its religious meaning, left God aside, and turned into a national conflict between the worthy and unworthy. It was repositioned as a story of success and a source of pride for one nation and an historic lesson of warning to the other.

**Conclusion**

I have shown how Jewish and Arab nationalisms translated and adopted a hegemonic Western racial discourse as a therapeutic emancipatory idea in a process initiated in the second half of the nineteenth century. As argued by Niranjana, translation “reinforces hegemonic versions of the colonised” yet “paradoxically, translation also provides a place in ‘history’ for the colonised.” Thus, this conceptual and intellectual assimilation in the Western racial discourse enabled a place in history for both national movements and therefore received ample attention in the history textbooks.

---

84 Ibid., 38.
85 Tejaswini Niranjana, “Translation.”
We have seen how these textbooks narrate “the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships”, fusing race, land and nation into a perfect unity. A unity that derives its exclusiveness from the advent of civilization, and is therefore undisputed and uncompromising.

If indeed “in Zionism, as in other projects of similar nature, the authority of history replaced the authority of god”, it is perhaps sensible to discuss a hierarchy of histories. As we have seen, the conflict over Palestine and over the rightful kushan of the land made ‘Semitic’ affinities between Arabs and Jews redundant and anecdotal. It is evident that Arab and Jewish educators had something else in mind. The next chapter examines the institutionalisation of these themes and their translation into a systematic pedagogical doctrine.

87 Gabriel Piterberg, The Returns of Zionism, 96.
Chapter Five: Teaching History

On June 30, 1924, Palestine celebrated its first matriculation exam under British rule, orchestrated by the PBHS. The exam’s supervisors appointed by the Education Department and its content illustrate what history teaching and valued historical knowledge meant during the mandate period. Behind the supervisors’ desk sat educators with contradictory ideologies. Rafiq al-Tamimi and David Tems, a high-school history teacher, were both ardent nationalists, Albert Haymson (1875-1954) was a Jewish government official, who although a Zionist did attempt to reconcile both nationalist movements in Palestine, and there was also Farrell, representing the official educational authority of the empire. The four of them, however, shared a great passion for history, and all but Farrell authored history books. Surprisingly enough, they had shared views on the legitimate historical knowledge one should have upon graduation. This historical canon, shared by British officials and Arab educators, whether in favour of the British civilisational project or against it, was the solid foundation that enabled the teaching of one undisputed, unquestioned history throughout the mandate.

This chapter will examine the pedagogical roots of the Department's curriculum and the historical evolution of the history syllabus as well as the similarities and differences between the Jewish and Arab history syllabi. Attention will be given to the pedagogy of history instruction and its contradictory trajectories. Finally, the chapter investigates the presence or absence of history textbooks in schools and their usage in the classroom.

By the time the British had occupied what was soon to become Palestine, the existing Ottoman, missionary, philanthropic and Hebrew schools of the Arab and Jewish community were already teaching modernised and secularised history syllabi. By the late nineteenth century, these schools offered a Westernised curriculum and a modern history of the world. The post-war decades under British rule intensified this process with the centralisation and
supervision of the education systems, the standardisation of the history syllabus, matriculation examinations and the proliferation of modern history textbooks written by local educators.

History was no longer narrated through themes or linked ideas, but as a linear stream of progress, a strange idea to the religious understanding of history, where humanity’s actions and wellbeing relies on the almighty. The traditional kuttab and heder (not in their modernised versions), were not interested in other histories apart from the religious narrative and did not seek to promote progress. On the contrary, they relied on tradition and the eternal rightful connection between God and men. A historical narrative was present, but it revolved around religious themes, a cycle rather than a chronology. Adopting a modern syllabus meant the abandonment of the traditional historiography in which God and not men play the central role. God remains an actor in later history textbooks, but he is no longer the protagonist of history.

While one should speak of history syllabi when discussing Hebrew and Arab education for the various trends, private, mission and government schools, the Western stencil is dominant in all of them. Overall, the history class revolves around great men and their wars with little attention to the non-elite population, leaving an anecdotal and marginal role for women. The history class revolved around chronology rather than themes or dilemmas; it was a given compulsory shopping list of knowledge, beginning with ancient times and concluding with modern times. Arab and Jewish historical evolution was studied primarily with respect to their connections, conflicts and influences to dominant European cultures and societies, Greek, Hellenic, Roman and later western European. Once Israel and Arabia ceased to be the centre of Jewish and Arab existence, their history was taught as a constant dialogue with the West, excluding all other histories. There was no mention of East Asia, Africa, or north American civilisations and their particular histories, revolutions, inventions, developments or even the influences of some of these civilisations on Islam or Judaism (apart from a marginal discussion about the modernisation of Japan, again in relation to the West). If mentioned, these did not
appear as active subjects but as a target for Western colonialism and imperialism that appears uncritically as one aspect of European hegemony over the entire world.

This generalising introduction is relevant since the following analysis takes these assumptions as self-evident in history instruction and therefore will not focus on them. Instead, I dedicate attention to the translation mechanism of these trends to Palestinian education and focus on its particularities within this discourse.

Archaeology of the Curriculum

Public education ‘has everywhere been Janus-faced, at once the very fount of enlightenment and liberty, and a vehicle for control and political socialisation’ reconciling freedom and order.¹ Durkheim, whose work influenced central educators and intellectuals in the Arab provinces during the late Ottoman period, stated that the role of public education in the nation state is embodied in the curriculum as the re-enforcement of social solidarity, norms, rules and the division of labour in society. The ideal school according to Durkheim “possesses everything it needs to awaken in the child the feeling of solidarity, of group life”. History instruction was central due to its capacity “to imbue children with the collective spirit… By making the history of their country come alive… we can at the same time make them live in close intimacy with the collective consciousness”²

The state, according to Durkheim works as a “social brain” whose functions are to create representation for the collectivity. Bourdieu added that these representations are of a class divided society rather than a cohesive harmonious body.³ In this respect, curricula are examined not as a mere table of contents for a certain semester, but as a reproduction of an ideological superstructure. In order to fully understand the “essence” of a curriculum, one should ask:

¹ Andy Green, Education and State, 179; For an historical survey on the establishment of state controlled education systems, Andy Green, “Education and State Formation in Europe Asia”.
³ Pierre Bourdieu, The State Nobility, xviii.
whose knowledge is it? Who selected it? Why is it organized this way, for this particular group? And finally, what is absent from this knowledge and why?4

The theoretical framework of the “hidden curricula” might help in answering these questions. This theory looks beyond the written and declarative objectives and focuses on the tacit and unstated norms, values, and beliefs transmitted through the curriculum and permits a more complex scrutiny. However, if indeed, “schools are considered as the places where educational ideologies are performed to maintain [the] existence of dominant cultures”, then the answers to these questions are simpler than we think, as the different tables of modern curricula bear a striking resemblance all over the world.5 Modern education meant a particular curriculum and division of courses based on a Western European model. Hebrew and late Ottoman Arab education were not exempt from this process, initiated in the mid-nineteenth century and culminating under British rule.6

The examination of curricula from the period suggests that as a taught course, history was never as important as language courses (Arabic or Hebrew), foreign languages, and most importantly the learning of mathematics (see tables on pages 348-351). Rawdat al-ma‘arif for example, introduced history and geography in the fourth and final elementary grade with one teaching hour while Quran, Arabic, English, arithmetic and geometry were taught 7, 8, 5, and 5 weekly hours respectively. The course continued up to the fifth year of secondary schooling and overall, after six years of study, a student would learn 29 weekly hours of history, while 37, 46 and 37 weekly hours in English, Arabic and maths and geometry respectively.7

The protocols of the 1920 Va‘ad education committee, a forum of great impact primarily for the centrality of its members and its historical moment, show a similar tendency. A

5 Damla Kentli Fulya, “Comparison of Hidden Curriculum Theories”.
consensus was reached by the committee, stressing that the new Hebrew school would be based on labour rather than verbal education, a “radical revolution”. One member, the educator Pesach Auerbach (1878-1945), stated that in order to promote the national revival, the entire curriculum should be based on and revolve around labour rather than reading books or adding extra teaching hours.8 The committee’s discussion on the teaching of history was third in its importance after covering handicrafts (melechet-yad), Bible and Talmud courses. The role of the history course in comparison with the other topics discussed could be seen in the curriculum presented by the committee (page 349).

It seems that academic knowledge of history was perceived as less important in the training of modern citizens than courses considered more “useful and practical” or conversely, courses that entailed a more direct cultural-national significance. The tables of different curricula also reflect the importance attributed to the teaching of the Quran/Bible and Arabic/Hebrew. As in Western education systems, both national movements considered instruction in the national language and the secularised reading of the Holy Scriptures to be crucial for the cultural and national revival, demonstrating an adjustment of a Western educational prototype to a particular national trajectory, a “local dialect of modernity”.9

In this curricular hierarchy, however, History was far from marginal; historical themes were recurrent in literature and religion classes, and dominant in Quran and Bible reading, language courses, school ceremonies and activities. In these courses, the historical narrative is omnipresent, echoing either in the background or in some cases setting the tone and framework. History was also a mandatory course in secondary education in both systems.

While discussing the Palestinian curriculum introduced by the British, Tibawi argues that it was a “hasty blending” of the Egyptian and pre-war Ottoman curriculum based on the French

---

8 Ya’ad ha-hinukh, *Tamtsit ha-protokolim shel yeshivot ha-ya’adah le-ibud tokhnit bishvil bate-ha-sefer ha-ʻamamiyim ha-kelalim sheba-arets* (Jerusalem: Y. Halpern, 1920), 16.
scheme, designed during the period of military rule and remaining similar under the civil administration. Tibawi’s depiction of the British administration remaining loyal for thirty years to a French curricular scheme as a “curious accident” is rather simplistic and misleading primarily due to the pedagogical and administrative evolution in the decades preceding the mandate.  

From the turn of the century “education emerged as a prominent item on the agenda of socio-political thought” gradually turning Egypt and the Ottoman Empire into an “educator state”. “Nationalist educator-intellectuals”, ascending in their intellectual pedagogical scope and political-administrative power, were the spearhead of this evolution. They were the ones to debate and shape their nations’ curricula and syllabi. For them, as stressed by Salmoni, Western education over-shadowed its deprived Eastern twin with its “life-orientedness, embrace of science and cultivation of disciplined freedom”. Yet their insistence on cultural authenticity and a scholarly borrowing rather than direct emulation shaped two distinctive education systems in Egypt and across the Empire.

The development of Egyptian public education was a result of various intertwined processes. Nevertheless, after a century of industrialisation, modernisation and a cultural nahdah, what determined the core features of this system were the push and pull negotiations with British imperialism. As in the case of Palestine, education was a politically charged issue. Egyptian education under Cromer went through a systematic process of Anglicanisation. Cromer and Dunlop sought to establish their system on strictly British personnel and elevated the teaching of English at the expense of French and Arabic. This policy triggered a nationalist discontent that led to a dramatic administrative shift in 1907 with the appointment of Zaghlul

10 Tibawi, Arab Education, 78–79.
as Minister of Education. Curricular changes were soon to follow making Arabic the only language of instruction excluding foreign languages (see table on page 350).\textsuperscript{13}

The “curious accident” here was that as articulated by Salmoni’s thorough research, the Egyptization of Egyptian education was conducted by Egyptian educators who were “more Anglo-American than anything else”, “positively enthralled by what they perceived as a peerless Anglo-American educational system”.\textsuperscript{14} This enthralment had an introspective effect. It prompted a pedagogical quest for parallels to the perceived strengths of the British-American systems. Egyptian pedagogues emphasised in particular the role of morals and the virtues of Islam in the curriculum to counter a spiritual emptiness in schools, a hurdle for national revival. History instruction was an essential tool in this pedagogy and as we have seen earlier, Egyptian history teaching in general and history textbooks in particular had great influence on education in Palestine.

The Ottoman state based its 1869 Regulation for Public Education on the French educational model. Since then and until the end of the empire, Ottoman education sought to find a sustainable equilibrium between modernity and tradition within the curriculum. This “balancing” was due to the growing pressure, influence and challenges posed by Western education from within and outside the physical borders of the empire. As embodied in a 1900 memorandum issued by the Special Imperial Council, “those graduating from the established schools possess the attainments of science and knowledge that are necessary according to the progress of modern civilization, that they obtain intellectual incisiveness and religious firmness, that they be faithful to the sublime sultanate and endowed with sound morals”.\textsuperscript{15}

The reformed Ottoman curricula, even under Hamidian rule, used the non-Muslim schools’ curriculum “as a source of emulation”. Striving to unite a diverse, multi-cultural, multi-ethnic

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., 195.
\textsuperscript{15} Cited in Fortna, “Education for the Empire,” 206–207, see also 17–18, and Emine O. Evered, The Politics of Late Ottoman Education, 27.
empire, late Ottoman education went beyond Islamic identity and unity. Its thrust was the promotion of an Ottoman citizenship and identity that could overcome ethno-nationalist tension, “a citizenship building program”.\(^\text{16}\) Education under the Young Turks stressed even further the importance of progress, modernity, freedom, equality, loyalty, obedience and sacrifice. The Balkan Wars marked the shift to a more ethnic nationalism and Turkishness and a growing suspicion towards the West and its values.\(^\text{17}\)

Some similarities do exist between pre and post 1908 syllabi. Both focused on classic Ottoman history with limited regard to European history or Western civilisation and expanded the scope on the empire’s decline and the age of reform.\(^\text{18}\) In both syllabi, the student encounters European history only in the fifth and fourth grades respectively with Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt. European general history is covered in the sixth year along with Islamic history and is marginal in comparison with Ottoman history.\(^\text{19}\) Judging by the 1904 history syllabus of the Rushidiya schools, it seems that the CUP curricularists continued the already existing approach, focusing on early Islamic history and classic Ottoman history, presenting the latter as the last leader of the Islamic nation and promoting a notion of community and brotherhood.\(^\text{20}\)

A detailed comparison between the Ottoman and Egyptian curricula with the Palestinian one reveals a noticeable affinity to the Egyptian with a few traces from the Ottoman one. Morality and civics, courses that were considered central in both Hamidian and post 1908 curricula are marginal in the Palestinian curriculum. The pre 1908 history syllabus and the post 1908 Ottoman syllabus resemble the Palestine history syllabus only in their focus on the rise of Islamic civilisation. Conversely, the primal focus on the Ottomans is switched in favour of the Arabs while Western civilisation moves from the margins into the centre of the Palestinian

---

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 785–786.
\(^{19}\) Ibid., 790, 792; Uğur Ünal, *II. Meşrutiyet öncesi Osmanlı Rüşdiyeleri*, 47–49, 84–86.
syllabus. Naturally, Turkish or Egyptian ethnicization of ancient history did not find their way into the Palestine syllabus. The importance of this trend was in its influence as a method and its translation to an Arab national history.

Moreover, although the Ottoman system was divided into two three-year cycles and the official Palestine syllabus discusses a six-seven year curriculum, the Egyptian division of cycles resembles the reality in Palestine, where the vast majority of village schools were of four grades similarly to the Egyptian system. The affinity of the fifth and sixth grades’ curriculum proves this point.

Indeed, graduates of the Egyptian education department dominated the early days of the Palestine Education Department. Captain Tadman, who headed the Department in its first two years, had served in the Egyptian Education Department. Tibawi’s comment about the learned experience from Egypt and India\(^21\) was particularly true in the case of Bowman, who worked under Dunlop, the British adviser to the Education Ministry (1894-1906) in Egypt. Bowman severely criticised the Dunlopian system that accepted no creativity and stressed strict obedience to regulations and sticking to the syllabus, leaving no room for local independent development, a system he depicted as “killing for the soul”\(^22\).

Another colonial educational experience is worth mentioning, that of Bowman and Farrell in Iraq. Iraq was Bowman’s baptism of fire as Director of Education within a fragile colonial framework. As we shall see in the following discussion about the history syllabus, Bowman and Farrell’s experience in Iraq was of great influence in the energies and vision brought to Palestine. Bowman’s superior in Iraq, the colonial administrator Colonel Arnold Wilson was a negative image of Dunlop. Bowman admired Wilson not only for his intellectual capacity, for his knowledge of dialects and incredible memory, but also for his ability to listen and answer

\(^{21}\) Tibawi, *Arab Education*, 78–79.
\(^{22}\) Bowman, *Middle-East Window*, 68.
the queries and pleas of the various sects.\textsuperscript{23} Bowman adopted Wilson’s approach, believing that the flexibility of the educational administration was the key for its sustainability. He adjusted the educational policy in general and the syllabus in particular according to religious and sectarian lines, making recurrent negotiations with local clerics for their approval and support.\textsuperscript{24}

As in Palestine, in Iraq Bowman made the curricular transition from Ottoman Turkish to Arabic believing that “Arabic to the Arab is as French to the Frenchman, a highly respected cult, its neglect in Turkish Arabia nothing less than notorious”, making its proper teaching the first objective of his Department.\textsuperscript{25} In Palestine, the curricular transition was initiated prior to Bowman’s arrival. It was clear for the new administrators that the new curriculum would be taught in Arabic rather than Turkish or most importantly, English and that the local Arab Muslim culture would dominate its syllabi, a reality that already existed in Egypt but differed in other British colonies. The fact that Tadman’s door was opened to prominent national educators such as Sakakini to discuss the pedagogic future of education in Palestine and the appointment of the latter as principal of the highest Arab school in the country is another case in point.\textsuperscript{26}

Thus, although based on the Egyptian model, the Iraqi curriculum slightly differed from it and it was only natural for Bowman to implement it in Palestine as well, as it demanded a similar educational transition. Indeed, the Iraqi curriculum bears clear resemblance to the Palestinian one in its division of hours and taught courses (see table).

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 171–174.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 194.
\textsuperscript{26} Moed, “Hinukh be-btsel.”
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Syllabus of the Primary Course of Study, Baghdad, 1919

Time-table of the Elementary Course of Study*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qur'an and Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Language</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Penmanship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry and Mensuration or Elm. Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Lessons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours per week</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notice that in this curriculum, similar to the Palestine village curriculum, English is not taught.

Time-table of the Primary Course of Study (Baghdad, 1919)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
<th>6th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qur'an and Religion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Language</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Penmanship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Lessons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Penmanship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours per week</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 Ibid.
1921 Syllabus for State Elementary Schools for Boys in Town and Villages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>2nd Year</th>
<th>3rd Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
<th>5th Year</th>
<th>6th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Language</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Study</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qur'an and Muhammedan Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or Bible and Christian Religion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total hours per week

30 30 35 35 35 35

Notes:
1. The Syllabus, as laid down for the full six years’ courses, is intended mainly for town schools. In village schools, the syllabus for the first two years may be followed; if a third- or fourth-years class exists, and no English is taught, the hours devoted to English, according to the syllabus, should be divided between Arabic (3 hours), Arithmetic (2 hours), Geography (1 hour), and Manual Work (2 Hours).
2. Physical training in each class should be carried out for 20 minutes or half an hour, at least 3 days a week, either before the first lesson, or during the midday interval, or either the last lesson. Two periods of 10 or 15 minutes each are better than longer period.
3. During the intervals between classes, boys should be encouraged to run about as much as possible, or to take in easily-organised games. Books should not be taken into the playground.

1921 Daily Time table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>a.m.</th>
<th>p.m.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st period</td>
<td>08:00 to 08:45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>08:50 to 09:35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>09:55 to 10:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>10:45 to 11:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interval</td>
<td>11:30 to 01:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>01:30 to 02:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>02:20 to 03:05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>03:15 to 04:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first and second years the school day consists of six periods only, and the pupils leave school at 3:05 p.m.

---

29 Department of Education, Syllabus for State Elementary Schools for Boys in Towns and Villages (Jerusalem, 1921), 6.
30 Ibid., 8.
### 1925 Department’s Syllabus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
<th>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Language, Arabic penmanship</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Study</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language, English penmanship, Translation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours per week</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: No distribution of lessons in the preparatory class is laid down as universally applicable. The subjects to be taught are Arabic, Arithmetic, History and Geography, Handwork, Religion. About half the lesson time should be given to Arabic. The methods used in the kindergarten classes of the girls’ schools should be followed so far as possible. Details are left to the discretion of district inspector headmasters and teachers.

### 1929 Syllabus for the Village Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Preparatory Class</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of Agriculture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Agriculture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The History Syllabus

After examining the pedagogical roots of the Department's curriculum, we shall now focus on the Department's history syllabus. The elementary school syllabi published by the Education Department presented a comprehensive curriculum, which included a schematic description of all taught courses (see tables on previous pages). Initially, the Department differentiated between two types of schools with a different curriculum. The town schools’ curriculum was a seven-year program, initiating with a preparatory class followed by a six elementary classes. The village schools’ curriculum included a four-year program, a preparatory class and three elementary classes. A syllabus for the village schools was only specified in the 1929 syllabus. Until then, the schools were supposed to adopt the town syllabus “as a standard at which to aim and applied so far as local conditions and the special circumstances of each school allow”.

The village schools’ rationale was a “rural bias”, laying emphasis on instruction in practical modern agriculture and avoiding topics that were considered impractical for the villagers such as English instruction. Bowman feared that mass immigration of the educated youth from the village to the cities seeking a clerical life, would leave behind a backward village and an overpopulated city. To prevent this, as Bowman told the Tarshiha School principal after the latter commented that village life was tiring, “once the village life was attractive, clean, healthy, good water supply, literary lectures, magic lantern… then the boys would not want to go away, and the teaching staff would find plenty of occupation and interest”.

The Department’s problematic vision of spreading literacy and progress through the village schools, its challenges and shortcomings were already discussed in Miller’s study, emphasising

---

1 This analysis corresponds with Harte’s, as his research was the only detailed and systematic analysis of the Palestine syllabus. Harte focused on the English publications of the 1921 and 1925 syllabus with no reference to the Arabic versions of the village syllabus published in 1929.
2 1925 Syllabus, 5.
3 Humphrey Bowman, “Rural Education in the near and Middle East”. See also, ibid, “Some Aspects of Rural Education in Palestine”, BM, 2/6/149, MECA.
4 Bowman’s diary, 11 March 1932, Bowman files, MECA.
the Department’s contradictory aims; establishing universal education while preserving social stratification. As we shall soon see, the analysis of the village history syllabus further questions the pedagogic seriousness with which the Department approached these schools.

To my knowledge, during the 1920s the Education Department published four full primary school syllabi, in 1921, 1925, 1927 and 1929. The 1921 town and village syllabus presented a general outline of the history and geography course, the 1925 and 1927 versions, which were practically identical, presented a detailed syllabus and the 1929 version for village schools offered a four-year program. As far as I have been able to ascertain, an Arabic version of the 1921 syllabus does not exist, nor does an English version of the 1929 village syllabus. During the 1940s a draft was written for a new history and geography syllabus for the sixth and seventh elementary classes, but its circulation remains unknown. The Supreme Muslim Council published its own primary school syllabus in 1942 that also resembles the 1925 text with minor adjustments. The detailed and thorough work done in 1925, a year of relative stability that enabled a project of this magnitude, was not repeated until the end of the mandate and the same text with slight changes was used until the end of the mandate. Perhaps it is not a coincidence that the only formal primary syllabus drafted by the Va‘ad during the mandate was published in 1923.

The only noticeable change took place after the appointment of De Bunsen as Director of Education. De Bunsen’s arrival marked a shift in the relation between the school and the administration. In the first issue of a new journal for government teachers, the new Director of Education highlighted the need for constant communication between the Department and the

---

6 The syllabus recommends using Breasted and Higham’s textbooks and includes a detailed history syllabus of Arab history for the sixth grade which includes “the Arab world in the twentieth century” and “the great war and the Arab world”, both not mentioned in the 1925 Department’s syllabus, Idārat taftīsh al-madāris al-islāmīyah, Manhaj al-ta‘līm al-ibtidā‘ī (Jerusalem: al-Majlis al-islāmī al-a‘lā, 1942).
teachers. This teachers’ journal, that probably did not reach its second issue, symbolises this short-lived shift.

De Bunsen understood that the old syllabus, representing the remains of the old order needed to be replaced and the writing of a new syllabus was initiated. In an open letter to all government teachers, the Director of Education requested the teachers’ opinions. De Bunsen’s approach to the syllabus was flexible, emphasising the teacher’s freedom to decide the exact course of his teaching (ijtiḥād), widening (tawassu‘) or reducing (taqlīl) its scope. De Bunsen was straightforward regarding the old syllabus: “I urge you not to follow it as the law is followed (kamā yutābiʻ al-qanūn), as you are free to benefit from your personal experience and observations”.

Unfortunately, De Bunsen’s vision of reform failed to materialise and a new syllabus was never published. For twenty-three years, the Education Department did not find the time, energy, will or resources to write a new version or even amendments to the old syllabus in a period of dramatic historical events and in a rapidly changing society. Bowman and Farrell, who headed the Department until the end of the mandate, were the ones who wrote or supervised its writing and perhaps did not see a reason for reform. The administration probably feared to wake a sleeping lion by opening in volatile times, profound educational dilemmas that had everything to do with nationalism and self-determination. For the British administration it was an educational catch 22. Pedagogically, the system could only develop with a constant development of the taught curriculum, yet the opening of the subject could have brought an inexplicable educational deadlock.

The identity of the syllabus authors remains unknown, although it is mentioned that “assisting and advice have been obtained from many persons mainly connected with schools

---

7 Bernard De Bunsen, “‘Nashrat’ idārat al-ma‘ārif,” 2 July 1947, 65.9/1-314, ISA.
outside the government sphere”, meaning primarily mission schools. Harte gives a list of a few possible contributors; members of the PBHS such as George Antonius and primarily Farrell who was highly invested in the teaching of history in secondary schools, served as an examiner in the matriculation exams and headed the History Sub-Committee of the PBHS. It might also be likely that Bowman, who read history at Oxford and decorated his memoirs and autobiography with historical insights and history book reports, also took part in its writing. Bowman criticised what he referred to as the “Dunlopian system” for its lack of creativity and its unbending devotion to the syllabus, leaving no room for local independent development. Bowman attempted to establish a department opposite to Dunlop’s and the incorporation of local educators for the writing of the syllabus seems probable. This spirit manifests in the preface to the 1925 syllabus: “It is not desired that the teacher’s liberty to choose and develop his own methods should be restricted by too close an adherence to minute instructions”.

In addition, the phrasing of the 1925 Arabic syllabus in contrast with 1921, implies that perhaps Khalil al-Sakakini and Is‘af al-Nashashibi, two consecutive inspectors of Arabic and authors of Arabic textbooks, contributed to the syllabus. Al-Nashashibi, the “gate keeper of the Arabic language in Palestine”, was known for his strict emphasis on correct grammar and the sanctification of classical Arabic, to the extent that his audience, even the highly educated, often failed to understand his language. Sakakini was known for his vision to modernise the language and his educational commitment to make it accessible and enjoyable to learn.

Al-Nashashibi’s approach echoes in the rigid language of the 1921 Arabic syllabus focusing on proper reading and correctness, “the main object of teaching the Arabic language… is to accustom the students to read, write and understand correct Arabic”. It contrasts with the

8 1921 Syllabus, 5.
10 Bowman, Middle-East Window, 68.
12 Najm, Dār, 41.
13 1921 Syllabus, 9, (emphasis added).
more flexible phrasing in 1925 stressing that “grammar is only a means to an end” and that “vulgarism and provincialism in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary must be carefully eradicated” in order to “interest the pupil in the classical and modern literature of the Arab nation”.

Sakakini was appointed in September 1926 to supervise Arabic instruction and mentions in his memoirs engaging in syllabi writing while his textbooks for the instruction of the language were widely used in government schools. His spirit is noticeable also in the objectives of the course “To make the pupil, both in speaking and writing, master of an easy and correct style which is both in accord with the tradition of the classical writers and adapted to the needs of modern life.”

In accordance with contemporary pedagogy, the history and geography syllabus emphasised the involvement of all senses in the educational process. The syllabus encouraged going out for short field trips and the use of a sand table, plasticine models and photos of personages, all meant to turn the instruction into an interactive experience. This methodology paralleled the British educational discourse of the time and could be seen in different publications. The 1921 syllabus goes as far as advising the use of The Times Illustrated or The Graphic magazines as to make the classes “more graphic”, resources that were abundant in Britain but in no way accessible to Arab teachers in Palestine.

The highly detailed history syllabus, receiving more attention than any other course, also indicates a “hegemonic instinct: a desire to ensure that students drew the right lessons from the subject by stipulating precisely what content should be covered in each year's study”. Harte contrasts the flexible history guidelines in the British educational system with the detailed one

---

14 1925 Syllabus, 8–9.
15 Sakakini started writing his famous textbooks for Arabic instruction, al-Jadīd, in 1924 while reading British and American pedagogic literature his son had sent him from America, Moed, “Ḥinukh be-btsel,” 184-185, 189, 194–195.
16 1925 Syllabus, 8.
17 Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 128.
18 Ibid., 115.
in Palestine. This comparison misses the dialectical nature of hegemony; the less detailed syllabus in British education implies a greater hegemonic presence and therefore requires less detail. While on the surface the British approach was open and flexible, the texts discussing the teaching of history seem to reflect a very clear, precise idea of what should be taught, and what should not, without administrative interference. This clarity, consensus and tradition in the teaching of the course are the manifestation of a functional ideological apparatus that was non-existent in Palestine. A ‘hands off’ administrative policy in relation to the syllabus was therefore impossible in British eyes. This detail reflects weakness rather than strength, anxiety rather than assurance.

The village syllabus of only four classes, offers the same syllabus as the seven-year syllabus with a limited civics class, excluding the detailed development of political institutions but including a survey of Palestine. Until 1929, the year of its publication, no specific syllabus was issued for the village schools although those represented the bulk of government education. This did not mean that the 1929 syllabus presented a novelty to the 1925 text. On the contrary, the history and geography syllabi are a cramped version of the latter, reproducing the same instructions with a summarised detail of the topics. If the 1925 syllabus seems overcrowded for its seven-year program, teaching it in four seems impossible. Moreover, the Department’s attempt to establish a comprehensive village curriculum, compressing seven years into four is unclear. The village syllabus was written with complete disregard to students who wished to continue their studies in the town schools, and rather than presenting a pedagogical adjustment to the village, it seems of limited relevance to the village teacher.

The history course for schools in urban areas is divided to two three-year cycles and a final year. In the first two years, “the teacher will confine himself mainly to Arab personages… In the three years together, an introduction is given to both general Arab history and the history of Palestine with a few necessary references to other nations and personages principally those
who are of importance in Arab and local history”. The second cycle focuses on regional geography “and a connected general history of the world from the earliest times to the present” and “stress is laid upon the geography and history of Arab countries”. In the third year, the history of ancient civilisations is taught “in relation to Palestine” and the fourth year focuses on the history of the Arabs “from the ‘Age of Ignorance’ (inclusive) to the present day”. The fifth year focuses on medieval and modern Europe and the final year is dedicated to the revision of both courses and a civics class covering the development of political institutions primarily in the Western world (ancient Greece to Western Europe) and an outline of institutions in Palestine.

The history and geography syllabi reflect an historical period of transition, an unclear educational ethos, and therefore the reproduction of conceptual inconsistencies and contradictions. For example, the 1925 history and geography syllabus mentions the word Palestine 24 times. The second cycle of the history course is “with special relation to Palestine” and specific events and personages are mentioned in the context of local history, students are asked to draw maps of Palestine and in the civics class, Palestine is studied as an administrative unit. Harte suggests that through the syllabus, the British were attempting to create a sense of a separate Palestinian identity and indeed as mentioned, Palestine is used as a recurrent source of reference.

Yet, if this was one of the objectives of the syllabus, due to British cautiousness or ambiguity Palestine seems as a technical, bureaucratic unit and in some cases a random junction of important historical events. Palestine as a shared unifying notion, a unit of particular historicity does not exist in the syllabus and is attached to Syria five times in the syllabus. In the concluding year under “History of Syria and Palestine” a “revision in detail of the history

19 1925 Syllabus, 28.
20 Ibid., 29.
21 Ibid., 37–44.
of Palestine and Syria” is suggested, stressing the importance of bilad al-sham rather than Palestine, a concept and vision that the British did all they could to allow to sink into oblivion. The Department’s attempt to compromise between the nationalists’ own preference for inclusion of Palestine in Syria and the mandate’s aim to turn Palestine into a valid territorial unit, produced within the syllabus an erasure of both territorialities that neither intended.

Greater Syria, rather than Palestine remained a source of geographic-historical reference and territoriality until the end of the mandate in history textbooks as well. This was explicitly stressed by Barghuthi and Totah: “Palestine was, and still is, a part of Syria, and cannot be separated by a natural border and therefore by no racial (jinsī) or historical elements. That is why historians did not give it independent names but called it after the people and tribes that lived in it”.

The different syllabi reflect a strong preference towards British and English history over other European countries. The 1921 syllabus, fourth year geography advises a “regional geography of Europe with special reference to the British isles and the colonies”. The British personages carefully chosen for the third and fourth year syllabus, second only to the Arabs in scope, are the heralds of discoveries (Drake), democracy (Edward I and Cromwell), modernity and progress (Watt and Stephenson) and freedom (William Wilberforce, and Gordon). Moreover, in the fourth year, the British occupation clearly marks the recovery of Egypt after years of volatility. The syllabus illustrates this with the chronology of events: The Khedive Isma’il, ‘Urabi, the Mahdi in the Sudan, the revival of prosperity in Egypt, thus justifying British imperial rule in Palestine as well.

---

22 This is explicit in the title Sabbagh chose for his book and its content, treating Greater Syria as the relevant historical unit, al-Sabbagh, al-Madaniyat; See also the survey about the Nahda in Syria in, ‘Anabtawi and Ghunaym, al-Mujmal, 142–144.
23 Al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filasṭīn, 3.
Bowman failed to see this recurrent bias towards the British in the history and geography and in the English course as well. He insisted in his testimony before the Royal Commission that “[w]e [the British] do not want to thrust down colonial ideas too much in Mandated territory” and noted that no British symbols like portraits of the king were hung in class.24 The Director of Education was keen to avoid the wrongdoings of his imperial predecessors but succeeded in doing so only symbolically. The British national symbols were removed but the colonial thrust still dominated the curriculum.

The syllabus furthers this appeasing phrasing towards British rule fostering a notion of citizenship and partnership in the sixth year civics course, “the study of history should give the boy a sense of the responsibility of citizenship and his duty to his country and his fellow-men”.25 The 1925 syllabus states that the instruction of history “will be effected by the instruction of pupils in the privileges and duties of good citizens”. This wording attempted to blur the absence of political rights of these citizens. The autocratic nature of the mandate was also concealed, attempting to highlight the same notion of partnership with the reference of the Executive and Advisory Council in the civics course (in the 1929 syllabus only an Advisory Council was mentioned). This representation of practically non-existent or feeble forums of no influence, seconded in the syllabus only to the High Commissioner in the administrative hierarchy of Palestine, presented a false notion of a Palestinian quasi-democracy.

Notions of progress and modernity are prominent in the syllabus. The sixth year course focuses on a “[b]rief outline of the rise and progress of European states…; the opening up of the world. Kinds of Government. The duties and privileges of a good citizen”.26 The 1925 syllabus concludes that “[t]he aim of the teacher must now be to collect certain scattered threads and weave them together so that the pupil may leave the elementary stage of education with an

24 Bowman’s testimony before the Royal Commission 27 November, 1936, Private/ Secret Meeting, BM 2/2/97/3, MECA
25 1921 Syllabus, 16.
26 Ibid., 19.
orderly idea of (a) the processes and conditions which have evolved the modern state and modern society, (b) the problems which confront that society, (c) the duties of a citizen towards his country in modern conditions (1925 Syllabus)”. 27

This orderly idea materialised in the syllabus as historic lessons and a global perspective on Western societies and states throughout the centuries. However, the syllabus turns progress and modernity into an ultimate other for the Arab student and Arabness. The civilizational survey of the civics course starts with the title “Primitive man and the Family”, followed by “The Qabila among the Arabs. The duties of the Shaikh. The clan. The village community as social unity in an agricultural population”. All current features of Arab society in the syllabus mark the most basic modes of human development, second only to hunters and nomads.

Concluding the syllabus in this manner embodies the educational rationale behind the colonial civilizing mission. The Arab’s civilizational stage, stuck between hunters and nomads on the one hand and the Greeks and Romans on the other, can only strive to climb up the ladder of progress, culminating in the sovereign Western states. The specific focus on Palestine, its administration and the obligations of its citizens is marginalised and kept to the end of an overly compressed syllabus. In the problematic political state of British administration, good citizenship was not inculcated through stressing the relevance of loyalty to the benevolent government and an omnipresent omnipotent state, but by foreign sources of inspiration. It was clear that the authors wished to keep a safe distance from a profound discussion on the mandate administration. Instead, Roman, American and French governments were set as abstract role models.

The only attempt to inculcate an abstract idea of a particular historical duration and a sense of shared culture and history is in relation to Arab history. The word umma (nation) appears only once in the syllabus in the second class. The English version states as follows: “The

27 1925 Syllabus, 44.
teacher’s aim as before is to interest the pupils in the heroes of his [sic] own national story and in the great personages who have moulded the history of the world… [and] give the pupil a clear idea of sequence and development… the first of this aims is the more important”. The Arabic version is more explicit: “the teacher’s maximal aim (al-ghāyah al-quṣwá)… is to make the heroes of his students’ nation loved by them (ān yuḥabbеб al-ābṭāl fī ummat ʿullābuḥ ilayhim)... making it [history] fascinating (al-tashwīq), and the pupil fond if it, is more important in this class”.

Indeed, Arab and Islamic history are the most detailed in the syllabus. From over 130 personages mentioned in the syllabus, over 70 are Arab or Islamic historical personages and four years out of the seven-year curriculum revolve around Arab and Islamic history. Attention is given to the ancient Eastern empires with specific attention to the “coming of the Semites”, the ancestors of the Arabs. In the second-year syllabus, the list of Arab heroes begins with Zenobia, Sayf Ibn Dhi Yazan and Mundhir III, and in the fourth class Arab pre-Islamic kingdoms are discussed prior to the rise of Islam. All in adherence to the dominant discourse of Arab nationalism with its inception in the ancient Semitic empires proceeding with the Arab kingdoms and culminating with the arrival of Islam.

While reading the different syllabi published by the Department one cannot but wonder why British education was so severely criticised by different scholars. Al-Haj argues that the “policy was based on the reinforcements of traditional values, which is obvious from the curriculum of the public government schools where religious education, e.g., was emphasized vigorously in order to undermine national education” and that it deprived the Arabs of any national content and the teaching of current history. Jabareen stresses that the education system produced “politically blind individuals who were totally alienated from their own

---

29 See Zaydan’s pioneering work, Zaydan, al-ʿArab qabla al-islām.
30 Majid Al-Haj, Education, Empowerment and Control, 93.
heritage, culture, and natural political concerns”. Contemporary articles in the newspapers also criticised the government system for depriving the Arab youth of their heritage and history.

Harte suggests in contrast that these scholars were not aware of the content of the syllabi and its emphasis on Arab and Islamic culture. Harte strengthens his argument with a comparison between the government’s syllabus and that of the Najah National College in Nablus and shows the striking similarities with one of the centres of Arab nationalism in mandate Palestine. Finally, Harte concludes, “Palestinian historical identity can therefore be more usefully imagined as developing in constructive dialogue with, rather than in binary opposition to, the Department's syllabus”. Moreover, unlike the colonial policy in India, where British anxiety about political unrest triggered an intimate supervision of history textbooks prohibiting any historical reference to Indian unity or inclusive Indian identity, notions of Arabness were dominant in the Palestine curriculum.

A few explanations could help settle this conundrum of contradictions between the official curriculum and the way it was perceived by contemporaries and later scholars. First, the scrutiny of an official government publication tells only the story of the document itself. We have no knowledge of its distribution or enforcement by the Department. However, interviewees who did have a memory of the history class usually mentioned topics that corresponded with the syllabus, particularly ancient civilisations and classic Arab history. So if Arab history and culture were widely covered in school, could it still be that Palestinian education deprived the students of their heritage and culture?

31 Al-Haj, Education, Empowerment and Control, 47; Jabareen, “The Palestinian Education System”; Miller, Government and Society, 93.
32 Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 146.
Perhaps Totah’s testimony before the Royal Commission of Enquiry could help define the missing link. Totah accused the British of establishing an “education so colourless as to make it harmless... They [Palestinian Arabs] feel Arab culture is neglected. The Arabs of Palestine feel there is no such aim behind their education”.

34 What did Totah mean by colourless and harmless?

A harmless syllabus would reflect a pedagogical restricting awareness to periods and topics that did not contest the legitimacy and good intentions of the mandate and British rule in Palestine. A comparison with two Iraqi syllabi could help in delineating educational harmlessness. Harte, for example, shows the overlapping in selected personages in Arab history based on Simon’s short survey of the Iraqi 1940 history syllabus. This overlapping between Husri’s nationalist syllabus and that of the Department proves in his view the extensive engagement of the Palestine syllabus with Arab history and culture. What is missing is the analysis of the names omitted from the Palestine syllabus. Five personages out of the seven omitted names were modern Arab leaders and three were symbols of Arab nationalism and liberators: ‘Umar al-Mukhtār, King Husayn bin ‘Ali and Faysal. This was contrasted in the Palestine syllabus, where there was no mention of persons of such contemporary symbolic magnitude. Furthermore, the syllabus fails to mention, for example, the Arab revolt during the Great War. The mentioning of these personages could have been considered harmful and they were thus omitted, with no relevant contemporary figure being mentioned.

If comparing a ‘colonialist’ syllabus with that of a department that epitomised national Arab education seems unfair, juxtaposing the Palestine syllabus with the one crafted by Bowman as Director of Education in Iraq in 1919 would even strengthen the argument. This syllabus, crafted for a new administrative entity like Palestine, succeeds in moulding an

historical continuity of a glorified history. The syllabus begins with “the birth of civilisation in ‘Iraq” and “stories of the great men of pre-Muhammadan ‘Iraq”, through the rise of Islam when “Baghdad becomes the centre of the Sciences, Arts and Crafts of the world”, and concludes with an optimistic note stressing that through “Basrah, a great port and gate to Eastern trade, Iraq may again become one of the world’s greatest granaries”.37 No such superlatives can be found in the Palestine syllabus although such examples could be easily be found in its history.

Bowman’s departure from Iraq to Palestine occurred in the midst of the 1920 insurrection. In his memoirs, he mentions that his entire work "went by the board" and all the teachers and students "went adrift" with most schools closed, some in ruins and out of his control.38 This personal turmoil, occurring a little over a year after the publication of his syllabus, paralleled by the proximity of an Egyptian revolution, must have influenced his educational terminology as a colonial administrator.39 Thus, superlatives and optimism gave way to colonial circumspection.

Farrell, like Bowman was also a graduate of the Iraqi colonial experience. Depicted as “imperialist” and “Dunlopian” by Tibawi, Farrell’s bitter experiences in Iraq were of constant collisions with senior Arab officials. Saiyid Hibat al-Din al-Shahristani, the Minister of Education, led the Arabisation of the Ministry of Education personnel and the limiting of missionary education in Mosul, a policy adamantly opposed by Farrell. According to one source, al-Shahristani demanded Farrell’s removal from the ministry and according to another Farrell finally resigned after a dispute he had with Husri over the nature of the Iraqi school

---

38 In a farewell letter to Colonel Wilson, Bowman seems less pessimistic, assuring Wilson of the Department personnel’s loyalty during the disturbances and limited participation of government employees in the “political intrigue”. Bowman reported that most government schools were “free of all taint of this kind”, Bowman to the Colonel A. T. Wilson Acting Civil Commissioner in Mesopotamia, Baghdad, 12 August 1920, BM 1/4/134-135, MECA.
system. Husri’s refusal to work under the direct dictates of a British educational model considered unfit for Iraq’s historical conditions led to a collision with Farrell’s solutions to “the moral degeneration of the Iraqi people”. Farrell’s vision of a British boarding school system with emphasis on “character building via cold showers” were blocked by one of the greatest and most vocal Arab pedagogues of the time, a herald of nationalist independent Arab education. If indeed Farrell contributed to the writing of the syllabus, the British bias and the absence of historical coherence could be attributed to his educational ethos, a negative image of Husri’s.

Still, this colonial circumspection did not necessarily mean an awareness of the shortcomings of the syllabus. Bowman saw no conspicuous flaws in the Palestine syllabus. On the contrary, after the long strike that initiated the Great Arab Revolt, Bowman testified that his Arab personnel had no problems with its implementation; it was effective and quite “smooth”. Miss Helen Ridler, the principal of the Women’s Training College and inspector of girls’ schools in Palestine, was also pleased with her institution’s engagement with Arab culture, giving “great importance to the teaching of general history and the geography of the world, and especially the history of the Arab nation and its geography”. Stressing that “teaching these topics in a sensible manner” is the best way to eliminate national and religious disputes in the area. Contrary to Tibawi’s assessment that the British were “teaching the right things, to the wrong people”, Bowman and Ridler believed that they were teaching an exact and relevant syllabus for the Palestinian student.

41 Magnus T. Bernhardsson, Reclaiming a Plundered Past, 200; Reeva S. Simon, Iraq Between, 76–77.
42 Bowman’s testimony before the Royal Commission, 27 November 1936, Bowman’s files, BM 2/2/27, MECA.
43 Majallat al-kullīyah al-‘arabīyah 1, vol. 8, 15 December 1927, 39.
44 Tibawi, Arab Education, 88–89.
Contrasting the Department’s syllabus with that of the Va’ad helps clarify Totah’s statement about colourless education. For Totah, Hebrew education was the source of reference as “Jewish education has an aim. It is not colourless. Its aim is to establish Zionism, to establish a national home, to revive Hebrew culture.”

A Colourful History, the Hebrew History Syllabus

Let us follow Totah’s terminology and examine the different colours in the Hebrew syllabus. First, a brief historical background about the evolution of the Hebrew syllabus is needed. According to Azaryahu, the first complete Hebrew curriculum in Palestine was authored by Simhah Wilkomitch, (1871-1958) who headed the Rosh-Pina school. Wilkomitch authored the syllabus in 1903 after a training period in Switzerland and it focused on agriculture and labour. The Teachers’ Union (est. 1903) placed Hebrew education for the inculcation of the “Israeli spirit” and physical training, as its prime goals. In 1904, the Union presented an eighth year curriculum, the first to be widespread in settlement schools. The curriculum gave history instruction ample attention, dividing between general and Jewish history, meaning that it focused on two separate historical entities.

In 1907, The Teachers’ Union presented another curriculum based on the work of three teachers from the Jaffa Girls’ School, Joseph Azaryahu (1873-1945), Yehiel Yehieli (1866-1937) and Mordekhay Ezrahi (1862-1951). The three were of Eastern-European descent and active members in the reformed heder, ha-Heder ha-metukan. This “modern school in every parameter” initiated in the late 1890s, introduced the teaching of Hebrew in Hebrew, was the

45 Miller, Government and Society, 96.
46 On Wilkomich’s contribution to Hebrew education see, Haramati, ha-Morim ha-halutsim, 94–104.
47 Azaryahu, Ha-hinukh, 34–35; Agudat ha-morim, an early version of the Teachers’ Union made an attempt to author a general curriculum for Hebrew schools in Palestine in 1895 but the program was never implemented in schools, Reichel, “Ben "kartanut"," 70–71.
first to teach the Bible in Hebrew without the mediation of Russian or Yiddish, and focused on a modernised teaching of Jewish national history. 50 According to Goldstein, Hebrew education in Palestine was the successor of these first attempts to establish a national education in the Pale of Settlement of Tsarist Russia. 51

The 1907 curriculum was later authorised by the Teachers’ Union and Azaryahu considered its publication an historical moment, although it was not officially implemented in schools. 52 The syllabus was the first to introduce the integration of general history into national Jewish history with the former dependant upon and completing the latter. This curriculum became the general 8 year program for schools all over the country and served as the model for the 1923 syllabus (table on page 350). 53

The imprint of the Jaffa Girls’ School, one of the central hubs of early Hebrew education, was recognisable in the 1907 program. 54 The school’s 1911 program offers a six-year curriculum with some modifications from the 1907 curriculum, such as the omission of Arabic instruction. The teaching of history began in the second grade as part of Bible instruction and as an independent course in the fourth grade. The history course is presented as a table, with Jewish history on the right, representing the focus of the course, and related historical events in general history on the left. Conceptually, this was an early version of the dominant history instruction in Hebrew education. This methodology, its outline of topics and personages served as the basis for history instruction throughout the mandate period. 55

50 These schools represented only a small fragment of Jewish education that at the time was still almost entirely operating along traditional lines, Elboim-Dror, ha-Ḥinukh, 1:35–39; On the evolution of teaching Hebrew in Hebrew and its importance see, Shlomo Haramati, Meḥankhim yehudim, 17–38.
51 Joseph Goldstein, “Ha-ḥeder ha-metuḳan”.
52 Elboim-Dror, ha-Ḥinukh, 1:222.
53 Azaryahu, Ha-ḥinukh, 39–40, 44; (Joseph) Ozrakovsky, (Mordechai) Krishevsky, (Yehiel) Yehieli, ha-Tsa‘ah le-tokhenit ha-limudim tarsa‘z, 1906–1907, 8.103/3, Education Archive, Tel-Aviv University.
54 Elboim-Dror, ha-Ḥinukh, 1:152, 219.
55 Tokhnit ha-limudim shel bet-ḥa-sefer ha-‘ironi le-vanot be-Yafo : Mosad ḥoveve-Tsiyon (Jaffa: Defus A. Atin, 1911).
During the mandate, each education trend published its own primary school syllabus. The Labour Trend published its full syllabus only in 1937 and the Mizrahi published its full comprehensive syllabus in 1932. In addition, private schools often worked according to their own syllabus. The General Trend had published its full and only primary school syllabus in 1923 and the same one was used until the end of the mandate period.

Each trend had its own historical consciousness. The Labour Trend, adherent to the Marxist ideology, proclaimed that “educators should always emphasise the economic aspects and social relations in each historical period”. The Mizrahi had a religious bias: “the teaching of our inception (toladah) will bring the student to the recognition (hakarah) of the unique role of the divine providence in the course of history… The long existence of our small and poor people within various great peoples… that despite their political and cultural might have perished determines the acknowledgment of Torat Israel’s strength and the special providence accompanying us. This acknowledgment would tie the student with a stern bond to the people of Israel and the land of Israel…”

These differences between the trends were considered unbridgeable. The Labour Trend educators and political leadership accused the General Trend of persecution and continuous attempts to abolish proletarian ideology and a socialist educational ethos. Rabbi Meir Berlin, a leader of the Mizrahi trend blamed the general trend for “bringing the understanding to the hearts of the children that there is nothing between true and false prophets but different social views… while we say that schools that educate in this spirit had better burn. An abyss lies between our views of the Mizrahi and the General trend. Religion is not a course… the schools of the left and the Generals are utterly unacceptable”.

56 Kavim (Tel-Aviv: ha-Histadrut ha-kelalit shel ha-ʻovdim ha-ʻivrim be-erets-yiśraʻel, ha-merkaz le-ḥinukh, 1937), 11.
57 Tokhnit ha-limudim ha-nehuga be-bate ha-sefer shel ha-Mizraḥi- (Jerusalem: Mahleket ha-Ḥinukh shel ha-sokhnut ha-yehudit le-erets yišraʻel, 1932), 20.
59 Ha-Tzofe, 24 April 1940.
Irreconcilable as they were, the history syllabus of all three trends worked under a similar historical framework. Different emphasis on socialist Zionism in the Labour trend or the focus on central Rabbis in the Mizrahi did not contest the paradigmatic overview of the nation’s history as a distinctive essence beginning with the Bible and culminating with Zionism. Thus, the influence of the Va’ad’s history syllabus, emanating from its earliest publication and its hegemonic role in the Yishuv is recognisable in all syllabi. Therefore, the following analysis shall focus on the General Trend, the largest and most dominant of the three trends.

The methodology of the Va’ad’s history course was very similar to the Government syllabus and extremely detailed as well. It shared its pedagogical approach, advised teachers to use similar resources, to work in accordance with the student’s cognitive abilities and emphasised the use of telling history as a story for simplification while highlighting the role of important personages. From a bird’s eye view, the Arab and Hebrew systems shared a few central bodies of knowledge. As in the government syllabus, excluding the national history, the focus was only on Western history with the emphasis on the ancient Eastern civilisations followed by the Greek and Roman Empires while African, South-American or Asian history was taught only in relation to discoveries or imperialism. Another affinity is the reliance on an ethnohistory of a golden age, a concept Smith attributes to diaspora nationalisms such as the Greeks, Armenians and Jews whose national histories were “indebted to pre-modern cultural resources, or were even perhaps prefigured by pre-modern ethnic homeland memories and attachments”. 60 Smith suggests that these “ages of creativity and glory, of meaning to the collectivity in its everyday existence, and providing a canon of excellence and a heroic model for emulation… were to prove crucial for the new secular religion of nationalism with its cult of the authentic and pure”. 61

60 Anthony D. Smith, “Diasporas and Homelands”, 3.
61 Ibid., 8; see also, Anthony D. Smith, Myths and Memories, 65–66.
If a pre-modern ethnic homeland becomes an abstract concept rather than a place, Arab nationalism has its own exile, one that began with the demise of Arab dominance in the Abbasid Caliphate and the loss of national vitality. For centuries, they were exiled from their homeland, as masters of their own destiny. Arab history in the syllabus corresponds with the notions of black and golden ages. For example, the list of Arab personages in the 1925 second grade syllabus jumps from Saladin to Muhammad ‘Ali, creating an historic void of centuries. Similarly, the Hebrew syllabus dedicates six years of study to the history of Jewish existence in Eretz-Israel that ended in 132 AD and two years for the remaining historical narrative (tanach to palmaḥ). The 1800 years of exile, offer only a history of national fragmentation and passiveness. In contrast to their history in Eretz-Israel, Jews are no longer the protagonists but living on the margins of historical development, examined through their relation to the majority or ruling class. For example, in the eighth year syllabus:

“Jews in Italy: the Renaissance in Italy and the status of the Jews in the country; inventions and discoveries and their outcomes, Abrabanel and the exiles of Spain in Italy. Or, Jews in Germany: the reformation in Germany; Reuchlin and Luther and their attitude towards the Jews.”

After describing the similarities, let us now focus on the colours, the ones that differentiate the Department and Hebrew syllabi. Perhaps the most striking and important difference relates to the authors of the syllabus and the presence rather than the absence or vagueness of a speaker. In the Hebrew text, there is no conundrum and no reason for a conflict of interests with the government. Leading Jewish educators authored the program and Va‘ad ha-Ḥinukh later

62 See the adoption of the decline and reform nomenclature by Arab intellectuals in, Sheehi, Foundations of Modern Arab Identity.
63 Tokhnit bate ha-sefer ha-‘amamiyim ha-‘ironiyim (Jerusalem: Maḥleḥet ha-ḥinukh shel ha-hanhalah ha-tsiyonit be-erets yišra‘el, 1923), 58.
approved it for circulation. The syllabus is written in the first person, surveying “the history of our people” ('amenu) and the course is meant to “revive in the hearts of the student a personal participation in the destiny of our people” (goral 'amenu) and make them “cherish the sanctities of the nation, the true and the sublime”.

As in the government syllabus, national history takes the lion’s share. However, the framing of the Jews as a common essence, “our people” ('amenu), is drawn in warm colours in contrast with the anthropological or dry academic phrasing discussed earlier, mentioning “the students’ nation”, rather than our nation. In civics instruction, part of the geography or moledet course, the Yishuv’s agency is highlighted as “our national institutions” are discussed in the third grade and “the organisation of the Hebrew Yishuv, the Va’ad ha-leumi… elections…” are given the same scope and focus as the mandate government. The dominant presence of a speaker injects a vivid motion into the historical narrative.

The post-war colonial setting is of less importance for the Hebrew syllabus. The entire Zionist historiography was based on the inextricable unity between the Jewish people and Eretz Israel. The inconsistencies in the history syllabus derived from the random post-war borders did not exist in the Zionist case. The land of Israel is an idea, an essence in Zionism; Palestine did not yet materialise as such for the Palestinian Arab.

While the history course only starts in the sixth grade, the historical context is recurrent in the Moledet (homeland) course (parallel to the observation course). During Moledet class, tales, legends and personages are to be told in relation to the close surroundings of the

---

64 All three trends were autonomous in authoring their syllabus. The Labour trend syllabus was authored by an elected Pedagogic Committee, Dror, “Irgun ‘ovdey zerem ha-‘ovdim”; Rabbi Jacob Berman and Dr. Jacob Shalom Engel, two senior inspectors of the trend authored the syllabus, tokhni 'amamiyim ha-'ironiyim, 9, 41 (emphasis added).
65 Ibid., 22.
66 Ibid., 57.
students. The Bible course began in the third year and represented 31 weekly hours, second only to the Hebrew course, as “the focus should be on our teachings, for they are the soul of the people, the spirit that influenced its soul through all generations”. The history of ancient Eastern empires was taught as part of the Bible class, corresponding with the biblical text and grounded in its narrative. Ancient Egypt, Assyria, Babylon and Tyre, for example, were part of the fifth year Bible syllabus and learned while reading the Book of Kings.

In Hebrew education, Bible instruction embodied the organic connection between people and land. The Bible, the “charter” for Jewish colonisation of Palestine in the words of A. D. Gordon and “our mandate for Palestine” in the words of Ben Gurion, was employed as “the textbook for national history”.

The formal history course starts with the first exile to Babylon, still based on the biblical texts (Books of Ezra and Nehemiah) and ends with the Zionist movement and the Balfour declaration illustrating an historical watershed in Jewish existence where the circle is complete as the people return to their homeland. The first year of the history course is dedicated to Jewish life in Palestine from the return to Zion until Bar-Kochva and the two final years are meant to cover more than 1800 years of world history. Jewish history in the diaspora starts only in the second year of the course, saturated with the suffering (tela’ot), expulsions (gerush) and the persecutions (redifot) of the Jews. Events such as the spread of Christianity, the rise of Islam or the crusades are set as stage decoration for Jewish history and receive limited attention. The seventh-year syllabus for example covers the following chapters:

The Jews in Eretz-Israel after the destruction of Betar (140 A.D.)

The Spread of Christianity

The Jews in Babylon

---

68 Ibid., 10.
69 Ya’ad ha-hinukh, Tamtsit ha-protokolim, 18.
70 Tokhnit bate ha-sefer ha-’amamiyim ha-’ironiyim, 28.
The Arabs

The Jews in the Muslim East

The Jews in Spain

The Jews in other European Countries

The Crusades and their causes

The protocols of the 1920 Committee reveal the poor and marginal value attributed to the teaching of general history by the leading educationalists of the time. The advocates for the virtues of general history articulated its importance in broadening the student’s horizons, and its capacity to strengthen the ties with the Jewish communities by learning the histories of their countries. Osrakovski, the chair of the committee, argued that Jewish history is “organically tied” to the history of other peoples for its dependence on them, and therefore could not be understood without the latter. Others called for the removal of general history from the curriculum, as bearing no educational value and being burdensome for students and teachers alike. Finally, General history was rejected as a taught course in primary education. The committee decided with a sweeping majority of 12 vs. 3, that general history would not receive weekly teaching hours and should be taught only in relation with Jewish history, a decision that materialised in the 1923 syllabus.\(^\text{72}\)

Ben-Zion Dinburg later formulated and structured this approach. When Dr. Dinburg joined the teaching staff of the Jerusalem Hebrew Teachers’ Training College in 1922, he cancelled the separation between the general and national history course. Dinburg believed that the study of two separate histories could fracture the marrow of Jewish history, “consolidated by a homogenous unity which engulfs all periods and all places....” (Dinburg, 1935).\(^\text{73}\) Dinburg made this connection in order to separate the sheep from the goats: “The general history that

---

\(^{72}\) Va’ad ha-ḥinukh, Tantsit ha-protokolim, 22–24.

\(^{73}\) Uri Ram, “Zionist Historiography.”
should be taught in my view is the history of the cultural, material, social and spiritual. Those
can be organically linked with the history of [the people of] Israel and the history of the land
of Israel… in the history of Israel, the individual, wherever he may be, is important when he
-teaches us about the [Jewish] society, and if he is nothing but an individual, he has no historical
significance whatsoever… even as an individual”. 74

General history in this case, serves as background, important as it may be, and worthwhile
reading only when it bears a collective lesson. Dinburg believed that while both could be taught
simultaneously, as a collective the Jews can only learn from one.

What Almog calls cultural ethnocentrism in relation to Hebrew education was dominant in
the reading material covered in the Hebrew class that included the literature course. The
recommended reading list included 45 books, of which only four were translated from foreign
languages. 75 The reading list reflected the modern trends in Hebrew and Yiddish literature of
the time and most authors were still alive at the time. It was ethnocentric, but at the same time
alive and illustrative of an active cultural-intellectual movement. Going back to the
Department’s colourless curriculum, the predominance of classical and traditional Arabic
literature in the Arabic course overlooking the vibrant flourishing literary scene that challenged
the classical understanding of Arabic added to its greyness and dullness.

The bias towards British history does not exist in the Hebrew syllabus, another proof of
the system’s independence. The Hebrew student started his English course in the fifth grade
while the Arab started it in the third. Overall, the urban Arab student reached 34 weekly hours
of English instruction in comparison to 16 in the Hebrew system. The Yishuv’s fear of
Anglicanisation of its youth meant a limited investment in teaching the language and little
engagement with British culture. 76 The syllabus mentions Britain only in the seventh grade

74 Reichel, “Ben "kartanut”,” 229.
75 Ibid., 103–104; Tokhnit bate ha-sefer ha-‘amamiyim ha-‘ironiyim, 61–62.
76 Elboim-Dror, “Memshelet ha-mandat.”
geography course as part of a survey of European states. Besides its climate, national resources, industry and inhabitants, the syllabus mentions the Irish national movement. In the early 1920s this meant a clear message to the British.\textsuperscript{77} The laconic mentioning of The Battles of the Great War in the Department’s program is brought up in its Zionist national context as “the World War (1914-1918), its outcomes and the Balfour Declaration” in the Hebrew syllabus.\textsuperscript{78} Once more, the imperial context of the declaration remains silent and the Jewish context highlighted.

To conclude this discussion, the Hebrew syllabus differs from the Arab in its coherence and educational determination. The Department’s contradictory, fractured and estranged historical narrative seems pale and colourless in comparison with the ‘organic unity’ of the Zionist narrative. One reflects a correspondence with a vision, ethos and reality of an active community in Palestine and the other corresponds with abstract bodies of knowledge and overlooks or displaces the community’s agency.

\textbf{For Us and no Other}

A final comparison should be drawn to the presence or treatment of Jewish history in the Department’s syllabus and that of Arab history in the Va’ad’s. Before examining the history syllabus, it is worth examining the engagement of both syllabi with the national other, or its absence from them. Neither syllabus offered language instruction in the other’s language, Hebrew or Arabic, at primary level. Not including Hebrew instruction for Arabs, representing an overwhelming majority in Palestine when these documents were written, is understandable. In Hebrew education, although as we have seen the teaching of Arabic was a recurrent pedagogical issue and a few schools did offer Arabic instruction in primary education, the 1920 committee did not discuss its instruction or its inclusion in the syllabus. It is rather surprising, considering the presence on the committee of leading educators like Epstein and Luria,

\textsuperscript{77} Tokhnit bate ha-sefer ha-‘amamiyim ha-‘ironiyim, 47.
\textsuperscript{78} Ibid., 59.
discussed in the first chapter, that it failed to include Arabic instruction in the curriculum they proposed.\textsuperscript{79} In later years, Arabic instruction continued to be excluded from the primary syllabi of all three trends.

Arabs as a community or a majority are not mentioned in the Hebrew curriculum. The moledet course for example, encourages the student’s familiarity with his environment. Under the topic “inhabitants” the syllabus mentions: “the inhabitants of the area and the near surroundings according to their nationalities (le-le’omehem), their religion and professions”.\textsuperscript{80} This treatment of nationalities (closer here to ethnicities) and religions of the “inhabitants”, tell the story of a non-community, a proliferation of identities. The word Arabs does not appear in the homeland course and is excluded from the geography course as well. In the fifth-grade geography course while discussing “a general survey of Eretz-israel”, the “inhabitants” are contrasted with the “Hebrew settlements”.\textsuperscript{81}

The history syllabus surveys Arab history in particular only once in the sixth grade covering “The Arabs: Arabia and its inhabitants, their belief and customs until Muhammad (a general survey). The Jewish influence on the Arabs; a Jewish kingdom in Arabia (Abu Kariba and Yosef). Muhammad, the Quran: the conquest of Eretz-Israel by the Muslims. The spread of Islam; the Caliphate in Damascus and Baghdad”\textsuperscript{82} and later moving to discuss “The Jews in the Muslim East”. Under the topic “The Jews in Spain”, the word Arab or Islam is not mentioned. Finally, under the topic “The history of the country” in the eighth-grade geography class, the Arabs are mentioned as one of the conquering forces after a survey of pre-history and biblical history: “The Roman conquest, the Arab conquest, the crusades, the rule of Egypt, the

\textsuperscript{79} Va’ad ha-hinukh, \textit{Tamtsit ha-protokolim}, 28–38.
\textsuperscript{80} Tokhnit bate ha-sefer ha-’amaniyim ha-’ironiyim, 10.
\textsuperscript{82} Tokhnit bate ha-sefer ha-’amaniyim ha-’ironiyim, 51.
Turkish conquest”. Later, the syllabus describes the Jewish ‘Aliyot (immigration waves) over the centuries, the genesis of the new Yishuv and “the work of the people for the building of the country” and concludes with “the English conquest”,83 importantly externalising the mandate from the Yishuv’s own history; the British are just another occupier, while the Yishuv was (already) building the country.

Here, the Arab historical presence ends with the crusades and re-appears in the geography course as “one of the waves of foreign and transient occupiers that the Land of Israel had known”.84 As a current cultural or national collective Arabs are non-existent, they are present absentee, faceless “inhabitants”. Indeed, as articulated by Almog, the Sabra was cut off from Arab culture spiritually, intellectually and physically.85

The Yishuv or Jewish presence in Palestine suffers from the same invisibility in the Department’s syllabus. Harte rightly reads the British fear of writing problematic issues into the syllabus that would highlight their commitment to the Jewish national home and their reluctance to incorporate any notion of shared history or values.86 Historical events that were directly related to Jewish history were mentioned as part of a local Palestinian history and historical periods of cooperation between Arabs and Jews were not mentioned. The treatment of Jewish presence or Jewish history is indicative of the Department’s walking between the raindrops that we have seen earlier, adopting a policy of educational avoidance.

Returning to the criticism targeting the Department, it is understood how this avoidance policy in the curriculum established an educational trajectory that lacked relevance for some of the most pressing issues for the Arab community in Palestine. As we have seen, educators found different approaches to fill this institutional vacuum or educational void. Complex

83 Ibid., 56.
84 Almog, The Sabra, 195.
85 Ibid., 196.
86 Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 126.
questions in regard to identity, citizenship and the future of their country not only troubled their students, they demanded relevant answers for themselves as well.

A Contradictory Pedagogy

Analysing the history syllabus and government official publications sheds light on only one among many unknowns in this pedagogical equation. This section focuses on the engagement of central educators with history instruction and their understanding of the required methodology and spirit for teaching it. The second part examines the challenges of the history teachers and local schools to implement this pedagogy.

In four articles published in the pages of the Teachers’ College journal in the early 1920s, Miqdadi articulates the most detailed outline of proper history teaching one can find from the period. Miqdadi’s articles are unique in the sense that they are not only practical pedagogy, but also an attempt to present a comprehensive approach to history in general and the teaching of history in particular. The fact that they were written by the most charismatic history teacher in the College, an Arab nationalist in the early years of this leading institution, add weight to his perspective. More than anything, his thoughts encapsulate the pedagogic tensions of an enlightened nationalist history teacher.

Miqdadi’s science of history adheres to a Western framework with its inception with Herodotus the “father of history” (abu al-tārīkh) and a harsh criticism towards classic Arab historians (Ibn al-Athir, al-Tabari). Arab history, Miqdadi argues, was more literary and poetic than historical, a history that revolved around conquests, the expansion of kingdoms, portraying the rulers as “shadows of God on earth”. This historiography marginalised the Arab contribution to the sciences, medicine and arithmetic. The weakness of the Arab states is
derived from this historical negligence. The spread of practical science, and not poetry, wins wars, Miqdadi concludes. Instead of this traditional history, Miqdadi calls for the preference of social history initiated by Ibn Khaldun and mentions Thomas Carlyle, arguing that great men are capable of great deeds only with the help of their nations (musā‘adat al-ummah). Modern social history encompasses all aspects of human existence, religious, economic, political and social, and is therefore democratic. These aspects, according to Miqdadi, are beneficial to understand the “nation’s phenomenon”.

The study of history in this respect, could not only help modernise a country, it could also win wars. As we have seen earlier, Miqdadi’s targeting of Arab historiography fits his general criticism of the Arabs. Here, their historiography symbolises Arab failure in choosing their historical battles while moving towards social history sets another Western trajectory, leading to national progress.

This was why Miqdadi’s pedagogical inspiration derived from current American and British publications. Following Pestalozzi and Spencer, Miqdadi promotes psychological education, placing the student’s cognitive capabilities at its core and the development of the student’s imagination, memory, emotions and values as key principles. The pedagogic texts of the time, in Palestine and the Arab world in general, distanced themselves from recitation and the absorption of dry knowledge. Already in 1925, Ahmad Samih Khalidi translated an English version of The Montessori Method, introduced and promoted in British education by the educationalist Edmond Holmes. Montessori’s emphasis on “unrestricted liberty” of the child through the labouring and the training of the senses echoes Miqdadi’s history class, where

---

88 Al-Haj Ibrahim, “al-Tāřīkh.”
89 Al-Haj Ibrahim, “Tadrīs al-tāřīkh.”
91 Maria Montessori, The Montessori Method.
the students become active participants, rather than passive listeners and their understanding follows action. Moreover, the centrality of the child, his personal progress and will become the core of the educational process. Thus, at least on paper, the history class is treated as a holistic experience.

Deviating as much as possible from traditional rigid education, Miqdadi objects to appeasing, threatening or hitting the students as a disciplining method in order to get their attention. Instead, he encourages the teacher’s enthusiasm and the arousing of all senses in the educational process. Khalidi, as well, emphasises the active role of the student in class, and favours encouraging them to ask questions and express their personal impressions. Teachers are encouraged to use maps, building models, stories, field trips and photos, or anything that could interest and increase the curiosity of the student. Even the traditional structuring of the classroom is challenged, turning it into a live theatre or an imagined scene from history. Darwazah implemented these ideas while serving as principal of the Najah College, building a school theatre where students and staff members preformed historical-nationalist themed plays written by him, with the purpose of resurrecting history itself, bringing Arab days of glory back to life.

Inspired by Western pedagogy, Miqdadi is not blind to its shortcomings and criticises the European nationalist trend of history education, exalting the history of the nation and excluding the history of others. In this kind of history teaching, “the student reads the history of his country in depth and prefers it to the history of other nations until he imagines that his nation is the epitome of human effort and that his country is superior to others. This is why, sentiments

92 Al-Haj Ibrahim, “al-Tarbiyah al-‘aqliyah.”
94 Al-Haj Ibrahim, “Uṣūl tadrīs al-tūrīkh.”
96 Darwazah, Mudhakkirāt, 1:540–541.
such as “Germany is above all” emerge and the German student is surprised why people are reluctant to live under the rule of his own country and accept its culture, and the same happens in France and Britain”. 97

This criticism did not prevent Miqdadi from advocating the very same ideas. Miqdadi criticises teachers who teach the history of other countries before they know the history of the Arab nation and states that Arab history should have complete preference over other histories. Moreover, Miqdadi illustrates through the history of the Arab Semites, the necessity of teaching the nation’s history as a linguistic, geographical, religious and traditional unit, highlighting common interests and emotions and the notion of being an interrelated block (kutlah mutarābiṭah). This is while, in another essay, he promotes a secular (al-‘almānīyah) teaching of Arab history regardless of religious belief. 98 According to al-Dabbagh, this kind of teaching based on a nationalist approach (al-nahj al-qawmī) is essential for the creation of one set of thoughts, values and shared traditions and hopes. 99

Miqdadi’s history class leads the students to “worship” the heroes (ya‘budūn al-ʻabṭāl), “sanctify” them as role models, and encourages pilgrimage to their graves. The examples given contrary to his criticism are those of ‘Umar and al-Walid. Al-Walid, for example, is mentioned for his loyalty and willingness to become a simple soldier after being the commander of the Muslim armies. Miqdadi argues that Walid’s virtues—loyalty, obedience and sacrifice—are relevant to the young Palestinian especially in times when partisan interests overshadow general will, thus articulating the importance of historical knowledge for a better understanding of current times. 100

97 Al-Haj Ibrahim, “al-Tārīkh.”
99 Al-Dabbagh, Madrasat al-qarya, 90.
100 Al-Haj Ibrahim, “Uṣūl tadrīs al-tārīkh.”
National heroes “are all iconic individuals invested with the admiration or adulation of those who see in them the embodiment of values through which the community at a particular time identifies itself, in whom it sees its protectors, ‘its salvation’”.\(^{101}\) The lengthy list of over fifty Arab national heroes and historical themes offered by Miqdadi as content for the history course, includes all of two Christians (Imru’ al-Qays and Jurji Zaydan), four women (Shajar al-Durr, Khadija, Aisha) and predominantly focusing on Islamic history, essentially follows Caliphs, kings and generals.\(^{102}\) These role models chosen by Miqdadi are supposedly far from representing his idea of secular-social history and his emphasis on Arab history is very similar to the one he earlier criticised in European education. However, if indeed these heroes represent the “embodiment of [Miqdadi’s] values”, following our analysis of his re-writing of Islam and Muhammad as a progressivist modernising power, this list does not underline Islam’s superiority or an ethnicist notion or Arabness. Whether it is pedagogically possible or not, Miqdadi wishes to turn this rather traditional list of iconic individuals on its head, extracting secular and social values from a familiar, more relevant heritage.

Al-Dabbagh offers a placatory approach to resolve this contradiction. While agreeing with Miqdadi’s emphasis on heroes, the strengthening of the patriotic sentiments and the sanctification of the homeland, these notions should be taught “with respect ( ihtirām) to other nations for the rule of tranquillity, law and order (ṭama’nīnah) among the people of the earth”. The love for our nation, argues al-Dabbagh, “should not blind us to seeing the qualities of other nations, and conversely our respect towards the world must not distract us from our separate

\(^{101}\) James McDougall, *History and the Culture*, 150-151.

\(^{102}\) Indeed, the centrality of great men (al-rijāl al-‘iẓām) is prominent in both the history writing and history teaching pedagogy. Khalidi, for example, adds the term “great men” (al-rijāl al-‘iẓām) to his translation while the British source clearly reads “men”, while defining the concept of history as deeds of men and the way they lived their life, Khalidi, *Arkān*, 153; Great Britain. Board of Education, *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools. Board of Education* (London: HMSO, 1927), 114; Two examples amongst various publication focusing on great men are, Nicola Ziadeh, *Shakhṣiyāt ‘arabīyah* (Jaffa: al-Maktaba al-‘aṣrīyah, 1945); and Lawrence’s Great [Men] of the Past, focusing both on “Western” and Arab historical personalities, Anton Shukri Lawrence and Eugene Hoade, *‘Uṣamā al-māḏī* (Jerusalem: al-Maktaba al-‘aṣrīyah, 1936).
Khalidi agrees to this point, insisting that history instruction “need not be confined to any one country or any one age”.

Grating as these contradictions may sound, they were not unique to Miqdadi. Often, progressive humanist education went hand in hand with nationalist pedagogy. Husri, for example, kept a statue of Pestalozzi in his library and based on his readings of Montessori and Frobel sought to go beyond religion and sectarianism, proclaiming, “let us distance ourselves from intervention”. At the same time, Husri attributed an almost metaphysical restorative and inspirational power to history and preached for an instrumental history instruction that would mobilise the youth.

This pedagogic paradox was not confined to Arab nationalism and one does not need to go as far as the fascist embrace, albeit temporary, of Montessori for similar examples. The same trends could be found within the pages of the pedagogic English journal *The Teachers’ Aid*, mentioned by Miqdadi as one of his sources. A close reading of the issues of the time reveal the direct influence of the journal not only on Miqdadi’s writing but also on the general outline and educational approach of the College’s journal. The weekly journal offers various articles dealing with the teaching of history and gives “hints” for the history teacher. The journal also addresses the problematic marginalisation of general history and its importance for the better understanding of British history and speaks in favour of cosmopolitanism and

103 Al-Dabbagh, *Madrasat al-qarya*, 88–90; A similar approach can be found in, Jawharīyah, “Īḍāḥ dars al-jughrāfyah.”
105 For a discussion about the instrumentalisation of these theories to Zionist education see, David Shachar, “’amlanut ve-’avodah”; Yuval Dror, “National Education”.
108 Here are some examples of articles from *The Teachers’ Aid*. The focus on heroes and great men very similar to Miqdadi’s terminology, the mentioning of Thomas Carlyle and the importance of biographies as basis for history teaching and offering a reading list for each hero: Chas K. Herring, “History and Geography”, 13 December 1919, 253; the focus on the work of “individuals” and “strong men”, E. S. Stuart, “The Analysis of History”, 27 December 1919, 610; discussing narrative and biography in history teaching, “Suggestions for the History Lesson”, 29 January 1921, 286; about “spicing up” the history lesson “Teaching History”, 18 December 1922, 191 and “Story Telling in the School Curriculum”, 25 September 1920, 412.
internationalism. However, the periods and historical issues discussed in the journal focus essentially on British history. One good example is the weekly column “Great Days of History”, commemorating hundreds of historical events for the use of teachers, the bulk of which are dedicated to the British palace, British notables, and British wars and conquests.

And if these supposedly pedagogical impossibilities were not enough, the heavy burden of history teaching also required extensive knowledge in history. The history textbook should be far from satisfying the “real teacher” (al-ḥaqīqī), in the words of Miqdadi. Miqdadi attaches a long reading list discussing Islamic conquests and Khalidi advises teachers to read al-Tabari, Ibn al-Athir, Gibbon and “the best of modern historical books, embodying the results of scientific research [which] could strengthen the teacher’s insight into the meaning of great movements, and enrich his store of stirring details”.

To conclude, the abilities of the “new model” history teacher go far beyond the syllabus. He is required to show interest in, renovate and incorporate various methods of teaching. He should constantly be updating his historical knowledge with the reading of newspapers, books and journals and be well acquainted with his surroundings, his country and neighbouring countries.

In reality, this far-reaching visionary pedagogy had very little in common with the vast majority of Arab schools, particularly in the early days of the mandate. Access to written sources was scarce, even in the central city schools for the bulk of the mandate period. The traveling libraries initiative at the beginning of the 1920s, offering a short selection of books carefully selected by the Department and carried on “animal transport”, is a case in point.

Interviewees testified that even in the late 1930s and until the end of the mandate, daily

---

110 See issues of The Teachers’ Aid dated 1 April 1922-23 March 1923.
112 Tibawi, Arab Education, 88.
newspapers could be found in most villages only when one would buy them while visiting a neighbouring town or city. Educational journals could be found only in urban centres. Thus, the vision of a well-read, knowledgeable teacher, a loyal follower of current events and historical discoveries was a rare phenomenon as in most schools these sources were simply out of reach.

There were a few improvements especially towards the later days of the mandate and primarily in the urban centres and secondary schools, which could have enabled the history teacher to gain an acquaintance with newer sources and journals. The Arab College's library started with 250 books in 1923, held 1600 volumes in 1927 and 7122 in 1946. Tibawi’s report on his own success as the Southern District DIE, proudly states that at the ‘Amiriyya School in Jaffa, there were 1101 books in 1941 and up to 1945, 2000 volumes were added; the stock of the school library in Beit-Dajan rose from 600 to 1000 books during the same years.113 Lutfi Zreik recalled that his secondary government school in Safed held a large library in the late 1940s. However, Miss H. M. Wilson, teaching in Bir-Zeit in the late thirties reported that the school had no library.114 The presence of written texts are crucial for both teachers and students as sources of not only knowledge and inspiration, but also practical reference. Availability of books enables the teacher and students to go beyond the syllabus and explore new worlds.

In sharp contrast, for the Hebrew history teacher these resources were considerably more accessible. Hebrew children’s libraries were established in Palestine in the new settlements since the end of the nineteenth century and by the mandate period, there was one in every Jewish settlement and school. A Hebrew teacher or student who wished to read a book could easily do so, an objective that was far from reach until the end of the mandate for the Arabs.115

The scarcity of teaching resources joined other challenges. The unfortunate career of Ahmad Sha'ban ‘Aydeh, a teacher in the government schools, stretching over two unsatisfactory decades from 1922 to 1942, seems to reflect further difficulties for the history teacher. First, in the village schools, the full responsibility for all subjects and all administrative issues was laid on one single teacher. Sha‘ban, for example, taught history, Geography, Arabic, religious studies, English and Maths and according to the reports submitted by his DIE, he “was of limited knowledge”, “looks dull, inert, and does not adhere to the syllabus”, “inactive… he knows very little of the syllabus and is slack”. Furthermore, ‘Aydeh, like most teachers of the time did not take the Teachers’ Higher Certificate Examination and was repeatedly urged to do so by his DIE. However, the severe shortage of teachers was what kept this teacher in the system without formal training. ‘Aydeh’s DIE kept transferring him every few years to another village school even after he had determined that “he is not the type of teacher to be kept in the service” or that “there is no hope for this teacher to bring up the school to the academic standard required”. A personal letter of warning was sent to him after his students in ‘Ain-Houd failed to answer the questions presented by the DIE in history and geography, describing their knowledge as useless as central historical links between successive periods were overlooked.

‘Aydeh’s reply, understandably defensive, embodies the predicament of many village schools in Palestine. He argued that he arrived at the school a few months earlier and therefore could not be blamed for the poor level of knowledge after a long period in which the education was in the hands of “no more than a Kuttab sheikh”. ‘Aydeh depicted the village school in a Qur’anic terminology of catastrophe; a “levelled plain” (qā‘ān ṣafṣafān) and its students as “frozen skeletons” (hayākil jāmida). He added that history and geography are indeed important

117 DIE Galilee to ‘Aydeh, 25 April 1931, ibid.
subjects that require all educational resources, like the ones available in city schools, but missing in his village. Furthermore, stating that the syllabus is not flexible, highly detailed and extremely hard (ṣa‘b jiddan), he most importantly emphasised the dire need for new textbooks written in accordance with the syllabus containing instructions for the teacher. ‘Aydeh dramatically concludes his address to the Department, “the teacher is like your son, obedient to your command”, stating that this complaint fell upon him like a bomb, “killing him with politeness” (taqtalnī qatlan adabīyān), but nevertheless, he shall further his efforts!118

This is a correspondence between an incapable teacher of limited knowledge in history and no pedagogic training and the system that appointed him, which while aware of his capabilities, could not afford to lose him, train him, or supply the resources he required for proper history teaching. On the contrary, the requirements of the history class outlined in the history syllabus were irrelevant and incompatible for his students, the “frozen skeletons”.

However, some history teachers were remembered for their exceptional educational skills and knowledge, overcoming the shortage of means by hard work. Sada Sabbagh, a teacher in the Safed Elementary Girls’ School, impressed her school principal and DIE with her efforts to prepare her history and geography classes although lacking the required books, engaging the students and properly linking the subjects and enabling understanding. Yet again, Sabbagh represents a minority, being a graduate of the Women Teachers’ Training College and obtaining the WETC.119

Unfortunately, the existing literature describing the history teacher focuses on the central secondary school, the ones that produced students who later produced memoirs of their school years. It was easier in the secondary schools since teachers could dedicate themselves to only one or two subjects. Thus, while enabling the desired glimpse into the history class, one should
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118 ‘Aydeh to DIE Galilee, 5 May, 1931, ibid.
remember that although central in the annals of Palestinian education, they represent only a fraction of the majority discussed earlier.

The legendary history teachers in these institutions indeed had a tremendous impact on their students. Jabra, for example, mentions Diya al-Khatib his history teacher in the Rashidiyya, remembered for his “mastery of the material of his course... I felt he opened amazingly ramifying temporal depths in my way of thinking”.120 There were also teachers who left the opposite impression on their students, even at the most prestigious schools. Dr. Muhammad Hadi Haj Mir obtained his PhD in history from Tübingen University, though there were doubts regarding the validity of this diploma.121 One of the senior history teachers in the Arab College, Haj Mir is remembered as strict and tedious. One student recalls his exhausting home assignments, his marking according to numbers of pages rather than content and his shameless promotion of his brother’s farm products in the college.122 Ziadeh who co-worked with Haj Mir as a history teacher in the College, criticised him for having no understanding of history, teaching its margins rather than its core through equations such as: ‘Ali (Aisha+Talha+al-Zubayr)= Battle of the Camel.123 It was no surprise, Ziadeh noted, that so many of the Rushidiyya and Arab College students shared no love for history when Haj Mir was its only spokesman.124

Some teachers praised themselves for the work they did. Zu‘aytir wrote about his days in Acre as a history teacher for the sheikhs of al-Jazzar mosque, and how he used history teaching to ignite his students’ nationalist spirit, mentioning al-Rafai’s National Societies (al-jam‘īyāt

120 Jabrā, The First Well, 162–163.
121 Ziadeh, Ayyāmī, 1:91; Najm, Dār, 75–76.
123 The Battle of the Camel took place at Basra in 656 between Aisha (one of the Prophet’s wives) and her supporters against the newly appointed Caliph, ‘Ali. The battle is known as the First Fitna, the first war where Muslims fought Muslims.
124 Ziadeh, Ayyāmī, 1:92.
as the source book he chose for this end. However, in his formal teaching post he was never appreciated, depicted as rhetorical (khiṭābīyah), “nervous and lacks experience”, ill tempered (‘aṣabī al-mazaj) and susceptible (sarī‘ al-ta’aththur). Teachers, supervisors and students all perceived their own qualities differently.

These reports enable us to divest Zu‘aytir memoirs of some of their glory, they also illustrate in their mundaneness, a translation of the system’s official policy to reality through the eyes of less senior, strictly Arab administrators. For example, the promotion of nationalist ideals in the history class were not cherished, although nevertheless acceptable to assessors.

Radi Abd al-Hadi’s DIE reported that he had “an inclination for noisy patriotism. He likes to make speeches, writes articles about things which he has not a fair knowledge of. But however is a good teacher of history and geography”. This inclination did not stop the Department from constantly promoting the talented educator to become the principal of the Hebron Secondary School in 1943. Lutfi Zreik testified that his Syrian history teacher in the Safed Secondary School was a patriot (waṭani) and focused on apogees in Arab history such as the Battle of al-Qādisiyyah, making the students proud of being Arab (niftakher bi-‘arabiyyatinā). Zreik’s story is one of many, where waṭani teachers had no problem educating according to their ideals in government schools. Indeed, secondary schools educated the ideal age group for the inculcation of nationalist ideas, when the adolescent is in search of a worldview to relate to, consolidating his own identity. However, limited access to secondary education, more than administrative restrictions on nationalist education, meant a limited exposure of young Arab Palestinians to these ideas.

Nationalist sentiments could even be aroused unintentionally, as in the case of Miss Wilson’s class. A teacher in the Bir-Zeit Arab High School, Wilson mentioned that an exercise

125 Zu‘aytir, Bawākīr, 33–34.
126 See Confidential Report on Teaching Staff, 3 February 1928, “Akram Zu’aïter,” n.d., 8.0/1-110, ISA.
“on subjunctives or participles could be twisted into an allusion to the Arab cause”. For example, when Wilson talked about Disraeli the students shouted “but he was a Jew!” and while teaching British history the students’ thoughts drifted to Palestine. While talking about Disraeli’s phrase “a great man is one that affects the minds of his generation”, all the students thought of Hitler. Yet history teachers were not necessarily the ones to preach nationalism. Ibrahim al-Daqaq, who attended Rawdat a-ma’a rif in the 1940s, mentioned his chemistry teacher at Rawdat al-ma’a rif as the teacher who discussed Arab nationalism and history, other testimonies recall a charismatic gymnastics or Arabic teacher leading the nationalist spirit of the school.

To conclude, throughout the bulk of the mandate period and at the bulk of Palestinian schools, the average history teacher was one of limited pedagogic training and educational resources especially in the village schools. This contrasted with the central urban institutions, which were highly selective for students and teachers as well. The secondary schools of Jerusalem, Haifa, Jaffa and other developing urban centres employed university graduates to teach history and were also able to supply all the required resources such as textbooks and maps. The pedagogical discourse mentioned earlier reflects only the up-to-date and professional treatment that the teaching of history received in Palestine’s Ivy League schools.

**Used, Unused and Misused Textbooks**

We have seen how central the historical text was for both the pedagogical discourse and the history teacher for history teaching. The following examination focuses on the circulation and
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130 Ibrahim Jamil Al-Daqaq (b. 1929), Interview, Jerusalem, 12 September 2013.
availability of history textbooks in schools and governmental control over textbooks’ production, circulation and censorship.

It is not in any way easy to determine what books were actually authorised or used in classes in the different schools, private or governmental. However, scarce evidence does exist in newspaper articles, correspondence of the Department of Education and personal testimonies. In the early days of the mandate, especially during the period of military rule and the early twenties, Egyptian books dominated the educational scene in the government schools. Egyptian books were bought by the Department and distributed directly to the districts.131 This was initiated by Maj. Gen. Arthur Wigram Money (1866-1951), appointed Chief Administrator of Palestine (1918-1919) in the days prior to the full occupation of Palestine. Money had sent a request to the Egyptian Ministry of Education for advice and a sample of government system textbooks.132 The military administration had to work fast and find practical solutions to the void after the departure of the Ottomans. Politically and technically, it was easier to import resources from Egypt. This was also true in the “Egyptian period” of the Teachers’ Training College, opened by the British military rulers in March 1918 and based on Egyptian methods, textbooks and personnel.133

The dominance of Egyptian resources probably continued throughout the first decade of the mandate. Stewart Symes, Chief Secretary to the government noted in 1928 that “the schools relied largely on Egyptian sources for the supply of text-books”.134 For some periods of history, Egyptian textbooks were used until the 1940s.135 The two volumes of the Egyptian textbook Tārīkh ūrbā al-ḥadīth (A modern History of Europe) were still used at the Arab College in the

135 Al-Tamimi writes in his forward that so far the secondary year students in Palestine have been using Egyptian books, with slight differences from the Palestinian syllabus, al-Tamimi, Tārīkh ūrbā al-ḥadīth, 3.
late 1930s. As a student, Ziadeh recalls himself reading from Egyptian books such as *The Nile Reader*, noting in irony that the students and teachers, having no other textbooks knew more about the river Nile than the Jordan River. Ziadeh later became a history teacher in Acre’s secondary school in the late 1920s and had no history textbooks. He used to summarise his history lessons from an English copy of Breasted’s *Ancient Times* since the Arabic translation was not yet available in Palestine and a copy of the *Tārīkh al-umam al-islāmīyah (History of the Islamic Peoples)* authored by the Egyptian scholar Muhammad al-Khudari. Ziadeh’s use of an improvised copying machine they called a *bālūṭah* in order to hand out his summaries for his students in a central secondary school of a central town is indicative of the shortage of history textbooks.

Further evidence regarding the scarcity of history textbooks comes from the letter sent by the former Labour MP Susanne Lawrence to Wauchope in which she depicts a “shocking lack of Arabic textbooks… in history e.g the teacher writes what he likes and the children write it down”. Lawrence warned Wauchope, “that the possibilities of propagating the most objectionable and chauvinist views by means of biased history can hardly be exaggerated”, as in the case of Germany and Russia. Wauchope’s reply defended his Education Department, stating that a Textbook Committee had been operating for years, scrutinising all school textbooks prior to their use. Moreover, “the lack of children’s readers has occupied the attention of the Department for many years, but great difficulty has been experienced in finding persons with the gift of interesting narration in a clear and simple style”. So far, Wauchope continues, the Department was able to produce “simple and effective” Arabic reading primers. However, “[i]t is unfortunately the fact that no history book in Arabic suitable for pupils in Palestine

136 Ahmad Samih Khalidi to Bloom, 2 November 1936, Special Committee on Curricula and Examination 15 July 1936, 2500/102, ISA. Al-Tamimi’s book was probably meant to replace the Egyptian version and properly follow the Palestine syllabus.
138 “Susanne Lawrence to Arthur Wauchope,” no date specified but presumably early 1935, CO 733/273/5/ 28-29, TNA.
Schools at present exist, but I should like to assure you that this deficiency is not necessarily an encouragement to undesirable propaganda by teachers: the syllabus for history, as for all other subjects, is clearly laid down by the Department, and may not be altered by the teacher, whose notes of lessons are always available to the Head of his school and to Inspectors”. Following Lawrence’s criticism, Wauchope had set up a committee with Farrell as its chairman that would advise what textbooks are required and “how they can best be produced” and “invite Arab writers to translate or adapt suitable textbooks” in “simple Arabic”. Wauchope briefed the Colonial Office about the correspondence stressing that it was a matter of Government expenditure but felt “that new text books are needed to replace one or two unsuitable ones”.

This central initiative for the production of textbooks succeeded in producing a translation of one history textbook, *Landmarks of World History* which was published by Longman, Green and Co. in 1937. It seems that this was the only history textbook that was fully funded by the Department and published by a British publisher. The two following volumes of the book, “the expansion of the Arabic people and repercussions on the western world, down to the fall of Constantinople” and “from the Renaissance to the present time with special reference to the Near East”, were never published. According to Tibawi, the reason why the trilogy was not completed was that “inspectors and teachers alike considered it a challenge to their amour-propre to be reduced to the role of mere translators”. The *Palestine Post* correspondent noted that the book was “a laudable enterprise, and will no doubt attract attention in Arab schools outside as well as in Palestine”, and that it was already put to use in Aden. This publication is the only available evidence of the book’s publication in Palestine and I was not able to find

140 “Arthur Wauchope to Parkinson, Assistant Under-Secretary of State, Colonial Office,” June 18, 1935, CO 733/273/5/27, TNA.
141 A detailed description of publication process and outcomes could be found in, Harte, “Contesting the Past,” 171–174.
142 *Palestine Post*, 29 January 1939.
144 *Palestine Post*, 29 January 1939.
any evidence of its actual use in schools. Even if it was widely circulated in late 1939, a remarkable achievement given the political circumstances, this is overall still a very poor achievement for the Department as a producer of relevant history textbooks after over two full decades.

Furthermore, the translation of a British history textbook could hardly answer the need for a textbook written specifically for Palestine. This fact, along with the idea to print the book in the more advanced presses in London rather than with a local publisher considered “negligible” by Farrell, seems to reveal the government’s mistrust and indifference towards a large community of educators and publishers that were fully capable of producing this kind of textbook themselves. Farrell’s insistence on the Department’s cooperation with English publishers seems inconsistent as the “commercial risk” and “highly speculative” nature of such ventures are highlighted in his report as well.145

The case of Farrell’s refusal to publish Radi Abd al-Hadi’s textbook is one example, possibly of many, of teachers who sensed the need and invested time and efforts in writing a textbook that was not accepted by the Department. The eight notebooks sent to the Department included The Kings of Western Europe and a geography textbook that were never published.146 Abd al-Hadi, a teacher in his early twenties, did not give up and over a decade after being denied, managed to co-author a textbook that was also authorised by the Department.

Indeed, the various history textbooks written by Palestinian educators were local initiatives of educators, most of whom were employees of the Education Department although in most cases the Department was reluctant either to support them financially or to circulate them widely.

145 Farrell, “Memorandum,” October 23, 1939, CO 733/431/8, TNA.
146 Farrell to Radi, April 25, 1932, “Radi Abd Al-Hadi.”
Jerusalem stands out as the centre of these early beginnings, as the centre of British administration. Husayn Ruhi (1878-1960), a Baha’i educator and preacher of Egyptian descent, was a senior inspector in the Education Department since its inception. Ruhi seems to have been the first to publish a history textbook in Palestine after the British occupation with its first edition published in January 1922 and its second in June the same year. Ruhi also published a geography book in the following year, and both books were published by the L.J.S Printing Press (London Jews’ Society), the Anglican mission for the conversion of Jews.¹⁴⁷ Two history textbooks were published in 1923. The first one was The History of Palestine published by Totah, the principal of the Teacher Training College, and the scholar U. S. Barghuthi. Totah had already published a history textbook on Jerusalem, The History of Jerusalem, in 1920 and a geography book, The Geography of Palestine with Habib al-Khuri (b. 1879, Kafir-Yasif), a teacher at the College. Taysir Žubyān (1901-1978) was a history teacher in Rawdat al- ma’arif and mentions that the book was written at the behest of the school. Žubyān dedicated his book to “his royal highness the great Amir Abdallah” and his noble efforts to “raise the light of knowledge”.¹⁴⁸ The next history textbook, History of Arabs and Islam (1925) was published by Darwazah, the principal of the Najah College at the time. The final book to be published in the 1920’s was History (1926), authored by Hannah Dahdah Farah, a school principal in Nazareth, originally from Gaza. Dahdah also authored a school song (anāshīd) book.

These local initiatives of the first decade of the mandate show the local potential that did exist in Palestine. Educators capable of writing textbooks and local presses to produce them were at hand already in the early 1920’s. Thus, Symes’ remark that “the staff of the Department of Education had not so far been able to devote much time to the local preparation of text-

¹⁴⁷ In 1921, Ruhi also published a translation of a book on biology.
¹⁴⁸ Žubyān, Zubdat.
books” in 1928, was not in accordance with the ability or competence of local educators but with the priorities set by the Department of Education.149

This trend of independent initiatives continued throughout the mandate by either inspectors or principals of government or private schools. The following decades were more prolific in the field of history and geography textbooks, predominantly written by inspectors of the Education Department. The fact that a number of books (Darwazah’s Arab History, Ḥarami, Ruhi, Lawrence, Higham and others) declare the initiation of a series of books that failed to materialise illustrates the hardship and lack of resources in pursuing such a project as well as the fact that it was possible for them at least to think ambitiously.

Drawing a comprehensive picture of textbooks’ use in schools is almost impossible based on the available sources since most schools’ syllabi did not mention the textbooks in use. However, a few of them did, and these reveal an interesting, although far from a comprehensive picture. Darwazah’s trilogy of ancient, medieval-modern and Arab history is known to have been taught in a few schools.150 Jabra, for example, learned history from Darwazah’s Modern History of Europe (probably referring to Darwazah’s textbook on medieval and modern times), that was “full of portraits and historical figures”; the author tells how he started drawing their figures, he was proud of one copy he made of Napoleon.151 Al-Tamimi’s Modern History of Europe was used in the Girls’ Arab college and the Arab College.152 Miqdadi’s textbook was used in the Rawda College153 and Ḥadhwa’s book with its Christian bias is mentioned as being used in the Latin schools and as attracting fire from critics, who argued that it was “sowing the

149 “Minutes of the Permanent Mandates Commission”; See also, Abdulqadir, “British Educational Policy,” 188.
150 See the curriculum of The Orthodox National School in Jaffa, for 1934-1935 (Jaffa: Maṭba‘at filasṭīn al-jaḍīdah), Barnāmaj Rawdat al-ma‘ārif, 1934-1935 (Jerusalem: Maṭba‘at dār al-aytām al-islāmīyah) and Barnāmaj al-najāḥ, 1938-1939 (Jerusalem: Maṭba‘at dār al-aytām al-islāmīyah)
151 Jabrā, The First Well, 154.
152 Ahmad Samih Khalidi to Bloom, 2 November 1936, Special Committee on Curricula and Examination, 2500/102, ISA.
seeds of criminal sectarianism and corrupting patriotism”.154 One interviewee mentioned the use of al-ʿAbidi’s *History of the Arabs* in a government school in Haifa in the late 1930s.155 Other books mentioned in school syllabi that were not authored in Palestine but that were widely used for the preparation for the matriculation exam in secondary schools were Breasted’s *Ancient Times* and Robinson’s *General History of Europe* and *Medieval and Modern Times*.156

The circulation of a textbook in the government schools required the authorisation of the textbook committee that had existed since the early 1920s and was divided into three separate committees (Arabic, Hebrew and English). Farrell noted that the committee enjoyed a “sufficient representation of educated Arab opinion”, although he objected to the inclusion of representatives of a private school of “lower standards” that would bring up “in an acute form controversies as to the suitability of chauvinistic Arab history books”. However, “in conformity with the general policy of Government, this Department has confined itself to criticism and advice and has not forbidden the use of any specified text book in private schools ...”.157 Farrell objected to a restrictive censorship of textbooks in private school primarily due to high costs and “doubtful political expedience”, although he did consider the exercise of the Department’s censorship as an “undoubted right”. Farrell also advised reforming the “not very effective control” over the use of Hebrew textbooks with the creation of a Jewish Committee supervised by the Department. Farrell, aware of the “autonomy which the Jewish system claims rather than deserves” left it for the government to decide whether this kind of supervision was

155 Hanna Abu Hanna (b. 1928), Interview, Haifa, 10 September 2013.
156 Madrasat frendz lil-ṣibyān, Ramallah, 1930; Bayān al-madrasa al-wataniyyah al-urūbūdhuksīyah bi-yāfā, 1934-1935; Barnāmaj Rawdat al-munāʿārif, 1934-1935; Barnāmaj al-najāḥ, 1938-1939; principal of Terra Santa to Bloom, Special Committee on Curricula and Examination July 15 1936, ISA, 2500/102 and J. Thornton-Duesbery to Bloom, October, 6 1936, ibid; Lutfi Zreik and Ibrahim Jamil Al-Daqaq also mentioned the use of the book in their schools in the 1940s.
expedient. Still, Farrell’s statement does not answer the question of censorship in government schools which it was easier for the Department to supervise. In order for a book to be authorised it first had to go under the scrutiny of no fewer than two expert teachers submitting reports later considered by the committee “who would thereafter make recommendations to the Director”. In this process, there was no need for censorship, as it was highly selective and the final ruling was that of the Director himself. Tibawi mentions two instances in which books were censured by the Department. The first one was Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, condemned it as unsuitable for Palestinian youth (unsurprisingly, since it was banned and censored in the UK and other countries as well at the time) and the second was *The History of Palestine*. However, direct censorship was not the only way to prevent a book from publishing. As shown earlier, the Department could simply deny a book’s publication with no further explanations and if indeed only two books were directly censored through the formal channels, plenty more were probably rejected in an institutionalised, quiet censorship.

The censorship of Totah and Barghuthi’s textbook has received ample attention in all previous writing on censorship under the British, and all refer to Tibawi’s citation from the Palestine Royal (Peel) Commission’s *Minutes of Evidence* given by Totah himself: “I was co-author of a book, The History of Palestine in Arabic for schools, and Sir Herbert Samuel the then High Commissioner banned the book, the Government banned the book because it had a very inoffensive reference to Zionism. You could not write a history of Palestine up to date without making some reference to it. It was not rabid, it was not a violent attack on it. It is there for everyone to read, but the book was banned and is still banned”. Tibawi continues, “in the

---

160 Ibid., 88–89.
161 Davis, “Commemorating Education”; Zachary Foster, “Arab Historiography”; Ricks, “Khalil Totah.”
words of Dr. Totah the objectionable reference in that book is: “Sir Herbert Samuel endeavoured to make the Arabs see the Jewish point of view as regards to Zionism and failed”. Nevertheless, Tibawi argues, the fact that “the book was banned is an open secret, but it has never been officially declared why it was banned”.

A detailed reading of the book might suggest other reasons for its censorship by the British. As shown earlier, the book contested the post war settlements and the validity of its borders. British rule over the country, similarly to what we have seen in the Hebrew syllabus, is depicted as another passing rule as “Palestine is a land of occupation and colonialism and if it was not Jewish it was Assyrian or Babylonian or Persian or Egyptian or Roman or Greek or Turkish or English, and we do not know its fate”. But the most severe criticism is directed towards the Jews, the Jewish religion and Zionism, with an anti-Semitic overtone. According to the book, Zionism was spurred by European persecution and the rejection of the Jews “for their inclination to high interest rates, their non-modern habits of consumption, their desire to monopolize commerce and their religious zeal”. These statements could hardly be regarded as “inoffensive”, especially in the first few years of British rule over the country.

Even if the reasons stated by Totah for the banning of the book were correct, its censorship was not in fact fully implemented. The book was still used in the Teacher Training College in the early 1920s and an advertisement notifying its publication in the official College journal proves that its circulation was no secret. For three consecutive months in all of Filastin’s issues an advert depicting the book as “the best modern history yet published” is another example at least of its apparent availability in the country. Furthermore, the use of the book

163 Cited in, Tibawi, Arab Education, 198.
164 Ibid.
165 Al-Barghuthi and Totah, Tārīkh filastīn, 76.
167 See the various issues of Filastin, 17 April- 13 July 1923.
was not considered problematic or clandestine. Over a decade later, a few months after the testimony of Totah, the principal of the Anglican Girls’ College in Jerusalem, a senior educator and member of the PBHS, mentioned the use of the book for the teaching of history.168

While far from being flexible on the acceptance and inclusion of textbooks, the Department’s censorship policy pales when compared to that implemented in India under British rule in the early 1900s. In the sub-continent, a textbook “black list” was circulated and the use of an un-authorised textbook by a school meant the exclusion of its students from candidacy for secondary examinations or government scholarships.169

A few documents from the final days of the mandate illustrate the mechanism of textbook circulation to schools. A circular sent by the Galilee DIE regarding *The Illustrated History Reader* stated that “the Deputy Director of the Education Department has permitted the use of the book… for the students of the second primary grade in the city and village schools”. The circular further permits the teachers to use the book according to the ability of their students and recommends its use, since “the main purpose in putting forward a textbook… for the first primary grades is to endear the student (tahbīb) to landmarks through the use of illustrated textbooks and the practice of reading”. This official letter is flexible in its authoritative style, allowing teachers to decide when exactly it is proper to use the book, and calls on teachers to send reports about the book’s use. Most importantly, the Department notifies that it lacks the ability to purchase sufficient books for all government schools.170 This meant that formal authorization was not necessarily followed by a widespread usage of the book in schools. There were also less enthusiastic authorizations of books. The letter informing headmasters about the use of Khalifa and Radi’s book *History of the Arab Kingdoms*, stated that “there is no objection” to using this book, and also requested a report from headmasters regarding its

168 W. A. Coate to Bloom, 1 March 1937, Special Committee on Curricula and Examination, ISA, 2500/102.
169 Sudipa Topdar, “Knowledge and Governance”, 61–76.
170 DIE Galilee to School Principals, 5 September 1947, 65.9/1-314, ISA.
compatibility with the suggested classes of elementary schools.\textsuperscript{171} Newspapers would also publish formal announcements made by the Department; ‘Abidi’s books were authorized by the Department in January 1945 and Ziadeh’s \textit{Ancient History} was authorized in December the same year.

Conversely, the Department was very clear about unauthorized books, not only of history, but on all topics. Books that were not formally authorized were banned even if they were already purchased and in use, as “it is not permitted under any circumstances to place a textbook in the hands of students, whatever topic it is, unless a written permission from the Director of the Department has been circulated authorising its use. And if it should happen that students purchased unauthorised books, in these circumstances those must be kept at their home.”\textsuperscript{172}

This policy of authorising without purchasing made the production process a financial risk, taken only by educators who felt the shortage of textbooks, and in most cases led to the production of books of poor aesthetic value, mostly with no or only vague illustrations and poor quality paper and binding. The quality of the Arabic textbooks published in Palestine pale when compared to the colourful volume printed by Longman & Green for the Department, the only book offering the coloured illustrations so crucial for the engagement of students with the taught material. This meant that if a student finally met a written historic text, it was in no appealing form. Again, this was in sharp contrast to the Hebrew student. The separation between printing presses for Arabs and Jews meant the superior quality of Hebrew textbooks printed in more advanced printing presses, especially after the transfer of the Jewish printing presses from Nazi Germany in the 1930s. This advantage was noticeable in all printed material for students including school journals.

\textsuperscript{171} DIE Galilee to School Principals, 1 March 1947. See also the permission to use Mahmud Zaid’s \textit{Historic Tales}, DIE Galilee to School Principals, 27 July 1947. ibid.
\textsuperscript{172} Ahmad Tuqan, Assistant Director of Education Department to all DIE’s, 22 October 1947, ibid.
To conclude, history textbooks became a common phenomenon in the last decade of the mandate. This was at first due to the novelty of modern Arab education in Palestine but turned into an administrative policy in later years. Imperial cautiousness and insistence on working with English publishers and English texts, along with the Department’s unwillingness to cooperate with local educators or publishers and thus encouraging a local industry withheld quicker development and production of better, more appealing textbooks. While eschewing censorship practices common to other colonies, the non-encouragement policy was enough to prevent undesirable materials from reaching students as it was simply economically unviable. As we have seen, the only familiar case of a forbidden historical text was not in fact severely enforced by the government.

**Conclusion**

The contours of the history course were determined by the regional and Western historiographic heritage, and compromised by Departmental inconsistencies. The juxtaposition of the Arab syllabus with the Hebrew one highlights these inconsistencies and underlines the educational gaps between the two systems. The constant tension between the Department and its schools, between educational centres and educational peripheries further stresses the challenges in implementing an educational policy. Focusing on the teacher’s perspective sheds light on the inability of the system to supply him with the resources he needed in order to fully fulfil his duties and casts doubt on the relevance of this pedagogical discourse to most teachers. The availability or absence of history textbooks, an essential resource for the history teacher, further reflects the Department’s educational policy towards history instruction, one of limited pedagogical initiative, renovation, or engagement. However, an emerging local pedagogical discourse and the development of an independent or semi-independent textbook industry reflect the interest, potential and ability of the Arab community to counterbalance this policy. The next chapter focuses on the pinnacle of Arab education in Palestine, the secondary schools.
These institutions deserve further scrutiny, as those that determined the pedagogical discourse discussed earlier, were hothouses for the training of textbooks’ authors and in general, set the educational pace of the entire country.
Chapter Six: A Coalition of Good Will - History Instruction in Secondary Education

In his critical understanding of academic symbolic capital, Bourdieu stresses that the diploma from a privileged school carries much more than a qualification in a specific field, it “guarantees a competence extending far beyond what they are supposed to guarantee”. The activities, hobbies, taste of people are a tacit or sometimes outspoken imposition of the institutions in which they study. The first things that come to mind while looking at the staged photos of Palestinian secondary schools’ students and staff (see photos on pages 270-271), all dressed in tailored suits are status, modernity, progress, prestige and hope. In the words of Lucie Ryzova, they were “enacting and performing modernity”. ¹ Whether under the French Catholic mission, Anglican mission, Supreme Muslim Council, national or Government Schools, secondary education symbolised the membership in a highly selective, prestigious group. ²

The recorded number of students taking the 1947 Matriculation exam, 326 (89 in English and 237 in Arabic) is indicative of this selectiveness. Marking an impressive increase since its initiation in 1924 with 20 Arab students, graduates of full secondary education in mandate Palestine were still a rare phenomenon in the Arab society throughout the entire period. Rare as they were, the graduates and the few full-secondary schools (offering a graduate diploma) were extremely influential in all spheres of Palestinian society, especially in the field of education; as a graduate of the Arab College stated, we felt we were “the strongest people in the world”. ³

---

¹ Locie Ryzova, *The Age of the Efendiyya*, 16.
² A similar description of Egyptian secondary education in, ibid., 185-185.
Nevertheless, what can define the affinities between this diverse group of independent institutions of different educational agendas with no direct government control? Could it be that their autonomy and informal ties with the Department were what made them dedicated agents and inculcators of government policy, especially in the field of history instruction? Althusser's theory of Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) elaborates this role. Ideological State Apparatus is differentiated from Repressive State Apparatus, directly linked to the state's institutions (government, army, police, and prisons) functioning by violence, while the ISA operates through ideology. Ideological State Apparatus are a plurality of “distinct specialized institutions”, mostly in the sphere of the civil society, such as churches, parties, newspapers, families, trade union and some schools. The state's hegemony transcends the classic separation between public and private, "the State of the ruling class, is neither public nor private… it is the precondition for any distinction between public and private”.

Rather than speaking of a ruling class seeking the reproduction of the division of labour, here we discuss the reproduction of pedagogy through the functions of a coalition of good will, uniting government officials and principals of prestigious schools. This diverse coalition, Althusser argues, is unified despite apparent contradictions "beneath the ruling ideology" of the ruling class. Let us deconstruct this ideology and its function in the field of secondary education and history instruction.

We already discussed the influential role of private education in Palestine and its role in the evolution of the national movement. In secondary education, its influence went beyond its obvious numerical advantage over government secondary schools. Bowman admitted that private secondary education was better than public provision. Their financial independence with the mission’s support and fees from students’ tuition enabled the employment of the best
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4 Louis Althusser, “Ideology”.
5 Bowman’s testimony before the Royal Commission, 27 November 1936, 2/2/32, BM, MECA.
teachers and usually attracted the children of the elite. In order to establish a regulated secondary education, the Department needed their cooperation and support; without them they were left with very little. This dependence on the voluntary cooperation of the principals was noticeable in their poor attendance at the meetings of the PBHS. Officially, the board included around forty members, but only twenty or fewer actually took part in the meetings. Apologies for absence from its members to its secretary, Judah L. Bloom, fill the Board’s files (most members did not even try to make them).

Although Bloom struggled to popularise the board’s meetings with little success and the most loyal members were employees of the Department, the Board’s policy, through the matriculation exam, enjoyed a hegemony over private secondary schools’ syllabus and led to the standardisation of secondary education. Private schools of diverse ideology and denomination voluntarily adopted the high standard of the history matriculation exam set by the PBHS.

**Shouted from the Housetops- Matriculating in History**

“The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem was the meeting place of two civilisations: on its soil the East learned from the West, and perhaps still more, the West learned from the East” Explain this statement (Palestine Matriculation Exam, 1939)

On the 11 July 1927, some dozen students took the London Matriculation exam. A short while after they started their exam, a catastrophic earthquake shook Palestine.6 “[T]he floor heaved, tables overturned… Candidates and invigilators raced to the door… The walls still shook… plaster was pouring from the ceiling”. This drama failed to terminate the exam. Once it was quiet, all returned to write their exams. Only a second more violent shock convinced the invigilator to stop the exam.7 Earthquakes, natural or political, did not always succeed in

---

7 Ibid.
challenging the Matriculation. The last exam was written in March 1948, in the days of a violent civil war while Jerusalem was divided into closed security zones. De Bunsen, afraid of not being able to get the written exams back to the British zone, finally received them through the barbed wire “to the amusement of the soldiers”.

The Palestine Matriculation Examination marked the culmination of secondary education in Palestine and these two incidents illustrate the importance, indeed near-sanctity, attributed to it. It was initiated in 1924 by the PBHS and with slight changes continued until the end of the mandate. In order to pass the exam, the student had to satisfy the examiners in six topics, three of which were mandatory: language, English, mathematics; the student chose the remaining three. The centrality and ample attention given by the Department to the matriculation exam was in no proportion to the numbers of students taking the exam and had no practical relevance to over ninety-nine percent of Palestine’s Arab students. According to the surviving files of the Department, no other topic received such close attention of prominent educators as the Matriculation exam, the opposite of the poor pedagogic attention given to primary education, although on the declarative and financial level, the Department was committed to the promotion of primary education.

The disproportionate engagement with the matriculation exam reveals the desired vision of the most central figures in Palestinian education, Arabs and British alike; the establishment of a Palestinian secondary education of the highest standards. To serve this purpose, the Department insisted on incorporating acclaimed local and international academics as members of the Board and as examiners for the matriculation and post-matriculation exams.

After initiating the matriculation exam, the Board sought the recognition of British, Egyptian, Lebanese and American universities, a prerequisite that necessitated a dragging
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8 De Bunsen’s Diary, 24 March 1948, De Bunsen’s Papers, held by De Bunsen’s widow.
correspondence with various universities. It was not only time consuming for the Department, it also forced it to work under British guidelines in order to parallel the University of London, Cambridge and Oxford Matriculation exams so that the students sitting for the exam could continue directly to British university education.

Palestine was not unique in this sense. Nigerian Grammar Schools in the early twentieth century operated on a British curriculum in order to receive government funding. Furthermore, so that their students could take the Cambridge and the College of Preceptors of London Matriculation Exams they were completely dependent on the guidance and direction of British Examining Boards. The Phelps-Stokes Commission of Inquiry on education in African states criticised the British bias in education and the complete disregard of local history, “if we asked about history, we soon discovered what happened in 1066, but of their own story nothing”. Mission and government schools rejected the commission’s recommendations to reform the British bias and to adjust the curriculum to fit local needs and culture and this trend continued until Nigerian independence in 1952. Kumar’s research shows an identical reality in Indian education under British rule.

This was not the case in Palestine. The matriculation syllabus was a product of joint efforts that included leading Arab educators, the exam could be taken in Arabic and part of the exam was dedicated to the history of the region and to Arab and Islamic history. The Board also corresponded with teachers and intellectuals about the content of the exam. Bloom, the Board’s secretary, consulted Arab literature teachers regarding the Arabic syllabus. In replying to his queries, teachers congratulated the board for this initiative and in their comprehensive letters highlighted the inclusion of modern poetry and literature and the unjust marginalisation of the

9 See correspondence with the Egyptian University, which recognised the Palestine Matriculation in 1942, 250092, ISA, for correspondence with UCL see CO 859/84/ 8,9, NA, also in Tibawi, Arab Education, 111-112 10A. A. Adeyinka, “Major Trends”.
11Thomas Jesse Jones, Education in East Africa, XIX, 27, 67.
12Krishna Kumar, “Textbooks and Educational Culture”.
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Jahiliyya. One commented that the syllabus could lead to the separation between Muslim and Christian students with its over-emphasis on Islamic history and the Qur’an. The Board also consulted the historian Constantine Zurayk who advised it to widen the scope of the selected works in the syllabus.\textsuperscript{13} For history instruction, syllabus issues were debated either in the Board’s meetings, or in the History Sub Committee.

Since the Department never published a secondary school syllabus, the required content for the exam determined the content of the syllabus. The Department published this content every year in a booklet specifying all the requirements. Not all schools immediately gave up their own syllabi, however. The English High School for Girls, for example, continued to prepare their students for the Oxford and Cambridge Joint Board School Certificate Examination.\textsuperscript{14} French schools were very hesitant in conforming to British education. Due to the detonative relations between the empire and France during the early years of the mandate, any interference in the curriculum of the French schools triggered an immediate alarm and reached diplomatic ranks. This suspended their inclusion in the Matriculation exam. The need for a recognised school certificate enabling employment in government ranks changed this approach towards the government curriculum and government recognition. Nevertheless, in the French Catholic School in Jaffa and in Dame de Sion, this happened only in the late 1930s. Even then, the number of applicants for the Department’s exam was poor as the government continued to recognise the schools’ certificate for government jobs.\textsuperscript{15}

Otherwise, over the years, the vast majority of secondary schools joined ranks with the Department’s exam. Within this growing community, “no other subject of the curriculum

\textsuperscript{13} Munif al-din Zayd al-Kailani, Majdal Secondary School, to Bloom, 25 June 1943; Muhammad Rushdy al-Khayyat, Bir-Zeit College to Bloom, 20 June 1943, College Des Frères Jerusalem to Bloom, 28 June 1943; Constantine Zurayk to Bloom, 14 June 1943, 2497/41, ISA.

\textsuperscript{14} S. Emery’s report to the royal Commission 1936, S. Emery, Box 2, 150-151, MECA.

\textsuperscript{15} Ichilov, Between State and Church, 29–32, 119–122; Mona Hajjar Halaby, “School Days in Mandate Jerusalem at Dames de Sion”.
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attracted more attention or provoked more controversy” than history instruction. Indeed, history instruction was the most discussed topic in the PBHS as well. Therefore, that these discussions only resulted in minor revisions in the structure of the exam with no actual changes in its content is an oddity. Largely, Arab and Muslim history never went beyond 1492 and focused mostly on the Umayyad and Abbasid Caliphates. Modernity and modern times in the exams were attributed to Europe, and the outline of British history was the most contemporary. The 1941 exam, for example, examined the period 1789-1939. As discussed earlier, the exam excluded Arab and Muslim history from modern times. This exclusion of historical periods, however, was not the primal reason for resentment over the history paper.

The high-level and sometimes impossible demands of the exam were criticised by the secondary school principals. In their correspondence with Bloom, they considered the history matriculation exam “the most burdensome subject”, and there seemed to be a consensus that its scope should be limited and simplified. The students were “struggling with a history text and a dictionary” even with the simplified textbooks. One principal mentioned the Arab students’ intimidation by the exam and their refusal to take it due to its “severe demands”. The principal of St. Mary’s school protested that her students “are so busy cramming” for the exam that they had no time for original work. Thorenton-Duesbery, the principal of St. George’s, proposed to “popularise” the exam and for it to be “shouted from the housetops” that this certificate meant a government job and rank higher than any other exam.

18 History Matriculation Exams examined 1924, 1938-1943, National Library, Jerusalem and M2496/29, ISA.
19St. George’s Headmaster to Bloom, 10 July 1931, 2500/103, ISA; Headmaster Notre Dame De Sion to Bloom, 12 September 1936, Special Committee on Curricula and Examination, 2500/102 ibid.; S. H. Semple Scot’s College to Bloom, 18 July 1936, Ibid.; Headmaster of Terra Santa to Bloom, 15 July, 1936, ibid. W. A. Coate to Bloom, 1 March 1937, ibid.
In this correspondence, the content of the syllabus was not criticised; it was a non-issue. The concern was that there was just too much of it. However, if Anglican or missionary schools could be suspected as agents of the white man's burden with their pedagogical obedience, the nationalist schools set a fine example. The Rawda and al-Najah colleges, neither of which was represented in the PBHS, taught history and geography for matriculation in Arabic and English using Robinson’s textbook in English, although their students took the exam in Arabic. This was the case in institutions which emphasised their commitment to “true Arab education… so the student could obtain the morals of his glorious nation”. The brochures of Rawda and Najah both emphasised the validity of their certificates for admission to universities and their history syllabus remained loyal to the matriculation demands. Judging by the syllabus and use of Robinson and Breasted as textbooks, it seems that these schools made no nationalist attempt to contest the Department’s requirements and legitimate knowledge, nor did the other nationalist schools including the Jerusalemite al-Umma and al-Nahda Colleges. Moreover, these institutions had a stronger emphasis on English instruction than government schools, initiating it earlier in primary education with extensive weekly hours. The preference for English as language of instruction, although it was not mandatory, reflects a hierarchy in educational goals. They knew they were assessed primarily on their academic standards and ability to grant their graduates credentials that would enable them to climb up the employment ladder. The publication of the student pass list according to their schools in the Palestine Post and the Arab press every year made this a public issue.

21 Barnāmaj rawda al-ma‘ārif 1924-1925, 5; Barnāmaj al-Najāḥ 1938-1939, 4–5.
22 Barnāmaj rawda al-ma‘ārif 1924-1925, 8.
23 Khalil Totah, Arab Progress in Palestine, 14–16.
The secondary history syllabus leading to the matriculation exam was determined according to the requirements of the main institute to which it would send its graduates, the AUB. There were other universities in the region, but the AUB remained the most popular destination for Palestinian students throughout the mandate. There were 230 Palestinians at the AUB in 1936, and 336 in 1939. A number of the Department’s most senior members were amongst its graduates. This was due not only to its geographical proximity and scholarly prestige, but also its Anglo-Saxon Protestant traditions that fitted like a glove to those of the British. Bowman’s diaries reveal this proximity of hearts; he frequently visited the University and had a very close relationship with its principals. After one of his visits, Bowman noted that the AUB “has since [1860] developed into the most important & best of its kind in the near east... It is a wonderful place, with an excellent moral basis, without being at all “missionary” in the old fashioned sense”.

This connection to Beirut, rather than Cairo, determined the secondary history syllabus. It is no coincidence that the Palestine matriculation exam was based on two popular American textbooks that were previously used at AUB, written by two American rather than British historians, J.H. Robinson and J. H. Breasted. The adoption of Breasted’s book was also linked to Bowman’s great admiration for Breasted’s work; Bowman had heard him lecture and had met him a few times. Robinson’s textbook, the only reference to modern history in the Palestine matriculation, embodied the linear historical narrative of progress’ triumph and Western success. Needless to say that the Arabs were marginal in this narrative, sinking into oblivion around the time of the crusades. Robinson highlights the dreadful destiny of non-

24 Bowman’s testimony before the Royal Commission, 27 November 1936, 2/2/33, BM, MECA; Tibawi, Arab Education, 111.
25 Bowman’s diary, 27 February 1924, Bowman files, MECA.
26 Bowman’s diary, 1 April 1928 and 10 March 1929, ibid.
Muslims according to Islam and describes parts of their Qur’an as “dull and stupid to a modern reader”.  

The popularity of this work led to its early translation into Hebrew in 1926, and to its wide use in Hebrew secondary education. Although mentioned as playing “a most important part in the economic development in Europe”, Jews, like Arabs, have no significant role in history and are mostly mentioned for their “ill-starred” destiny. Indeed, both education systems adopted this textbook, not only for its clarity, but also for its historiographical trajectory.

The important difference in the Yishuv’s schools was that Robinson was translated and that history instruction was given strictly in Hebrew. General history instruction depended on Hebrew textbooks such as Brawer’s on ancient times, Tcherikover’s on ancient Greece and Rome or Rieger’s on the modern period. These books did not contest the framework of modern historicism, but still articulated closer consideration of Jewish history within it. Hebrew high schools were autonomous in determining their history syllabus since the central and important ones did not participate in the Department’s matriculation exam. Writing their own exams and regulated by the Va’ad and the Hebrew University, they produced a syllabus with a strong emphasis on Jewish and Zionist history intertwined with general history. Similar to the Department’s syllabus, its demands were academic, but devoid of the latter’s inconsistencies.

As in primary education, the Department’s exam syllabus presented the same hodgepodge of histories: European, British, Ancient Near Eastern, Palestinian and Arab or Jewish. Mastering all of the above was a great challenge for most students. Often, examiners were displeased with the level of answers in the exams. The examiner for the 1941 exam, Dr. M Burstein, noted that the knowledge of general history was poor. ‘Anabtawi reported that the
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candidates’ Arabic was full of mistakes and although “answers on the whole not bad, candidates could not in many cases differentiate between Gallipoli and Garibaldi”. One student wrote that “at about 200 BC, the Near East was populated by Semites together with some mountaineers”.31 The examiners’ high demands were hard to satisfy, resulting in a high percentage of failing candidates, over fifty percent, for the bulk of the mandate period.

According to Abd al-Qader, a graduate of this system, this burdensome syllabus made students memorise the curriculum with no attention to other topics and produced graduates who were highly ignorant of issues that did not concern their studies.32 Hanna Abu-Hanna, a student at the College during the 1940s, testified that while preparing for the matriculation exam, boarding students at the Arab College covered their windows with sheets so they could avoid curfew and continue studying during the night. One graduate of the college proudly stressed that the strict discipline and demands were just like Eton College.33

One could not understand the teaching of history in secondary schools, at an age in when students’ political and ideological consciousness is taking shape, without the hegemonic role of the history syllabus set by the PBHS. In the stressful preparation for the matriculation exam, the highlighting of nationalist values or moral historical lessons was negligible. For progressive nationalist educators, the medium was the message. Success in the exam was a nationalist aim in itself. For the colonial man on the spot, establishing an academic standard that paralleled their own education in Britain meant imperial success. Sending graduates, however few, of this system to the best universities in the UK was a realisation of a conscious or un-conscious passion, the production of natives that were identical to them, spoke their language and sought the promotion of their interests.

As we have seen, there was no simple dichotomy between ‘authentic’ nationalist and ‘imposed’ colonial pedagogy. The borders separating the two are vaguer and more complex than we might think. The criticism and controversy over the rigid policy of Latin instruction provides a good example.\(^{34}\)

**Sola Scriptura**

The students of the ‘Amiriyya school in Jaffa, who saw the Latin course as a redundant colonial imposition, proclaimed a boycott of the course and went on strike. The crisis left Tibawi, the DIE, “distressed”.\(^{35}\) According to Abd al-Qader, one of the reasons for the emphasis on Latin and Greek in high schools was Farrell’s passion for both subjects. Farrell even volunteered to teach curious students the course and allocated scholarships in British and American universities for the study of Greek and Latin. Bowman shared a love for Latin as well.\(^{36}\)

As part of the PBHS history sub-committee, George Hourani, philosophy and Latin teacher at the Arab College, suggested the removal of Latin from the curriculum due to students’ poor achievements, lack of motivation and its “not altogether appealing” literature. Instead of the coercion of ancient languages and history, Hourani underlined the essential value of modern history, to which Hourani attributed therapeutic features making Arab students aware of the connection between the contemporary and the modern and its influences on the Arabs. Hourani warned that “for lack of experience our former students tend to adopt extreme views on these subjects or to ignore them altogether”. This can be done by “explaining the impact of Western ideas on the Arabs and enabling Arab students to adopt a *sound attitude* towards them”.\(^{37}\)

---
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35 A. L. Tibawi, Report on Education in the Southern District of Palestine February 1941- October 1945, submitted to the Palestine Director of Education, 1 May 1946, Tibawi, Box 3/5, 26-27, MECA. Another example of criticism on Latin instruction at the Arab College in the early 1940s in, Davis, “Commemorating Education.”
36Bowman’s autobiography is filled with Latin quotes and poetry, Bowman, *Middle-East Window*, 22–23.
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Khalidi, however, objected to the omission of Latin from the curriculum, arguing that it had “raised the level of studies in the college” and helped the students understand and appreciate the inner meanings of the English language. The objection to the study of Latin, Khalidi maintained, was initially an “artificial movement” from Jaffa, “encouraged by parents and the press” and initiated by boys who were not fit to sit in advanced secondary classes. The poor results in Latin were due to an “intentional” neglect of the subject by students who chose it as their sixth topic for the matriculation exam. However, he concluded, the failure itself could not become a reason for abolishing Latin as suggested by Dr. Hourani, as similar results had been obtained in geography and no one suggested its abolition.38

In his revised syllabus, Hourani also stressed the need to increase the engagement with Arab history. Hourani stressed that far from being “‘hot-beds of nationalism’… the Government schools turned out boys and girls who were ignorant of the history of the Arabs. They studied far less of it than English boys did of English history or Jewish boys of Jewish history. No defence is required of the thesis that youths should know the history of their own country. But it may be added that our students would be more eager to study Greek and European civilization if they felt that their own history was not neglected”. Since the syllabus was already “overcrowded”, this addition should come at the expense of the Roman period, “the parent of Western Europe” and basis for Western European countries, a history that was “not valid” for Palestine.39

Khalidi had a different view on nationalist education. A prolific writer of Arab history, Khalidi was very cautious regarding the implications of over emphasising the scope of Arab history in the existing syllabus, considering it “more satisfactory” than Hourani’s proposal, which he therefore rejected.40 In Khalidi’s suggestion for the history syllabus, Arab and modern

38 Ahmad Samih Khalidi to Bloom, 29 December 1946, PBHS, History Sub-Committee, 2498/67, ISA.
39 Dr. George Hourani to Bloom, December 1946, PBHS, History Sub-Committee, ISA, 2498/67.
40 Khalidi is also mentioned as the most enthusiastic supporter of the conference of the Muslim Clubs at Jaffa, in April 1928, Zu‘aytir, Bawākīr, 28–29.
history still received one year each out of four (from fifth to eighth secondary). Khalidi objected to Hourani’s omission of Roman and Medieval history so that ample room would remain for Arab and modern history. His objection stemmed from his insistence on the teaching of history as a continuous linear narrative.

Yet this was not due to Khalidi’s estrangement from nationalism, but a complex interpretation of it. Khalidi was a “stentorian voice and strong presence. He turned his educational theories into a way of life and so would accept nothing from his students but the pursuit of knowledge and distinction as a relentless patriotic tenet”.41 For Khalidi, “the General of Education in Palestine”42, patriotism was not in contrast with what he saw as his educational responsibility. Abu-Hanna recalls how once Jamal al-Husseini invited them to a demonstration in the city and Khalidi waited for them at the gate, stating that anyone who left to demonstrate would not be able to come back.43 After the October 1933 mass demonstrations, Khalidi closed the college after his students went on strike and refused to enter classes.44

Moreover, his patriotism did not prevent him from maintaining a close friendship with Bowman himself, who for his part appreciated him. Such relationships took their toll in some political circles.45 Bowman trusted Khalidi for his uncompromising stand against what he described as the politicisation of education. After the tense summer of 1929, Bowman wrote that Khalidi was “holding it like a knot day after day. Wonderful when one gets really strong Arab, far better than Englishmen: but no doubt Ahmad Samih Khalidi [is] not pure Arab. Turkish blood, perh[aps]. European? Fine type anyhow of oriental. Wish we had more like

41Jabrā, The First Well, 185; Zu’aytir, Bawākīr, 28–29.
42 A published interview held on 6 June 1945, concluding twenty years of Khalidi’s educational career at the Arab College, published 16 June 1945, 105/73/64-65, HA.
43Hanna Abu Hanna (b. 1928), Interview, Haifa, 10 September 2013.
44 Bowman’s diary, 29 October 5 November 1933, Bowman files, MECA.
45 Al-Jāmi‘ah al-‘arabiyah, 8 March 1934, and entries in Bowman’s diary, 29 October 1933 and 8 March 1934, ibid.
him”. Bowman attributed all the success and stability of the College during turbulent times to Khalidi’s administration and leadership.46

The incident illustrates the problematic one-dimensional concept of national education and its attributes. Hourani, a British Oxford graduate of Arab descent, taught his courses in English, spoke English to his students, and made an effort to expose them to Western culture, playing classical music records on a gramophone, giving short lectures on the musical pieces and sometimes bringing English books for the students to read.47 Yet it was Hourani who proposed the emphasis on modern and Arab history and the removal of Latin, and Khalidi who opposed it.48 Khalidi’s extensive writing on both education in the Western world and Arab history illustrate his progressive educational nationalism; he was a proud Arab nationalist, devoted to the modernisation of Palestine through education. If extensive teaching of Arab history came at the expense of Western wisdoms such as Latin or Roman history, he would be the first to oppose it.

These examples of progressive nationalist education were not unique to Khalidi or Palestine. Secondary education in Iraq and Egypt put similar emphasis on English instruction at the expense of Arabic instruction in some cases. In addition, the available syllabi suggest that secondary history instruction in Iraq and Egypt also confined Arab history to its golden age, giving over the study of modern contemporary times to European history.49

In Palestine as in the rest of the Arab world, leading universities were still temples of western knowledge and they were the ones setting the standard of secondary education. However, the writing of this temple of knowledge into the history syllabi by nationalist

46 Bowman’s diary, 20 October 1929, ibid.; Bowman, Middle-East Window, 263.
47 Najm, Dār, 4.
48 Ibid., 3. Hanna Abu Hanna (b. 1928), Interview, Haifa, 10 September 2013.
educators was not a coercive act of colonial dominance. It reflected a complex pedagogical discourse that combined, along with perceptions of practicalities and prestige, a belief in the existence and importance of a ‘correct’ body of historical knowledge that despite its detachment from the nation’s history, was nonetheless considered inextricable from proper education. In light of these examples, the concept of national authenticity in education deserves a more flexible interpretation in which supposedly foreign wisdoms are authenticated, invited to participate as well in the construction of a new Arab identity. The next chapter focuses on the learning experience of the students that studied in these schools and their interpretation of this authenticity.
Staging Modernity, Nationalism and Prestige

Debate Club of the Jaffa National Christian Orthodox School, 1935.50
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George Hourani teaching Latin, Arab College 1940s52
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The student board of the English Club, al-Najah, 1938.\textsuperscript{53}

School Staff, Friends Boys’ School, 1930 (The principal Khalil Totah, sitting second from the right).\textsuperscript{54}

Khalid ibn al-Walid football team with trainer, Rawdat al-Ma’arif, 1932 (Haj Amin al-Husseini at the centre).\textsuperscript{55}
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\textsuperscript{54} Madrasat frendz lil-ṣibyān, Ramallah, 1930. 
\textsuperscript{55} Majallat Rawdat al-Ma’arif, 5, no. 1, 19 December 1932, 5.
Chapter Seven: Learning history

The objective of this chapter is the assessment of students’ history learning and the examination of the place and role of history instruction through diverse educational methodologies beyond regular class instruction. Completing the previous chapter about teaching history, focusing on the subject from the pedagogic and administrative level, this chapter focuses on the students’ experience of historical education and their interpretation of the material they were taught.

The available sources for this dimension, school journals, testimonies and memoirs are scarce and problematic. Apart from all the obvious challenges of using them as an historical document, testimonies and memoirs, given or written decades after the actual school experience, rarely contain specific recollections of history instruction. School journals, especially in Arabic, are products of elite secondary schools and therefore represent only a fraction of the education system. Moreover, the essays published in such journals were written by a limited number of students and reflect the choice of the newspaper’s editor and probably the principal’s censorship. In any case, the essays reflect the dominant pedagogic discourse in school translated by the students and reproduced on the pages of the school’s journal. Mapping this mechanism of knowledge transfer seeks to illuminate the educational process as a whole. This is why the student’s voice is crucial for the understanding of the educational system; a critical examination of it reveals the bulk of its DNA.

In the fifth chapter, we discussed briefly the central role of history beyond the history class, its appearance in various courses and circumstances. However, history was not confined to taught courses or the school environment; as an educational product, history was everywhere. Here as well, there was a noticeable imbalance between the Arab and Hebrew students. As we shall see, the Hebrew student’s exposure to history education was much greater and institutionalised than that of his Arab neighbour.
Inventing a Secularised Educational Calendar

The invention of new secularised calendars was an essential tool to all nationalist movements in history. Modern education has a central role in disciplining the society to believe, rejoice and mourn its national history through a cyclical, repetitive calendar of celebrations. Children, before acquiring the ability to read and regardless of their emotional or intellectual development, become a part of a collective through these rituals and commemorations. As summarised by Hatina, commemoration “grants internal cohesion and historical significance, provides a psychological conduit of endurance, formulates a vision, and defines the distinctiveness of a specific group or community in comparison with others”.¹

The secularised version of the Jewish calendar offered various historical events. Charged with a secular national interpretation, the Jewish holidays were commemorated in all schools and extensive teaching time was allotted to tell their story and rituals. Although the historical interpretation of the holiday varied in the different educational trends, its common features and shared cyclic commemoration had a salient role in forging a shared imagined historical consciousness.

The connection between the traditional and the secular-national became non-detachable. As Margalit Rubovitz, a sixth grader from Evelina de Rothschild (EDR) wrote, “We now celebrate Hanuka… Before our eyes after thousands of years of exile, the bitter and courageous period, that resulted with the Candle Festival (Ḥag ha-nerot)… There are no heroes like the heroes of Israel and the Maccabeans… Hanuka is an exemplary holyday, a symbol of heroism and defence of the chosen people”.²

The Teachers’ Council for the Keren Kayemet (JNF, est. 1925), an independent organisation, had great influence on formal and non-formal Hebrew education, especially in

¹ Meir Hatina, Martyrdom in Modern Islam, 176.
the field of celebrations and commemorations, the backbone of Zionist education according to the council. The pedagogic discussions of the Council gave birth to a formalised commemoration of each festival. Its publications included detailed manuals for every celebration: what texts to read, how to decorate the class, how to stage the rituals and more.³

The educational instrumentalisation of the Muslim or Christian calendars was different. Similarly to Jewish schools, the Muslim and Christian religious calendars received ample attention in the curriculum. However, Muslim and Christian holidays were charged with a religious-traditional historicity, rather than a modern one, that was shared by all Muslims and Christians all over the world. Moreover, the religious divide between Arabs prevented or undermined the possibility of secularising the traditional calendar and turning it into a shared imagined historical consciousness.

Sorek examines the role of political calendars and shared martyrrology in the emergence of a Palestinian particularism. Sorek follows Yazbak’s work on the mawasim, Nebi Musa, Nabi Rubin, Nabi Saleh and the celebrations of mawlid al-nabi (the Prophet’s birthday), stressing their shift from local religious events into politicised national events transcending religious divides.⁴ The historical education in these cases, again not an institutionalised one, remained a side effect in these events. Mass pilgrimage to a holy site, especially when politicised, could strengthen the historical connection to the land and the notion of national collectivity. However, these events did not find their way into the curriculum or to the national calendar. Thus, their role as agents of historical consciousness remained active only as long as they were happening and relevant mainly to the active participants.

The religious-traditional calendar was only one of the historical timelines utilised by the school. Modern historical events, particularly those that occurred during the mandate gave birth
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³ Shoshana Sitton, Ḥinukh be-ruḥ ha-molede, 135–174.
⁴ Mahmoud Yazbak, “The Muslim Festival”; Tamir Sorek, “Calendars, Martyrs”.
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to new invented traditions. The Arab community commemorated the date of the Balfour declaration, 2 November, every year until the end of the mandate with varied intensity. Some schools would shut down for the day and in others, students went on strike. This was a commemoration as national protest against British policy, charged every year with different political meanings and in some years, it unified the bulk of the urban Arab community in Palestine. Since the commemoration took shape as a protest, it failed to institutionalise as a governmental administrative tradition and although students played a central role in it, most schools did not.

Mainly in urban schools, some students remember being encouraged by their teachers to demonstrate on 2 November. However, a few interviewees noted that the students had very limited understanding of why they were protesting, as the issue was not seriously addressed in school. A student from the Akka Secondary School recalls how instead of shouting “yasqūṭ wa’d balfūr” (down with the Balfour Declaration) they would shout “yasqūṭ wāḥid min fawq” (down with someone from above) while marching under the city’s balconies as a joke. A few schools encouraged the local organisation of students and discussed the demonstrations and their importance in the classroom, but those were an exception.

2 November, the first Palestinian national commemorative day, embodied and canonised the connection between victimhood (in this case of imperialism) and righteousness in Palestinian nationalism. In terms of historical consciousness, commemorating this day shook
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5 Iḥsān ʿAbbās, Ghurbat al-rāʾ, 88.
6 This comment came from a student at Rawdat al-Maʿarif, Ibrahim Jamil Al-Daqâq (b. 1929). Interview, Jerusalem, 12 September 2013.
7 Shukri Arraf (b. 1931), interview, Miʿilya, 27 November 2012. This chant followed the Palestinian AUB students to the annual march in Beirut. Yusef Sourji remembers himself marching through the Jewish quarters, hoping to meet beautiful Jewish girls, chanting, “tasqūṭ wāḥidah min fawq” (“Let a girl fall down from above!”), Yusef Sourji (b. 1926), interview, Nazareth, 3 December 2012.
the foundations of British education in Palestine as it questioned the mandate’s historical right. However, British objection to the commemoration along with the weakness or absence of a central leadership and in some cases the objection of some Arab educators to the protest, compromised its potential in becoming a sustainable unifying event, beyond sporadic demonstrations and strikes in the urban centres.

The Yishuv’s institutions invested great energies, and were very efficient in inventing traditions and giving them an educational rationale. The combination of an autonomous education system, a dynamic civil society and overall a conviction in a formulated educational historical ethos, practically wrapped the Hebrew student in historical lessons and historical consciousness. Dror argued that “mutually supportive [educational] devices” enabled this education. A combination of formal and non-formal educational institutions (especially youth movements) was responsible for the creation of the Zionist “civil religion”.

History was widely instrumentalised by youth movements to stress and emphasise their ideology. While the role of youth movements in Zionist education has been extensively studied, it is worth comparing a few of its features with Arab non-formal education, while focusing on non-formal history instruction.

Similarly to the 2 November commemoration, the Yishuv adopted the traumatic events of Tel-Hai (a small agricultural settlement in the upper Galilee where eight Jewish settlers were killed in a battle against a group of local Arabs on 1 March 1920), as an ethos of victimhood, righteousness and an historical myth of heroic martyrdom. The revolution in the Tel-Hai myth was the shift from the Jewish martyrdom, “to die to sanctify God’s name to willingness to die to sanctify the homeland”. Yom Tel-Hai, Tel-Hai day, became the first national memorial-
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10 A comprehensive survey on all the youth movements operating in Palestine can be found in, Mordechay Naor, Tenu‘ot ha-no‘ar.
11 Anita Shapira, Herev ha-yonah, 141–156.
day in modern Palestine. The educational commemoration of Tel-Hai, initiated a short while after the bloody event, is only one example of the “mutually supportive devices” that established a holistic historical education. The story of Tel-Hai became the subject of various literary publications that turned it into a legend, giving the story an a-historic dimension in which its martyrs were resurrected on different occasions, unrelated to Tel-Hai, to voice their vision. Josef Trumpeldor, the hero martyr of Tel-Hai, entered the pantheon of mythologised Jewish heroes such as Bar-Kokhva and Yehuda Hamaccabi, strengthened the historical connection between ancient Jewish history in Palestine and its contemporary existence, thus establishing a unified canon of heroic folklore. The Tel-Hai myth was learned and commemorated in schools with a “cultic ceremony” and given due weight in all contemporary educational publications. The educational process was completed by ideological discussions in the youth movement’s club followed by local ceremonies, and finally with the pilgrimage to Tel-Hai and the commemoration of the myth and its ethos with a ceremony. The inauguration of the Roaring Lion monument in 1934 monumentalised the story of Tel-Hai and turned it into a pilgrimage site. The monument became the symbol of the historical ethos and stood at the centre of the Tel-Hai rite.

**Knowing the Land**

Tel-Hai was only one event in the educational calendar that sought the structuring of a new national historical time-line. Its inculcation into the student’s historical consciousness involved working on all his senses. Field trips, conducted by both the youth movements and schools, were central in Zionist education. The fascination with knowing the land stemmed from Zionism’s vision of re-territorialisation of the Jews, redeeming them from the de-territorialised
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14 Jacob Shavit and Shoshana Sitton, *Staging and Stagers*, 76–78.
exile of endless wandering. Touring the land enabled a direct physical contact between man and land; assimilating in its paths, mountains, lakes and historical ruins was a manifestation of his desire.\textsuperscript{15}

National historical sites were the aim of these trips in most cases and carrying a bible as a guidebook was common. These field trips, often depicted as challenging and adventurous, were carried out as part of a written educational rationale so that the historical lessons would be accurate. The field trip became a critical addition to the history class in school and the physical encounter with history along with creative activities such as role-playing of historical figures turned history into a personal vivid experience.

The mere sight of or presence at an historical site was sometimes depicted as a mystical experience. One student wrote about her intense emotional experience while visiting the Wailing Wall, “like a magical rope tying my heart to the ancient wall… my soul longs for it…” Another student wrote how the wall remembers its own tragic and joyful history and one day it will tell all the memories and events it saw.\textsuperscript{16} When Asher Rivlin went on a field trip with his class in Jerusalem, he saw the ancient city coming back to life before his eyes.\textsuperscript{17} Another student spoke of the emotional experience while visiting the flourishing Judea Jewish settlements, where once the wilderness ruled. She expresses hope to become a farmer.\textsuperscript{18}

The Masada historical myth of heroism and sacrifice, according to Ben-Yehuda, began its “tour of duty” with the long field trips to the historical site conducted by youth movements. While trips to Masada started in the 1920s, and its historical significance received ample attention in the movements’ publications and activities from the late 1920s, it became a popular pilgrimage site for youth movements only in the early 1940s. The trip was preceded by a five-

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Benenu}, March 1936, 5-56.
\textsuperscript{18} \textit{The School Magazine}, 1936, 18-19.
\end{flushleft}
day seminar dedicated to the study of topography and history transforming the field trip into an historical journey. Masada’s ethos of Jewish heroism and independence became highly relevant during the war years. The connection between the historical ethos and the call for duty was embodied in the recruitments for the Palmach conducted by the movements’ leaders on the mountain’s top.

Field trips with a similar educational rationale are mentioned in the annals of the Arab College. Khalil Totah used to take the students to historical field trips in Jerusalem and its surroundings and during the winter break, a five-day field trip to the Dead Sea area was held and as mentioned before, Darwish al-Miqdadi saw field trips as an integral part of the history class. As a history teacher, he took his students on long field trips in Palestine, Transjordan and Syria.

While hiking, Miqdadi emphasised the historical heritage of the sites, especially the Christian and Muslim ones, often quoting verses from the New Testament or Arab sources. In his long essay “A Trip in Syria”, Miqdadi crosses the artificial boarders (ḥudūd ʾiṣṭināʾīyah) within his “beloved Syria”. Although Miqdadi quotes from the bible as well, he intentionally overlooks Jewish history. Jewish settlements are mentioned as colonies that rose on the ruins of the native villages. Miqdadi encourages the patriotic man to travel around his country, Syria.

Ziadeh, who joined Miqdadi on these trips, wrote about them in the College’s journal and continued the tradition when he became a history teacher at the institute. “You will not love your homeland unless you read it with your feet” he used to say to his students. Rawdat al-
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19 Shapira, Herev ha-yonah, 427.
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23 Najm, Dār, 43.
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Ma’arif had similar traditions of field trips that were later reported by the students in the school’s journal. Stories about visits to sites of historical Arab heritage were juxtaposed with descriptions of new Jewish settlements and loss of Arab land. Thus, descriptions of school trips were transformed into “tools for political action”.

In general, however, field trips were rare in Arab education in Palestine and most of my interviewees testified that they never took part in them. When field trips were conducted they usually reflected a different educational rationale. Field trips organised by the Christian missionary schools usually focused on Christian historical or religious sites. At the elementary level, this corresponded with a curriculum loyal to the particular congregation. Students in French Catholic schools in particular remember a strong bias towards French geography and history and a marginalisation of Arab history and culture. Suleiman Jubrail from the first secondary class at Bishop Gobat School (BGS) shared his camping experience in the school journal: “We stood and began to pray to God and what an awful silence there was… As soon as I stood at the entrance of our bed tent I looked around and saw the two sacred cities, Bethlehem and Jerusalem – the birth cave and death grave of Christ”. The various issues of the BGS’s journal are filled with reports on scouting activities. This one is a rare occasion in which the description goes beyond the trip. Jubrail mentions the sites, but attaches no historical depiction. Saleh Ahmad Sakik from the third secondary grade at BGS wrote about the field trip to the river of Jarisha. Sakik does mention that they went (only) to “let their souls breadth the air” (tarwīḥ al-nafs), but then mentions singing nationalist songs for the love of the

25 Greenberg, “Majallat Rawdat Al-Ma’arif.”
27 Sarūjī, Min murūj, 44–46.
homeland (ḥubb al-waṭan). Still, no national value was attributed to the trip itself and emotional descriptions as the ones one finds in Zionist education are rare.

Nimer Murqus in his highly critical recollections of his experience at the Akka Secondary School wrote: “And what did we know of our homeland after graduating…? Knowledge from maps and what we learned from textbooks. We knew and memorised its cities. We knew and memorised the names of its mountains and plains, but we never climbed on its soil and did not cover our feet with dust while walking on it… We learned something about the history of this beloved place that bears the name Palestine and about its archaeological sites, and its holy sites. But we visited none of these sites or places, and did not see them with our eyes but only through pictures… the aim of the rare school trips was to breathe some air”, stating that as students they did not know the neighbouring villages, let alone places of lesser proximity to Akka.

Scouting the Land

There were exceptions to Murqus’ disillusioned retrospect. Field trips and camping were central in the educational methodology of the Palestine Scout Movement, with its roots in the late Ottoman period and zenith in the mid-1930s; a Palestinian branch of the Baden-Powell movement was established in 1920. Bowman served as County Commissioner of Scouts since its inception until he left Palestine, and based on his diary, a strong personal connection emerges between him and the movement. When Baden-Powell visited Palestine in 1921, Bowman personally organised the welcoming rallies and mentioned he felt “very intimate” with Baden-Powell. Bowman personally attended the camps, personally travelled to the

29 See also, “Rihlah al-sāf al-thānī al-thānawī il’ā nahr al-jirīshah”, ibid, 3-5.
30 Najm, Dār, 42–43. See also Labib Dajani, “A Trip to the Citadel”, The Bishop Gobat School News, April to July 1937, 8-10.
31 Nimr Murqus, Aqwá min al-nisyān, 72–73. See also Nimer Murqus (b. 1930), interview, Kafr Yasif, 11 December 2012.
32 Bowman’s diary, 8 April 1921, Bowman files, MECA.
movement’s seminars, identified with the movement’s ideals and considered it an educational calling.\textsuperscript{33} During the ten days’ training camp in September 1924 Bowman told the campers, he was “no longer mudir al-maaref, but just their elder brother and scoutmaster” and mentions having personal heart to heart talks in his tent with all the participants.\textsuperscript{34} The rapid growth and relatively wide spread of the movement in Palestine is undoubtedly thanks to Bowman’s commitment.

Apart from Bowman, a staff that was mostly Arab led the movement and like him, they were fully committed to the movement’s ideals. By 1936, their cooperation and enthusiasm led to the establishment of one hundred scout troops with 3,187 scouts, headed by 167 scouters.\textsuperscript{35} During the late 1920s, private schools began establishing their own private scout troops. Those established within the mission schools were local initiatives usually directly tied to the church or linked to Baden Powell’s movement, as in the case of the St. George’s School troop, while those operating in the SMC’s schools often had a stronger nationalist bias and were used for ceremonial purposes and marches organised by the Council.\textsuperscript{36} Scouts headed the funerals of national leaders with their flags, songs and bands and were active during the mawasim as well.\textsuperscript{37} Still, in March 1935 after attending a scouts’ rally in the Muslim Sports Club in Jaffa, Bowman wrote that the scouts were still loyal, although the Mufti was trying to establish a rival national movement.\textsuperscript{38}

\textsuperscript{33} In November 1923, Bowman was made Camp Chief of Palestine, “an honour which I feel I am very far from deserving... but I am enthusiastic, and a real believer in the good of the movement”, Bowman’s diary, 8 August, 21 November, 1923, ibid.
\textsuperscript{34} Bowman’s diary, 24 September, 1924, ibid.
\textsuperscript{35} Arnon Degani, “They Were Prepared”; Another source mentions that the movement had 3,344 members, Abdulqadir, “British Educational Policy,” 246–247.
\textsuperscript{36} The St. George’s School Magazine 1, vol. 6, Christmas Term, 1929, 11-15, the school’s magazine published articles about the troops’ popularity and activity with no nationalist themes mentioned, Gordon Boutagy, Scoutmaster, “Our Scouts”, St. George’s Magazine 2, vol. 6, Summer term 1930, 18–20.
\textsuperscript{37} Jabrā, The First Well, 52–53; Uri M. Kupferschmidt, The Supreme Muslim Council, 233–234; Doar Hayom, 5 August 1934; al-Jami’ah al-Arabiyyah, 5 August 1935.
\textsuperscript{38} Bowman’s diary, 3 March 1935, Bowman files, MECA.
Indeed, colonialism perceived scouts’ troops as another tool to enhance the obedience of the native population. In all cases, this policy backfired, as the movement usually turned against colonial rule. From the mid-1930s, local scout troops directly engaged in the burning issues of the Zionist-Arab conflict, and Hebrew newspapers published articles about the increasing nationalist tendencies in the scout movement. Scouts were reported as uniting against land sales, touring the coasts, spotting illegal immigrant ships, and independently arresting illegal Jewish immigrants and bringing them to trial.

Degani rightly mentions that Bowman gave his extensive scouting experience only one line in his long published memoir. He was probably devastated by the manner in which, as he saw it, his creation turned against its own values during the Arab Revolt. It was Bowman who issued the ban prohibiting the wearing of the movement’s uniform due to scouts’ active participation in the first year of the revolt.

The Arab Revolt was the movement’s historical watershed, its greatest manifestation of power. Scouts, one of the few organised youth apparatuses in the Arab localities, not only led demonstrations but also enforced the strike, engaged in violent attacks on Jews on the roads and in the mixed cities and helped in the organisation of local armed groups. This activity was not confined to the Arab town. Organised scouts troops crossed the lines and entered Jewish settlements in order to convince workers not to break the strike. This presence of organised youth groups in uniform triggered great alarm in the Yishuv that protested to the High Commissioner about the troubling issue: “These nice youngsters are walking around freely, wearing uniform within the borders of Hebrew settlements while the agitation increases”.
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Furthermore, news about clandestine military training of scouts for the establishment of a future army were published. In later years, the Arab scouts attracted the attention of the Shai as well, following the activity of all the troops in the country, and filing reports about the “young radical enthusiast[s]” that headed them. Shimoni, a central figure in the Yishuv’s intelligence, depicted the movement in 1947 as “undoubtedly extremely nationalist” and pan-Arabist.

While Jewish students were active in the Haganah since its establishment with a growing involvement after 1929, the Revolt had increased and formalised the role of students in its ranks. In the summer of 1939, the Hebrew Education Department authorised the incorporation of pre-military education as an integral part of the high schools’ curriculum through physical training. It was called ḥagam, an abbreviation for hinukh gafani mugbar, extended physical training. In the following year, the Haganah’s headquarters, which had been using student volunteers since its establishment, formalised the draft of 16- (later 15-) year olds to the organisation. Soon enough, clandestine military training courses started with a comprehensive physical and ideological curriculum. By 1945, the Haganah’s Gadna (an abbreviation for gedude no’ar, youth battalions) and the ḥagam included approximately 12,000 participants.

Accounts of this historical shift that usually attribute it to the violent confrontation during the Arab Revolt and the repercussions of the Second World War overlook the reciprocity in this process. The advent of organised Arab youths fully committed to a national cause and their invasion of the Jewish public sphere played a central role in the Yishuv’s enhancement of youth militarisation. This worked both ways. Field trips by Jewish schools and youth movements

45 Davar reported that there were rumours of Syrian militants arriving to Palestine to train a future army based on the scouts movement, Davar, 5 August, 1935. See also report on armed military training of scouts at Hula and Tirah, ibid., 29 October 1935, 10 March 1936.
46 ‘Itonay (reporter), 3 February 1945, 8’klali/7 (scanned file), HA; “ha-Tsosim ha-‘arvim be-e”y”, 7 October 1945, see also 105/162, HA.
47 Shimoni, ‘Arve erets-yišra’el, 376.
48 David Dayan, Ken, anahnu no’ar!, 21–85.
often intentionally passed through Arab settlements, and marching fearlessly in all parts of the
country was another way to reflect physical dominance through the appropriation of
landscape.\textsuperscript{49} From an early stage, Zionist institutions were aware of the politically detonative
potential of these trips. In April 1920 the Bureau of Information, for example, reported that the
teacher Zuta and his students climbed to the top of the Mount Hermon and raised a flag, a deed
that caused much bitterness in the Sharifian camp.\textsuperscript{50} One of these trips during Passover 1924
attracted the attention of an Arab man travelling from Nablus to Tulkarm and witnessed, “A
large battalion of young immigrant Jewish girls and boys walking to Nablus, we travelled for
a long time until we reached its end. At first, we thought that they were about to conquer Nablus
by force of arms… The next morning I met large companies of young girls and boys returning
from Nablus, each company with its own leader guiding them, giving lectures.\ldots This is a
small example of the Jewish solidarity, unity, order and discipline to their leaders prevailing
among them, following them with devotion and shut eyes… And we? What means do we Arabs
have to defend ourselves against all this? … If we learned from the ways of the Jews living
among us and did as they do, we would only benefit from it”.\textsuperscript{51} The sight of the marching
organised masses left a strong impression on the writer and instantly triggered introspective
national questions. Tahir Qalyoubi (b. 1929), a student at the ‘Amirīyah secondary school in
Jaffa, mentioned the establishment of an independent scout troop by the students, after Farrell
had shut down the school’s troop for participating in a demonstration, initiated after watching
Jewish youths walking around with their khaki shorts and white hats, getting to know their
land. “We did the same thing,” he noted, camping and hiking across the country.\textsuperscript{52} It was no

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{49} Shapira, \textit{Herev ha-yonah}, 368–369.
\item \textsuperscript{50} Report from 1 April 1920, Booklet 1459/21-22, Shneorson’s files, HA.
\item \textsuperscript{51} The article was originally published in \textit{Filastin} and later translated into Hebrew, \textit{Doar Hayom}, 29 April 1924.
\item \textsuperscript{52} Tahir Qalyoubi (b. 1929), interviewed by Said ‘Ajjawi, Amman, November 3, 2007,
\end{footnotes}
coincidence that the Sport Festival (al-mihrajān al-riyāḍī), the first of its kind in Palestine in which the Arab scouts played a central role, took place in Jaffa during the summer of 1935, three months after the 1935 Maccabiah. For the Yishuv, the Maccabiah was a manifestation of Jewish strength and unity. Zionist symbols, especially flags, were celebrated with monumental parades in the streets of Tel-Aviv. For the Arabs, primarily the Husseini’s party that organised the event, it signified a nationalist reply of the same magnitude as the Maccabiah did for the Jews and the British. The festival, organised by a group of educators, was opened with a parade of fifty Bedouins riding their horses while carrying Arab flags; the presence of the Mufti provided prestige to the event. Al-Jami‘ah al-‘Arabiyah published articles about the national importance of the festival and the obligation to respect and sanctify the national flag raised during the event. As argued by Harte, the diverse nationalist activities of the Arab scouts were deeply rooted in historical consciousness. Troops were named after the national Arab Islamic conquerors such as Abu ‘Ubaida (Tulkarm), Usama (ibn Zayd, Qalqilya), Sa‘d ibn Abi Waqqas and Umar al-Farouq (Gaza) and Al-Muthanna ibn Haritha (Safed), visited historical sites on their field trips and staged plays with historical themes. Unfortunately, there is no record of publications of these troops. The only surviving written publications about scouting are those authored by Fawzi al-Nashashibi, a teacher at the Rushidiya and one of Bowman’s intimate partners in leading the scout movement (when Bowman told Nashashibi that he was about to leave Palestine, Nashashibi burst into tears). Nashashibi wrote seven guidebooks for the government scouts and according to Degani almost all lack the national historical connection and were heavily influenced by the a-political Baden-Powell literature.

54 Issam Khalidi, “Coverage of Sports News in Filastin”; Issam Khalidi, “Ḥusayn ḥusnī, rā‘id”.
56 Ibid., 18 July 1935.
57 Some troops were also named after contemporary national Arab leaders; the Lydda troop was named after Faysal and the Silwan troop after King Ghazi, al-Jami‘ah al-‘Arabiyah, 7 January 1934.
58 Harte, “Contesting the Past.”
59 24 September 1924, 21 April 1930, 23 April 1934, Bowman’s diary, Bowman files, MECA.
60 Degani, “They Were Prepared.”
establish a united independent national movement sought to remedy these a-political tendencies. At the conference held in Jaffa in 1934 an attempt was made to disengage from government control, change its flag and constitution, appoint King Ghazi as Chief Scout and unite all Palestinian scouts under an independent national leadership. Nashashibi tried to speak against this union and in favour of Baden Powell but his speech was interrupted by the crowd and his motion was denied unanimously. This incident symbolises the tension between the government scouts and the independent troops, one that was not resolved until the end of the mandate. The Arab scouts’ short years of glory (1934-1936) heralded the movement’s decline. The efforts to unite the movement under a national independent leadership failed, and local government troops, representing the bulk of the movement, suffered a severe blow during the Revolt. Their rebellious activity turned the movement into a hot potato for British administrators and no one succeeded to Bowman’s enthusiasm and commitment.

The movement renewed its activity only after the war and nominated Fawzi al-Nashashibi as its new chief scout. Gradually it regained its pre-Revolt numbers and magnitude reaching 10,000 scouts in November 1947. The organisational skills and experience of its members served as a basis for the semi-military youth organisations the Futuwwa and Nejjada established in the late 1940s. However, the fractured, volatile characteristics of the movement frustrated its educational potential. The quick rise and fall of locally motivated scout troops prevented the crucial continuity needed for a profound educational process. If indeed, “memory survives only in repetition”, in regard to the dissemination and inculcation of an historical consciousness, the intriguing history of the Arab scout movement remains marginal in the wider picture of Arab education during the mandate. This was in sharp contrast with the Jewish youth movements, the Hagam and Gadna. All Jewish youth movements were supported by

61 Al-Jami‘ah al-‘Arabiyyah, 7 January 1934; Davar, ibid.
62 Davar, 7 January 1934.
63 Kabha, ha-Palestînim, 72.
64 Hillel Cohen, Good Arabs, 53.
institutions that were able not only to maintain their activity throughout the mandate (most are operating to this day), but invested great energy in producing educational material of varied methodologies to widen their circles of influence within their own movement and the Jewish community as a whole. Each movement had its own journal, published its own educational and ideological materials and in many cases, local branches published their own journals. The Yishuv’s Education Department sought to establish a united national youth movement, but similarly to the Arab attempt it failed. However, the multiplicity of youth movements and youth organisations reflected a constructive diversity in Jewish civil society. Although each movement supposedly represented a different ideology, almost all were ardent Zionists, shared the same nationalist vision of Jewish sovereignty in Palestine, and with the intensification of the conflict, became highly militarised.

**Elusive Voices- Students’ Essays in School Journals**

School journals were the centre of the school community. The journal reported the different student activities such as the activities of the local scout troop and the results of the latest sport competitions with other schools. The careers and achievements of the school’s graduates were published and often, graduates contributed articles. However, while mainly focused at the school, all journals sought to transcend the school environment in their readership and offered subscriptions to non-students, especially graduates. Following the academic standard of the Arab College’s journal, other journals also offered publications of pedagogic articles, transcribed lectures, stories and articles by the contemporary Arab intellectual elite. Like the college’s soccer team and its students’ results in the matriculation exam, the journal was another symbol of the school’s intellectual-social standards and atmosphere.

Publishing an article in the school’s journal was an act of empowerment where students were encouraged to state their views. In most cases, the journal can be seen to have empowered a group of students, the journal’s editorial board, with the great responsibility of producing
their own newspaper. The incorporation of articles written by students next to those written by
the teaching staff on a document bearing the institution’s name gave a feeling of partnership
and equality to the students involved and the readers. The language employed, where often
students and teachers write open letters to the school, turns the school into a conversing
community, challenging the staff-student separation. Beyond its role as a reflection of the
school’s educational ethos and the school’s symbol of prestige, the journal’s importance lies in
this false notion that the institution is a joint project of an open functioning community. The
long articles of the college principals at the beginning of each journal delineate the clear
boundaries of this would-be emancipatory platform.

Taking part in this joint initiative, along with the opportunity to become famous and
respected for their writing skills, made it appealing for students to express their views while
unaware of the co-optation process involved in this endeavour. The scarcity or in most cases
absence of expressions of resistance, criticism or deviation from the particular school’s
ideology proves this point. This bias in schools’ journals furthers their weight as an historical
document exposing another layer of the mechanism of knowledge transfer.

To my knowledge, among Arab schools, only secondary schools produced journals.65
Furthermore, the journals studied here (table on page 351), were all published by Jerusalemite
schools or their close neighbours Ramallah and Bethlehem. Similarly to our discussion on
secondary schools, the shortcomings of this source, representing an elitist and geographical
minority are an advantage as well. Far from reflecting a comprehensive picture of the learning
experience in Palestine, the school journals of the most prestigious of Palestine’s colleges
articulate a distilled version of what the pedagogical elite was trying to achieve.

Ela Greenberg’s pioneering work, the first of its kind on school journals, focused on
Majallat Rawḍat al-Ma‘ārif from the early 1930s. Greenberg’s analysis looks at the journal as

65 Jacob Yehoshua, Tārīkh al-ṣiḥāfah, 224-242.
“a lens through which we can understand the link between education and identity” and is correct in arguing that “Rawdat al-ma’arif school did not just articulate a single political or religious identity… but rather reflected a more complex overlap and intertwining of religious, pan-Arab, and Palestinian territorial identities”. Greenberg’s focus on pan-Arab, Islamic and political issues, overlooks the notions of “internalised notions about East and West” in Majallat Rawdat al-Ma’ārif, which Greenberg attributes only to the mission schools’ journals. At the same time, her analysis misses “the complex overlap and intertwining” of identities in the mission schools’ journals.

The analysis offered here, looking at journals published regularly by four more schools, suggests that the journals of the Arab College, St. George’s School, Bishop Gobat School, Terra Santa College and Rawdat al- Ma’arif, shared many commonalities especially in the field of personal and collective identity.

The journals’ circulation is unknown, but we can assume that the few hundred students of the school, its staff as well and a few of the school’s graduates read it. It is also probable that the journals were circulated among the pedagogic-educational community, yet there is no evidence that supports the existence of a wider readership beyond the school’s community. Thus, we should treat each journal as a product published by the school’s community and directed to the school’s community.

The analysis here focuses on four central themes in students’ essays: the importance of knowledge and education, the students’ connection with their homeland, the students’ writing on historical topics, and the treatment of Jews and Zionism in students’ essays. To conclude this analysis, the same themes were examined in Hebrew school journals.
Darkness surrounds the School

The importance of knowledge and learning is a central theme in these journals. One of the most popular topics, “knowledge” represented much more than accumulated information. The meanings of jahl (ignorance) and ‘ilm (knowledge) were charged with a cultural, historical trajectory and accompanied with a gospel of a brave new future.

The students thought of themselves as already part of the solution, an enlightened few already taking part in an educational enlightened project and their school as a lighthouse surrounded by a darkness of ignorance, stagnation and superstition. Ignorance is the reason for all misfortunes, wrote one student, while portraying Knowledge as the ultimate panacea, the basis of civilisation (‘umrān) symbolising unity, progress and development. As one student noted, people without knowledge are like sheep without a shepherd. A student from St. Luke’s depicted the teacher as carrying a torch, illuminating the path, standing “at the forefront with the strongest fighters for the salvation of his nation” (inqādh al-waṭan), therefore, the homeland sheds a tear for every teacher it loses.

Based on this importance attributed to education and knowledge, students voiced criticism on the government’s policy of education in Palestine. Parallel to what was written at the time in the press; students stressed the great passion of the Arabs for education, the unfortunate scarcity of schools and their poor standards. Anyone who can sign his name becomes a teacher, a student noted.

In various essays, knowledge symbolises power and as what brought the West to its greatness. In order to achieve this greatness and emancipation from Western enslavement,
students call to follow the West, use it as a role model and encourage sending students there so they could bring modern wisdom and machinery. Thus, various articles are dedicated to modern inventions and scientific discoveries.\textsuperscript{70} The youth has a crucial role in this process, students noted, as all foundations require cement and steel, the youth require strength and knowledge for the sake of their homeland.\textsuperscript{71} Amin, a student from BGS concluded by stating that the homeland is in need of young men and women ingrained with the “new spirit of civilisation” (\textit{rūḥ al-madanīyyah al-jadīd}).\textsuperscript{72}

The East West dichotomy, already discussed in previous chapters, found its way into students’ writing as well. As a student at the College, Ziadeh warmly adopted his admired teacher Miqdadi’s severe criticism of the East’s predicament, as discussed earlier. In one of the earliest issues of the College’s journal, fifteen-year-old Ziadeh wrote a poetic description of the long deep slumbers of the East (a popular metaphor in other journals as well),\textsuperscript{73} awakened by the light of the West and rising like a lion, asking for guidance. Ziadeh offers a detailed awakening plan including role models such as German educators (Adalbert Falk, Bismarck’s minister of education) that turned the education system into an apparatus of national unity. Japanese organization is also called upon as a role model that depended on students that came back from the West. We in the East, argues Ziadeh, talk but do not do, something that ought to be reversed. Ziadeh lays further emphasis on a notion of collective self-respect, the only thing


\textsuperscript{71} “ibnā al-yaūm wa-rijāl al-ghad”, \textit{Bākūrat Jabal siḥyūn} 2, July 1923, 16; “Wājibatuna al-madrasīyah”, \textit{Bākūrat Jabal siḥyūn} 3, July 1925, 22-26; “Li-mādhā naṭlubu al-‘ilm”, \textit{Bākūrat Jabal siḥyūn} 3, July 1925, 26-29; “al-shabāb”, \textit{The Bishop Gobat School News}, Christmas Term 1940, 6-7

\textsuperscript{72} “Al-waṭan wa-al-wājīb”, \textit{Bākūrat Jabal siḥyūn} 2, July 1923, 24-25.

\textsuperscript{73} Slumbers of the East metaphor can be found in \textit{Bākūrat Jabal siḥyūn} 1, March, 1923, 28-29; “al-‘ilm wa-al-qūwah” \textit{Majallat Rawdat al-Ma'arif} 1, vol. 7, 19 December 1934, 12-16; \textit{The St. George’s School Magazine} 2, Easter 1933, 4-6.
that assures “our place in the human society” (*al-mujtama` al-insānī*). Ziadeh’s vision is one of inclusion in the new world through a particularistic development plan.

“Time is money!” wrote one of the students in English, as part of his article in Arabic calling for an economic renaissance. “From this sentence”, he noted, “we understand the importance of time”, comparing hard working Americans such as Henry Ford and the British frugality in domestic consumption to the Eastern dependence on God rather than work and the tendency to squander money on luxuries. Another student wrote that while the English asks who are you, the German asks what do you know and the American asks what can you do, the Easterner asks what is your religion. The student prefers the American way of thought, what can we do and what can we produce. The East here is at the bottom of the list, its reasoning irrelevant, obsolete.

Still another student, however, warns against a blind Eastern imitation of the Europeans. The superiority of Europeans is not due to qualities given by nature, Ali Daqqaq from BGS stresses, but due to their “activity, self control, self reliance, discretion and above all their frugality”. The journals articulate a moralistic accusative tone against Western illnesses. One student wrote against the consumption of alcohol as it prevents people from working and being productive while the country is already in an economic crisis. Others wrote about the proper way to spend your free time, against the negative effects of the cinema, the need for patience, and the dangers of hypocrisy.

---

76 “Akhlāq al-unmāh: ṭarīqah jaḍīdah lil-İstīdāl ilā alayhā,” *Majallat Rawḍat al-Ma`ārif* 1, no. 3 (March 1922): 76.
78 Essays against the abuse of alcohol in *Bākūrat Jabal ṣihyūn* 3, vol. 3, 1 July 1924, 30-33; see also *Majallat dar al-mu allimīn* 1, vol. 5, 30 September 1924, 12-16.
79 On patience in *Bākūrat Jabal ṣihyūn* 2, July 1923, 29; about spare time in *Bākūrat Jabal ṣihyūn* 1, 20 December 1923, 27-29; on hypocrisy in *Bākūrat Jabal ṣihyūn* 2, April 1925, 18-20; on the cinema in *The St. George’s School Magazine* 1, Christmas Term, 1932, 27-28
These articles reflect the students’ internalisation and reproduction of European perception of the Orient. The concept of Jahl, in this sense, does not target a few cultural failings, but covers more or less everything concerning the life of the ordinary masses. This “invention of ignorance” negates the archaic and traditional being, remodelling ‘ilm as an opposite entirety, a new world order. At the same time though, these articles reflect an awareness of the intensity of the cultural shift they were going through and foreground their free will to choose what to adopt from the West and what ought to be left behind from their own culture.

**Saving the Drowning Homeland**

The homeland and the nation, a very popular theme in all journals, usually appears in the context of a dramatic crisis. Amin Abu-Rahma, a student at BGS compared Palestine to a drowning young woman beaten by the waves, desperately calling for help while people claim to have better things to do. We need to act quickly, Amin wrote, or we shall lose her, he concluded. Abd al-Hamid Yasin from Dar al-Mu‘allamin tied the personal progress of a man and the progress of the nation. The homeland was personified, given a face, towards which they have a duty of protection.

Students declared their will to die for their nation and sanctified the virtue of sacrifice. “My life for my country, my blood for my country” wrote a third-grade student in a poem, “a death of power and glory is better than a life of weakness and humiliation” wrote another. Others wrote about the virtues of spiritual rather than physical courage for the sake of the nation.

---

80 See engagement with these themes in McDougall, *History and the Culture*, 113-114.
83 Bākūrat Jabal šihyūn 1, vol. 1, January 1922, 28-30, 10-12; Bākūrat Jabal šihyūn 1, 20 December 1923, 17-20; *The Bishop Gobat School News*, Summer Term 1939, 9-10, 14.
84 Bākūrat Jabal šihyūn 2, 1 April 1922, 54-56; On the brave death of heroes and shahada, *The Bishop Gobat School News*, Summer Term 1941, 5-6.
85 Sawt al-kullīya 2, vol. 1, August 1947, 1, 3-4.
Direct engagement with politics was scarce, although not completely absent, as noted by the editor of the *St. George’s School Magazine*: “The freedom of the press seems to be disciplined right and left. But we don’t care for we are not concerned with what they call Taboo topics”.86 One exception was *Sawt al-Kulliyah* (original transliteration), Birzeit College’s journal, first published in the volatile year 1947. The principal, Musa Nasir, published an article attacking the Jews, Zionism and the unjust principle of the mandate.87 Criticism of government policy usually took a more subtle articulation. Greenberg has shown that the *Rawda’s* journal called for its readers not to take government posts.88 One student from BGS spoke of Arab unity as a force that would enable the Arab nation to rise against the aggressor and liberate the homeland from the hands of those who took it by force (*muḥtaṣābīn*) probably meaning not only the English but also Zionism.89 A student from Terra Santa published an article about Tel-Aviv, presenting it as a gardenless, chaotic city of unrelated immigrants. Although the Jews seek liberty, the student notes, Jews are always afraid from “them” as they have an inclination to fear, and if there is no cause for such fear, they will invent one.90 But again, such essays were rare.

In the days of the Arab Revolt a student from BGS under the title “Revolution! Revolution!” called for an educational revolution that could end the chaos (*fawḍa*) in the country.91 Another second secondary student wrote against indifference to the casualties caused by the repression of the Revolt, and called to help “our brethren the orphans”.92 Although direct criticism of the British was rare, during the Revolt students found a way to express their views

---

86 “Editor’s Note”, *St. George’s Magazine* 2, vol. 6, Summer term 1930, 1-2.
88 The same issue includes an interview with an American priest, questioning his support for Zionism, ibid, 5-8.
89 Greenberg, “Majallat Rawdat Al-Ma‘arif.”
through historical examples. Abdallah Saleh, a first year secondary student, presented a historic survey of Arab elocution emphasising its decline under foreign rule and its renaissance in Egypt and during the Great Arab Revolt. Hisham Mulhis wrote about the importance of Arab unity for the future of the nation.

In the Arab College’s journal, there is not a single mention of the Revolt. This disregard in the case of the Arab College of the political earthquake in Palestine is indicative of one of two things; either Ahmad Samih Khalidi insisted on the evacuation of politics from the journal as the only way to maintain what he saw as pure academic standards, or the censorship employed during the Revolt prevented any kind of engagement in local political issues. In any case, it is clear that explicit discussion on the topic was not given space on the pages of the colleges’ journals. Whether due to government censorship or local educational censorship, this detachment underlines the tension between the lighthouse and its homeland, between the personal and the actual contemporary collectivity. Keeping the students away from local politics and focusing strictly on academic progress was a protection strategy for these educators, a price worth paying for future benefits. The school journals articulate a similar balance mechanism to the one discussed earlier, struggling with the parameters and the challenges of “progress”, community organisation and national aspirations under colonial rule.

**Language and Nation**

Students in Hebrew schools stressed the connection between language and nation. The heavy curricular emphasis on English and the exposure to non-Arabic literature placed Arabic on the defensive. While aware of the advantages in learning foreign languages, especially English, students voiced criticism regarding the marginalisation of Arabic instruction in the Rawda

---

93 The Bishop Gobat School News, January to April, 1938, 3-4.
94 The Review of the Terra Santa College 19, vol.7, Summer 1937, 141-143.
95 Only three issues of the journal from the period of the Revolt are available, May 1937, July 1937 and July 1938.
journal as noted by Greenberg and in mission schools' journals as well. A sixth grader from BGS noted that Arabic should be learned thoroughly for the sake of the nation. Some students, the writer observed, preferred to speak in foreign languages thinking that those are more civilised; this preference, he noted, “could annihilate our nation”. In these essays, following a familiar motif of the Nahda, the revival of the nation went hand in hand with the revival of the language. Students stressed the need to modernise Arabic and incorporate modern terms into it. Doing so would enable transferring the knowledge of other nations.

In the journals that were divided into English and Arabic sections, the medium was the message. In most cases, where the journal was divided into separate Arabic and English sections, students chose to publish their essays about Arab history, Arab culture and Arab nationalism in Arabic rather than English. When The St. George’s Review published its first Arabic section in 1931, it was Khalil Beidas the translator, novelist, and Arabic teacher at the school, who inaugurated it with a single article. Beidas’ first article was on “the iron will” of great historical figures from Alexander the Great to Napoleon, Newton and Bismark. In the next issue, Beidas was the single author in Arabic as well, presenting an article on pre-Islamic Arab proverbs, stating that the Arab poetry and literature were superior to those of all other nations. A few years later, Beidas published an article about Arab culinary culture. Sakakini, who contributed essays to a few of the schools’ journals, published a fictional story in the Arabic section of Bishop Gobat School News, about how a primitive pious community became modern and successful thanks to the efforts of one educated young man, who returned to his

97 The Bishop Gobat School News, April to July 1933, 2-3.
98 The Bishop Gobat School News, October to December 1937, 1-4; See also Sawt al-Kulliyah 4, vol. 1, issue 4, November 1947.
people and despite their reluctance, modernised them. Sakakini’s message about the importance of education and the ungrateful job of bringing progress to the people is clear. Stories such as these, written by either prominent pedagogues or students turned the Arabic section into a safe cultural-national expression zone. For the students, this amplified the performativity of their language, turning its use into a political statement, an expression of their identity.

**Our History, their History**

Essays about historical topics in school journals were exceptional in their depth and scope. These essays often included footnotes, referencing and the use of multiple sources in more than one language, Arabic and English but French as well. In most cases, they were not just stories, but included an argument, a statement.

The students’ writing about history was heavily influenced by the pedagogical historical discourse discussed earlier and the topics rarely deviated from their taught syllabus. History teachers and authors of history textbooks, as mentioned earlier, were central contributors to the Colleges’ journals, especially the Arab College journal. Radi Abd al-Hadi not only contributed articles as teacher but also served as the journal’s editor as a college student for a few years. Except Ziadeh however, who wrote for the college journal while still a student, the rest were already employed as young teachers. The various articles in the different school journals authored by Žubỳān, Miqdadi, ‘Anابتawi, Ghunaym, Anton Shukri Lawrence, ‘Abidi and Radi, helped to turn history into a popular writing topic, set a high writing standard and influenced the choice of topics.

---

The differences between the students and their teachers are in the loss of the nuanced, complex styles of their teachers’ history. The students’ essays are usually shorter, less informative and more explicit in their message. In most cases, it is a kind of a strictly educative history: a story and its lesson. This approach to history is indicative of the way they were taught history, as a story of great personal and collective relevance carrying a clear message to the present.

While discussing Arab history students chose to write about the Arab golden ages, a source of national pride. The historical unity of the Arabs during these golden ages was highlighted as a source of their strength. Students often wrote about Arab Islamic or pre-Islamic historical figures as role models of human virtue. One student wrote of the great enthusiasm in class while learning about the bravery of the pre-Islamic hero-poet ‘Antarah, because it taught them about the virtues of their ancestors. The students were then requested to write about the ‘Antarah of their era. Zahdi al-Daudi from BGS wrote about the humility of ‘Umar ibn al-Khattab as a role model for the entire nation. Another student dedicated an essay to the acquittal of ‘Umar from the fabricated charge of burning the Library of Alexandria. Islam and Arabs, the student noted, do not burn books. The Terra Santa debate team dedicated one of its meetings to debate the question “Who had greater influence, the Abbasids or the Umayyads?” in the fortification of Arab glory.

The call to emancipate the Arab women and its progress and development as a critical national project, was a recurrent theme in all journals. To promote this cause, students often

102 The Review of the Terra Santa College 9, vol. 4, Christmas 1933, 27; The Bishop Gobat School News, October to December 1934, 9-12.
103 Bākārat Jabal siḥyūn 2, vol. 1, 1 April 1922, 53-54.
104 Bākārat Jabal siḥyūn 2, April 1925, 15-18.
105 Bākārat Jabal siḥyūn 3, 1 July 1924, 8-14, 24-28.
107 The St. George’s School Magazine 2, Easter 1933, 4-6.
used heroic women figures from the Arab golden ages in history, from either the Jahiliyyah or the Islamic conquests. Once again, an attempt to find familiar and national role models to promote a vision of progress.

Various essays focused on aspects of progress and modernisation in the Arab East in relation to the West. The scientific progress in Andalus, a very popular topic in students’ and teachers’ essays, similarly to what was discussed previously, was seen as a civilizational proof of Arab competence, “a lighthouse for the entire world” while “ignorance ruled in Europe and Africa”. Ibrahim Khalil Bulus traced the scientific Egyptian Nahda to Napoleon’s conquest. Our Nahda, Bulus concluded, will not be based on the ancient Arab culture but on the modern European model. “I am an Arab and I was nurtured for loving the Arabs by an Arab mother”, wrote Mahmud Qa‘wār, in his article focusing on reason and knowledge as sources of Arab greatness in history. He concluded by suggesting emulating the West and reform (ijtihād) in contemporary Arab society. The Review of the Terra Santa College dedicated a series of articles to the scientific contribution of the Arabs in history, giving specific examples of scholars and their inventions and discoveries. To prove his point the writer uses Western (ifranj) sources, because “when they [the Western scholars] conduct research, they only seek the truth”. A second secondary student from Terra Santa was explicit about contemporary Arab scholarship, noting, “our Arab authors- unfortunately- are deprived of a literary study in its true meaning...” criticising Arab literary criticism as backward in comparison with the West.

---

111 “Al-ijtihād wa-al-ṣāḥr y’aman al ‘ajaib”, Bākūrat Jabal sihyūn 1, December 1924, 24-27; See also ibid 3, 1 July, 1924, 8-14; ibid 2, July 1923, 8-9; The Review of the Terra Santa College 13, vol. 5, Easter 1935, 57-61.
113 The Review of the Terra Santa College 9, vol. 4, Christmas 1933, 18-22.
Western history was almost as popular as Arab history for students and both topics usually relied on English sources. Students chose to write on a wide array of topics; Ancient Greece and the pantheon as a source of inspiration for humanity,\textsuperscript{114} the discovery of America and the “new world” as the centre of civilisation,\textsuperscript{115} Alexander the Great and unification of East and West,\textsuperscript{116} Napoleon and Hannibal as the greatest leaders in history for the strength of their will,\textsuperscript{117} and more. The chosen topics were usually part of the taught syllabus, laden with Western history. These essays reflect the relevance of this history for the students, and their ability to draw personal and collective conclusions from it.

The journals portray a community of young writers with a very strong historical instinct. History comes out as a central tool of mediation and analysis of their surrounding reality. Its omnipresence, therefore, transcends its frequent appearances in the school environment. Their personal understanding of history, usually utilised to convey a moralist collective decree, helps them define their identity, includes their sources of inspiration and offers a path and a vision for the future. Rather than reflecting an epistemic subjugation to the West, the dominance of Eurocentric, progressivist historical tropes, reflect a creative redeployment of these historical themes for their own purposes. The fusion of these themes with classical Arab history, bringing forward ‘Antarah, ‘Umar and heroic women from the Jahiliyyah next to Napoleon, Bismarck and Alexander the Great, was a method of appropriation and manipulation of colonial paradigms, in order to give sense and meaning to their own national heritage within the greater picture. Borrowing from James McDougall’s analysis of Algerian historiography, we might

\textsuperscript{114} The Bishop Gobat School News, Christmas Term 1939, 11-12.  
\textsuperscript{115} Bākūrat Jabal ṣihyūn 1, December 1924, 27-32.  
\textsuperscript{116} Bākūrat Jabal ṣihyūn 1, 20 December 1923, 30-32.  
\textsuperscript{117} Ibid, 25-27.
suggest that debating the civilizational role of the Abbasids and Umayyads rejuvenates the potential of an Arab civilising mission, challenging the perennial nature of the foreign one.  

**Missing the Jews**

The journals hardly ever published articles about Jewish history or Zionism. In the mixed schools, only Jewish students published favourable or informative articles about Jewish or Zionist history in either English or Arabic. In most cases, however, the historical role of the Jews in these journals parallels the one already discussed in the previous chapter and usually written by teachers who were future authors of textbooks. In his article about King Herod, ‘Abidi describes him as a great Arab king who brought progress and culture to Palestine only to be criticised and accused of apostasy by the ungrateful Jews. In another article by ‘Abidi, the Jews are depicted as the barrier preventing East and West from becoming one, an obstacle removed with the Roman ban on Jews entering Jerusalem. Radi, in an anti-Shia article, accuses Shia of aiming to destroy Islam. It is no wonder, he notes, that most Shiites are Jews, Christians, Persians and idolaters. This sectarian historiography originating from Jewish interests could also be found in Totah and Barghuthi’s book. In their discussion about the Jews of the Hijaz “who entered the Islamic religion to corrupt and destroy it”, they mention the controversial historical figure, Abdullah ibn Saba’, a Jewish convert to Islam who conspired to murder Uthman and was one of the “inventors” of the Shia, a sectarian peril to the Arab nation.

The rare mentioning of Jewish history or Jewish contemporary life relate to the detachment from political issues discussed earlier. The negative referencing of the Jews in history or the oversight of their history as it appears in the school journals is another example of the Zionist-Arab conflict writing itself into the school’s environment, a reproduction of the same features discussed in earlier chapters.

**An Alternative Tomorrow, al-Ghad**

As mentioned earlier, the validity of this analysis is limited to the obvious publication restrictions imposed by the school or the government. Therefore, one can question the validity of the school journal as a source for the learning experience of students. Naturally, “unworthy” or forbidden thoughts were not published, mainly thanks to student self-censorship. The independent journal of the Arab Students’ Union in Palestine (Rābiṭat al-ṭalabah al-ʿArab bi-filastīn) al-Ghad (Tomorrow) is therefore a useful complement to the sources examined thus far in this context’ the arguments suggested here. *Al-Ghad*, published at Bethlehem in 1938-1941, was the mouthpiece of the Students’ Union established by a group of Jerusalemite students in the summer of 1937 with the objective of fighting illiteracy and giving assistance to Palestinian orphans. To this end, the group opened a school for the illiterate during their summer break in 1937.

The publication was made possible due to the voluntary support and ideological devotion of ‘Abdallah Hanna Bandak, by the late 1930s an active member of the Palestine Communist Party, the editor of *Sawt al-Sha‘ab* and the owner of a modern printing press in Bethlehem. Bandak’s extensive experience in journalism and printing gave the journal an exceptional graphic quality, including photos and illustrations. Bandak edited the journal with an editorial board of students mainly from Bethlehem. His communist, anti-imperialist ideology brought forward young writers like Emile Touma and Tawfik Toubi, students who later became party
leaders. According to Adnan Musallam, the Department prohibited the circulation of the 
journal in its schools and prohibited students in government schools from writing for it, a policy 
that led to its end. The journal’s symbol, a hand squeezing a bleeding heart watering a flaming torch and its 
rhetoric, “in the name of God, in the name of Arabism and in the name of freedom”, reflected 
the spirit of the journal. However, rather than militant communism, the journal focused 
mainly on cultural and national issues and the principal aim of the union, fighting illiteracy as 
part of the liberation and modernisation of Palestine.

In its three years of publication, especially the first year, al-Ghad published essays written 
by students from most secondary schools in Palestine and a few in Transjordan, and included 
theses by female students as well. Indeed, an independent platform of expression for the youth 
was exceptional and appealing for young upper class idealists interested in the here and the 
now. The homeland and its dire need for rescue was a dominant theme, as in the other journals. 
However, al-Ghad spoke more openly about the role of colonialism and tyranny in bringing 
the people to their present sorry state, and openly called for Arab independence. In this 
capacity, the treatment of knowledge and the sanctity attributed to it parallels the school 
journals. Here as well, the notion of an awakened enlightened few (hence the torch as their 
symbol) is prominent. The students raised awareness of the illiteracy crisis and the 
shortcomings of the Education Department, seeking to enlighten (tanwir) fellahin with their 
“primitive traditions and customs, dominating their minds” basing their lives on distorted
The Union's focus on orphans added a social awareness of Palestinian society beyond knowledge, though. Essays about the orphans' misery and poverty and the obligation for self-sacrifice for their benefit is a central theme in the journal.

Unlike the school journals, al-Ghad published articles on contemporary issues in the Arab world and the world in general. When King Ghazi of Iraq died, students wrote of the event as a national tragedy and when the Second World War started, the journal published various articles against fascism and the atrocities of war. Moreover, al-Ghad published poems and short stories about unrequited love and intense emotions that normally did not find their place in the school journal, and encouraged young writers to publish their works. It perceived itself as an open stage for cultural expression.

Like the school journals, historical themes were popular in al-Ghad. Arab history remained confined in many essays to the golden ages to which credit was given by Western scholars mainly for its scientific and intellectual capacities in relation to the West. The journal even dedicated three articles to the scientifically proper way to write history, including the correct way to use and cite sources. In his third article, the writer commented on the scientific historical writing of the West and the corrupt manner in which it was used by the Arabs, but concludes with the hope brought by the new Arab universities. An ongoing debate in the journal about the correct way to modernise Palestine and the East’s potential to become Western emphasised the East-West dichotomy discussed earlier.


128 An article calling all Arabs to unite against fascism (and about the atrocities of war on the same issue) in al-Ghad 5, vol. 2, October 1939, 4-6; essays on the death of Ghazi of Iraq in 1939, al-Ghad 2, May 1939, vol. 2, 76, see also poem al-Ghad 3, June 1939, 131.

129 al-Ghad 7, vol. 3, January 1941, 122-123; on Arab mentality, al-Ghad 5, October 1939, vol. 2, 9-10; on culture in Andalus as superior to Europe’s, al-Ghad 6, vol. 2, November 1939, 36; on the Prophet and Muhammad bin Qasim the Umayyad conqueror, al-Ghad 3, June 1939, vol. 2, 128-130, 149-153.


131 See engagement with East vs. West, Nahda and the methods to modernise the Arabs, al-Ghad 1, vol. 4, May 1941, 170-171, al-Ghad 3, vol. 4, July 1941, 33-36, 47.
This historical consciousness expressed in an *independent* political journal illustrates perhaps more conclusively than in the school journals, the realisation of the educational process in inculcating the prism through which historical narrative is understood. *Al-Ghad* did not offer a new history; it differentiated itself by the mosaic of topics it presented which enabled a different connection to the past. Essays about contemporary Arab literature, covering the biographies of its protagonists and mourning them when they died with words of collective national grief, reflected a connection between the students and a living, vibrant Arab culture.\(^{132}\) Along with discussions over projects such as the abolition of illiteracy and helping orphans, a critical coverage of world events and the response they required from Arabs gave agency to the students and increased the relevance of the older history. Golden-age Arabs, rather than remaining a distant utopia, became another expression of contemporary Arab competence.

**Hebrew School Journals**

Hebrew journals for children were published in Palestine from the late nineteenth century. The Teachers’ Union published their children’s journal *Moledet* from 1911 until 1947, and from the beginning of the mandate Hebrew newspapers and teachers made several attempts to publish children’s journals.\(^{133}\) The most popular children’s newspaper was *Davar*’s children’s supplement, *ha-musaf li-yeladim* first published in 1931, and *Davar li-yeladim*, an independent weekly supplement published regularly from 1936 until 1985. This journal, incorporating famous authors and educators, aimed at articulating through “hegemonic proletariat poetics” a desirable Hebrew nativeness under the ideological guidelines of labour Zionism, rooted in the proletarian-settlement ideology. *Davar li-yeladim* had a strong influence on Hebrew education

---


as well. Often, teachers used articles written by educators in the classroom. Davar li-yeladim, the “children’s tribal fire” is one outstanding example of publications that incorporated the writings of children.

Children’s essays in these journals not only corresponded with the prominent authors who contributed to the journals. The Hebrew child was surrounded with Hebrew literature and translated literature for children, a central project in Hebrew and Zionist culture. This literature focused on creating collective notions of a desired Hebrew childhood, reinventing a Jewish childhood in Palestine, “the land of the child” in the words of the author Levin Kipnis. Mashiach summarised the central themes of this literature: the Hebrew child as a mythical hero, enhancement of the enrooting processes and connection to the collective, the structuring of a monolithic national territorial Israeli identity, spreading the ethos of the land as a child, incorporating the children in the future of the nation and their mobilisation, and the denial of exile while nurturing an exclusive native elite. Indeed, this literary environment served as a role model for local school publications and it should be analysed in this light.

The writing of students and children received ample attention in studies about the Yishuv, yet no such research has been conducted on Arab children’s literature in Palestine during this period. Mdallel argues that modern Arab children’s literature and the translation of Western literature for children began in Egypt in the late 1920s but we have no evidence of its reception in Palestine. In his memoirs, Ziadeh mentions a few books published as part of the Popular Culture Series (silsilat al-thaqāfah al-‘āmmah) in the late 1940s and ten more children's books were found at the course of this research, most of them authored in the 1940s as well. This

134 Ya’el Dar, Kanon be-khamah kolot, 1–9, 15–20, 53–60.
136 Celina Mashiach, Yaldut ye-le’umiyut, 13–21, 165–239.
137 Mdallel Sabeur, “The Sociology of Children’s Literature in the Arab World”.
138 Ziadeh, Ayyāmī, 1:73–74; Ziadeh’s short book focuses on a number of Arab or Arabised historical figures from ancient times to modernity “set apart by time but the history, the language and the country brought them closer”, Ziadeh, Shakhṣiyyāt ‘Arabiyyah, 6 This series included books by Ahmad Samih Khalidi, Ali Shaath and Fadwa Touqan.
hardly answers the question of children’s literature in mandate Palestine. It is certain though, that the production of children’s literature as part of an Arab Palestinian national project was not comparable to the massive Hebrew industry. Thus, the correspondence between children’s or student writing and an imagined ethos of childhood, so present in Hebrew school journals, is absent from the Arab ones.

Far from being a comprehensive survey of school journals, and while aware of the problematic engagement with journals from different periods throughout the mandate, this analysis juxtaposes the general themes discussed earlier in the Arab school journals and highlights the essential differences between the two. To this end, this examination focuses on high school journals, paralleling the age group of the Arab journals. Dror’s survey of high school journals highlights some of the themes discussed here and helped in the selection of sources.139

Like the Arab journals, these journals focused on school life, reporting on its different activities and accomplishments. Contrary to the Arab journals, these had no obvious academic pretention. While the Arab journals were laden with articles written by scholars, transcribed lectures and teachers’ articles, the Hebrew high school journal was usually shorter, less edited, and included mostly students’ essays.

**Darkness surrounds the Hebrews**

The Hebrew student did not share the Arab student’s feeling of remoteness and alienation from an illiterate primitive majority. The omnipotence of knowledge appeared only rarely, as did the connection between studies, leadership and national development. The Hebrew student seems less interested in the enlightenment or modernisation of his people in Palestine. Instead, Palestine itself becomes his project’s objective, redeeming it from its primitive tranquillity. For

139 Yuval Dror, “Sugyot ishiyot ve-le’umiyyot.”
the Arab student Palestine was a country of great resources and potential that could be marched to progress by education and technology. For the Hebrew student Palestine was an arid land that was developing thanks to Zionist intellectual, technological and moral capabilities. “Less than a century, (sic) ago”, concluded Margalit Rubovitz from EDR, “Palestine was a desert, an unheeded spot in the universe. Now Palestine is one of the most prosperous countries and the most civilized in the Near East… Palestine has grown, is growing, and will continue to grow and become the most important spot in the universe.”

The East West dichotomy is also less noticeable. Students who wrote about their family trip to Europe as tourists or while visiting their homeland, rarely used words such as West or modernity while describing the sites. While discussing Hebrew and Western literature in their published book reviews, there is not a sense of cultural priority or superiority. Thanks to the translation project of Western literature to Hebrew, students were exposed to Western literature through the mediation of their national language. In this process, those books became a part of their culture.

The abundance of translated articles from Western journals in Arab journals reflects a different kind of cultural outsourcing than the one we see in the Hebrew journals. In publishing translated articles, the Arab colleges, students and staff alike, took the role of importing and mediating knowledge that was perceived as beneficial and had not yet been Arabised. The Hebrew school did not share this role of cultural mediation, due to a combination of the zealot emphasis on Hebrew and a rapidly growing Hebrew bookshelf that included Western literature.

---

141 The School Magazine, 1936, 15-16, see also ibid, 1938, 10-11; Shtilim, January 1939, 10.
142 See reports on Hermann Hesse’s Narcissus and Goldmund, and Somerset Maugham’s Theatre in their Hebrew translation. Benenu, June 1941, 14-16; see also ibid, March 1941, 9; A book review on Pearl S. Buck’s The Good Earth, Shtilim, April-May, 1939, 11-13; See book report on All Quiet on the Western Front, Ha-Talmid, February-March 1931, 5-6.
Like the Arab student, the Hebrew student shared the fear of a blind imitation of hedonistic European youth trends that could deviate him from his national obligation. A student from the Reali School wrote against the imitation of other nations (*goim*), criticising the youths in the Diaspora and Palestine for dancing the foxtrot, “a symbol of decadence in European society”. Another student answered this essay, agreeing with the former and arguing that the seal (*ḥotam*) of the ancestors and their national features are inherited by subsequent generations… To prevent these trends of imitation, he writes against general education and in favour of nationalist education in the spirit of the prophets, “strengthening the power of our people in its historic land”. The decadence and inauthentic features, prominent in Jewish exile for the Hebrew student or amongst the Arab elite in the case of the Arab student, could both be cured, according to the students, by a stronger nationalist emphasis in their education.

**They are the East**

The East does exist in Hebrew journals, but as a general feature of the other, the Arab, rather than a personal or a collective part of the Jewish identity. “Both cities are so different. The one is Orient and the other Occident…,” wrote Ruth Karpf while comparing Jerusalem and Nuremberg’s old cities. Originally from Nuremberg, Karpf described the contrast between Jerusalem’s Bedouins in rags and its “mysterious dark bazaars and with all the interesting oriental things in them” with Nuremberg’s elegant people, poets and painters, roaming its alleys filled with “sun and light”. Nevertheless, Karpf and the other students at EDR “saw themselves as participants in the modernization of Jerusalem”.

The Arabs have a much more noticeable presence in the Hebrew journals than the Jews do in Arabic ones. In some essays, students wrote about cordial hospitality in Arab villages, or

143 *Ha-Talmid*, February-March, 1931, 1-3.
146 Schor, *The Best School*, 189.
offer description of joyful Arab folklore, but not without a patronising tone. “The life of the Arabs is very interesting”, wrote Elka Eden while describing an Arab wedding.147 Her sister, Menuha, added that at the end of the wedding, “she [the bride] belongs to him [the groom] now and no one can touch his property… he can hit her.”148

In most cases, as we have seen in other Zionist writings about Arabs, the Arab appears as a negative image of the Hebrew. There is no mentioning of “civilised” urban Arabs, but only poor, filthy ones with their black hair and deep black eyes.149 The stagnant, primitive Arab existence, their homes, their villages, their place in the natural landscape, are contrasted with the Zionist passion to develop and build. In one essay, the hill that was once Mustafa’s (a random Arab figure), with his donkey and his rock, are replaced with new buildings built by the Jews.150 While hiking and looking for Jewish historical sites, a popular topic of various essays, the Arab village appears as a breach of the historical landscape.151

During the Arab Revolt, students wrote about their fear and about incidents of violence targeting innocent Jews for no reason.152 There is no mentioning of a Revolt or a political organisation of any sort. Only robbers and murderers who carry out chaotic attacks are mentioned.153 The answer to the attacks was courage and mobilisation to protect and continue the Zionist project, “…that is the only thing for us Jews to do. We must continue to build our country”. In some cases, the suggested response was plain revenge.154

---

147 The School Magazine, 1935, 16-17.
149 The School Magazine, 1936, 17-18, 25-26; Benenu, July, 1937, 9-10; Ha-Talmid, February-March, 1932, 4-5.
150 Ha-Talmid, January 1933, 7
151 Benenu, March 1936, 6, June 1936, 7-8, March 1941, 13-14.
152 Chazan has found similar themes in the published children’s newspapers, Chazan, “Nof yaldut.”
A Reali student offered his interpretation of the Arab national movement, through the interpretation of Lawrence of Arabia, after he read his book. The student stresses Lawrence’s dismay at the Arabs, “a people of very low quality”, and argues that the Revolt was in no way an Arab national initiative. Still, he wrote, there is an “Arab danger” as they were able to unite and concludes by asking whether the Jews will be able to survive this threat while they are threatened with assimilation and only have Zion.\textsuperscript{155}

The Arab appears either as a romantic symbol of the oriental, a challenge that needed to be removed for the modernisation of the country, or as a direct threat to Zionism in his violent attacks. This depiction of the Arabs reflects the educational policy of their schools and the engagement with Arabs in the taught curriculum discussed earlier.

\textbf{Making History}

History was a popular topic for writing in the Hebrew school journals as well, and similarly to the Arab journals, attention was given to Jewish and non-Jewish history. Ancient Jewish history was often mentioned in relation to the holydays and the history of sites mentioned in published field trip reports. Indeed, the journals illustrate the holistic inculcation of the historical narrative discussed earlier.

The difference between the Arab and Hebrew journals corresponds with the difference in the syllabus, where modern Arab history is non-existent and Zionist history is given ample room. Students published various articles on the lives of past and present Zionist leaders. The popularity of these historical essays highlights the extensive attention given to Zionist history in the curriculum.

Writing about contemporary leaders enabled a personal, relevant connection between the student and his living national history, as we saw in \textit{al-Ghad}.\textsuperscript{156} This historical connection

\textsuperscript{155} \textit{Ha-Talmid}, November-December, 1931, 1-3.
between the ancient national past and the present national existence was clear in the Hebrew school journals. Arab students who were not taught contemporary national history could only find sources of national inspiration in the distant golden ages and the only contemporary history they leaned was Western. This imbalance in history instruction amplified the dichotomies between East and West and left the students with a foreign source of inspiration and an absent, local, familiar one.

**Conclusion**

Through our discussion of the experience of learning history beyond the classroom, we saw the subject’s importance in the formation of the student’s identity. The comparison between the different experiences of Hebrew and Arab students highlights a shared instrumentalisation of historical knowledge. For the students who wrote about history, as much as acting as an articulation of their identity, history was a tool that enabled an engagement with their present. An attentive reading of the students’ creative fusion of Western and Eastern motifs and their interpretation of historical-cultural themes, coloured with an outspoken collectivist emotional zeal, illuminate a few aspects of this generation’s voice. Colonialism was their only existential experience (one that was amplified in secondary education) and its structures of meaning and expression suffused their worldview. Particularly in the age of identity formation, their constant search for reassurance though cultural or national authenticity was their way to differentiate and designate themselves within the colonial reality and making sense of their role in it. However, rather than finding expressions of dissent or some kind of resistance or alternative to what they were taught inside or outside their class, as the innocent reader might expect from rebellious teenagers, the evidence reflects a reproduction of the values and content discussed in the previous chapter. Arab students’ views were principally an expression of what they learned for the demanding history matriculation exam of inviolable historical narrative within
a highly selective elitist education, orchestrated by Arab or non-Arab ‘Etonians’. This should be seen as proof of the system’s success in establishing the contours of historical consciousness.
Conclusion

This study aimed to contextualise education in general and the teaching of history in particular within the complexities of mandatory Palestine. Education in this context functioned as a reproduction and mirror of myriad relations within the Palestinian society. The study demonstrated how educational segregation became so determining, despite other possibilities being imaginable and even intended. Hebrew education, a central apparatus for the dissemination of Zionist ideology, sought to remove all ‘diasporic’ attributes from the new Jew, cultivating in its place a project of Hebraization and nativization of the Jewish student. National Hebrew education gained its political impetus with the materialisation of British national home policy and the intensification of the Arab-Jewish conflict.

The British government, from the highest echelons of the Colonial Office and High Commissioners to the senior administrators in Palestine’s Education Department, was fully conscious of education’s decisive role in the exacerbation of the intercommunal tensions, but also of its potential in pacifying them and promoting understanding. Yet, faced with greater challenges, this consciousness did not materialise into an official policy, cementing, de-facto, the physical educational segregation, turning its ideological foundations into self-evident certainties. This created a segregative mindset that negated intercommunal dialogue. The absence of such a dialogue established a relationship based on fear, suspicion and a hostile competition over who led a more nationalist curriculum.

However, this study also demonstrated how leading educators were able, at least conceptually and in a few cases practically, to challenge the self-evident truths of segregation. This insistence of different educators and institutions, during different periods of the mandate, who refused to let go of their vision of rapprochement through education, was what kept the question open for their own community and for future generations. Still, the segregative mindset had the upper hand and found its way into the curriculum, structuring exclusive
concepts of nationality, collectivity and territoriality, demarcated by the marginalisation and belittlement of the national other and its omission from the curriculum as a legitimate collective. These notions were translated into history textbooks and curriculum. This was done primarily through erasing or making the place of the national other insignificant in history and by writing contemporary animosity towards an enemy into the distant past, thus re-enacting ancient encounters between Arabs and Jews as examples of the perpetual conflict between the two nations.

For the Arab writers of history textbooks, the conflict with the Zionists was one ingredient in determining the final compound of the history textbook, a reproduction of dominant Ottoman, Egyptian and Lebanese historiography. These were overshadowed by Western historiography, which delineated the historical discourse, establishing a direct authority on the new Palestinian story, considered as a supposedly superior source of reference.

Conceived in a period of historical, cultural, and political transition, the Arabic history textbook was a historiographic amalgamation of its predecessors. Within this clear hegemonic discourse, Arab writers chose their own historical path, appropriating a historical space for themselves, seeking an authentic historical voice. The role of the Semites, the imagined ancestors of the Arabs, provided a good example for this appropriation of an historical space. Hebrew history textbooks were similar in this sense to Arabic textbooks, instrumentalising a Western version of the ancient past, a racial discourse and the civilizational role of the Semites, underlining a prestigious return to human history.

In this search for authenticity, the claims of colonial knowledge transcended Palestine’s past. Educators’ embrace of the colonial view of an inferior, stagnant East and an idle and primitive Easterner coloured their pedagogic vision of the future. Their vision of the new Arab, as of the Sabra, corresponded with an imagined Western role model, progressive, dynamic and knowledgeable, cured from the illnesses of the old Arab or the diasporic Jew. At the same time,
the new Arab spoke or fought for a local dialect of modernity, reinterpreting his past for his interests and visions. Returning to Marshall Berman, the new Arab sought to become a subject, as well as an object of modernisation, to get a grip on the modern world and make himself at home in it, on his own terms. It seems that in these respects, Arab and Zionist historiographies run in parallel.

The empowerment of the new Arab was voiced in textbooks through the virtues of Arab historical heroes and through non-Arab role models. The emerging pedagogical sphere engaged with this empowerment as well, stressing the importance of history, national and foreign for the modernisation of Palestine.

This pedagogical discourse was confronted or undermined by the inconsistencies and the anxiety disorder that characterised the Education Department’s history syllabus. British colonialism, through the history syllabus, occupied Palestine’s past and re-wrote it to fit the dictates of the mandate. The syllabus remained a colourless hodgepodge of Arab, Western and British history, failing to provide true agency to the Arabs in history and failing to make a relevant pedagogical sense of the new territoriality and collectivity formed after the First World War.

On the other front of this discussion, juxtaposing the Hebrew syllabus with the Department’s syllabus highlights the educational shortcomings of the latter. The Hebrew history syllabus, authored by Zionist educators for clear Zionist ends, was free of colonial inconsistencies and anxieties. The national Jewish history, as it appears in the syllabus, is characterised by a unity of land and people, giving historical agency particularly to the Jews and particularly in Eretz-Israel.

In Hebrew education history was omnipresent and institutionalised through a new national calendar, enacted and revitalised through pilgrimage to historical sites, a new hagiography, national celebrations and commemorations, as well as a bygone language revitalized and
spoken everywhere, from children’s literature and children’s newspapers to youth movements. Backed by relatively stable institutions, Hebrew education in all its spheres formal and informal was able to inculcate a shared historical experience or consciousness. The Arab community lacked the organisational capacities of the Yishuv and a national calendar that unified the entire Arab society was never created. The Arab scout movement serves as an example of an unfulfilled potential to take this role, curtailed as it was by British fear and Arab political factionalism.

Devoid of an institutionalised historical experience, the school journals became a realm in which history was utilised as a moral, cultural, and national compass. Born into colonialism and confined within the contours of colonial knowledge, Arab students fused Arab and Western history in their personal quest for an authentic and progressive identity, one that would enable maintaining their heritage and emancipate them from its weaknesses. History was similarly instrumentalised by the Hebrew students, but in a way that reflected the differences between the two education systems. In Jewish students’ writing, Zionism emerged as the historical modernising force of their homeland, and Zionists (they themselves) as its heralds, redeeming the country from its decrepitude, embodied in the image of the Arab. While almost completely absent from the Arabic journals, the national other, the Arab, has a noticeable presence in the Hebrew journal, not only as the negative of the Zionist vision, but also, especially in periods of violent volatility, as an enemy. Current events, almost completely excluded from the Arabic journals, were discussed openly in the Hebrew ones and the teaching of contemporary national history enabled an analysis of their surrounding reality. This connection between modern and national events and history, which was not taught in the Arab schools, amplified the relevance of the history course to the students’ lives.
In his critical essay “The French Revolution is over”, the eminent French historian François Furet articulated the inherent political bias in the historiography of the French Revolution, corresponding to contemporary partisan rivalry, where the historian “must produce more than proof of competence. He must show his [political] colours... the writing is taken as his opinion... Once he has given the password, his history has a specific meaning, a determined place and a claim to legitimacy”. This bias in French historiography, according to Furet, derived from the metaphysical attributions given to the year 1789 as a historical watershed, “the key to what lies upstream and downstream”. Having no definite end, the Revolution becomes “boundlessly elastic”; not only serving as an explanation of contemporary history, it is contemporary history.157 Furet’s call to end the French Revolution, did not intend to stop studying it, but rather to stop abusing it as a living reality, a far too obvious historiographic manipulation of the past that prevents a closer analysis of the truth.

Indeed, when a historiographic war is fought like a trench war, it is futile, and its central victim is history itself. Perhaps, however, since the only history worth studying is the one that redefines our present and challenges our views of the future, calling for its end would cut off its vitality, its relevance. Moreover, there is perhaps no (need for) extrication from a politicised historiography, nor any possibility of it, as we can never know what the defining moments are without studying many moments and making a human, political decision and choice about their significance. Following Furet only up to a point, then, I suggest studying history as a human dialogue and exploring it within an open, attentive historiographic debate.

The meaning of this premise for this research is threefold. The first point is general and conceptual, the second is contextual and particular and the third is the modification of the particular in light of the general. First, a constant need of a new story of the past is a feature of vivid and dynamic societies that engage with their past in order to understand or redefine

157 François Furet, Interpreting, 1-3.
themselves in periods of transition. Within the colonial discourse, this new story was written and taught as a (product of) challenging dialogue between local educators, students and empire. Second, the new story was also a product of an intercommunal dialogue of fear and suspicion orchestrated by a disastrous British policy of non-intervention that in practice furthered animosity and tension. The third point relates to the history of the conflict. For obvious reasons, historiography focusing on 1948 or the mandate period resembles in its politicised orientation the French revolutionary historiography criticised by Furet, provoking as it does political questions and being predominantly divided between two historiographic camps. This thesis, rather than offering an ‘end’ to the mandate period or the study of its education, attempts to open a path to new scholarly ‘beginnings’, aware of their necessarily politicised ramifications, and at the same time willing to be an active part in a dialogue about the construction of the past.

Yoni Furas, August 2015
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## Appendix

**Rawdat al-ma‘arif Curriculum, 1924-1925**

*(third and fourth secondary classes in history and geography taught in English)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Elementary Departments</th>
<th>Secondary Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Quran and Religious studies</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene (health)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology, Chemistry, Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic, Geometry, Algebra</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing, Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic Handwriting</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Barnāmaj madrasat al-Najāḥ al-waṭanīyah 1938-1939[^8]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>Elementary Departments</th>
<th>Secondary Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Quran and Islamic studies</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigonometry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene (health)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durus al-ashya-agriculture, animals, craftsmanship, health, nature studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* History in the sixth secondary is taught from Robinson’s textbook in its English version.

[^8]: Barnāmaj al-Najāḥ 1938-1939, 8.
### Va‘ad ha-Ḥinukh, elementary syllabus for boys 1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects /Departments</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishnah, Talmud</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>within Bible class 2 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moledet (observation)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography (social studies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicraft, working the land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic, Geometry, Accounting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing, Painting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moledet in the third department includes drawing and garden work.

### Syllabus for Boy’s Elementary Schools, Egypt 1907

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects/Departments</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic language</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic penmanship</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European language (English/French)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European penmanship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

159 Va‘ad ha-Ḥinukh, *Tamtsit ha-proṭokolim*, 36
Ozrakovsky, Krishevsky, Yehieli, 1907 Curriculum Suggestion (later adopted by the Teachers’ Union)\textsuperscript{161}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects/Departments</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation lessons</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moledet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Va‘ad ha-ḥinukh, Educational Committee of the Zionist Federation, Curriculum for boys, 1923**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
<th>VIII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
<td>23 Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mishnah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moledet</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic, Geometry, Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing, Painting</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden work</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moledet in the third department includes drawing and garden work.

\textsuperscript{161} (Joseph) Ozrakovsky, (Mordechai) Krishevsky, (Yehiel) Yehieli, ha-Tsa‘ah le-tokhenit ha-limudim tarsa”z, 1906-1907, 8.103/3, Education Archive, Tel-Aviv University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Published</th>
<th>Issues covered</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. George’s School</td>
<td>St. George’s Review</td>
<td>1905, 1924-1935</td>
<td>1929-1935</td>
<td>English and Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Santa College (Jerusalem)</td>
<td>The Review of the Terra Santa College</td>
<td>1930-?</td>
<td>1930-1941</td>
<td>English and Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir-Zeit College</td>
<td>Sawt al-Kulliyah</td>
<td></td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>English and Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Luke’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>English, Arabic, Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Al-Ghad</td>
<td>1939-1941</td>
<td>1939-1941</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelina de Rothschild, Girl’s School</td>
<td>The School Magazine</td>
<td>1935-1940</td>
<td>1935-1940</td>
<td>Hebrew and English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bet ha-sefer ha-tikhon bet-ha-kerem, Jerusalem</td>
<td>Benenu</td>
<td></td>
<td>1936-1941</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hebrew Gymnasium, Jerusalem</td>
<td>Shitlim</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reali School, Haifa</td>
<td>Ha-Talmid, ma hu omer?</td>
<td>1931-1934</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Arabic History textbooks