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‘Moshavot’ were a new form of colony established primarily by Eastern European Jewish immigrants to Palestine from 1878 to 1918, a period of radical changes: the industrial revolution, political and cultural shifts in the Ottoman empire, and social transformations wrought by World War I. How did these processes impact the public spaces of the colonies? Planned and designed as modern spaces, the public areas of the new Hebrew colonies (“moshavot”) demanded functional flexibility, adaptive design, and structural resilience to cope with shifting social, political and demographic conditions. According to researchers of urban space, the resilience of public spaces depends on how they are created and defined, and to which extent they evoke a communal sense of ownership and belonging. The new colonies’ public spaces were vibrant centres for a multi-cultural population. We will examine their vigour during these decades from three perspectives: planning and construction; functions; and long term development. What characterized these public spaces and contributed to their physical and spiritual strength - ‘French’ boulevards, Ottoman-style civic buildings and fountains, synagogues designed by German Templars? Utilising recently discovered archival evidence, we will present a few case studies of the dynamic public spaces that survived this stormy period of history.
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INTRODUCTION

Urban processes leading up to the Industrial Revolution did not bypass Ottoman Palestine. From the mid-19th century, rapid population growth occurred in major cities such as Jerusalem, Jaffa and Safed, and new neighbourhoods were established outside ancient city walls. Marginal settlements expanded, and new villages appeared in the local landscape.1

In the mid-19th century, the Ottoman rulers signed an agreement with Britain and Russia which allowed foreign citizens to purchase land in Palestine. American and German Christians quickly followed, establishing colonies in Jaffa, Jerusalem, and elsewhere. The first Hebrew colony, Petah Tikva, was founded in 1878 by a group of Jerusalemites, residents of the overcrowded Old City, who dreamt of a productive life close to nature. They were joined by Jewish immigrants, most of whom came from Eastern Europe with modern technologies and concepts.

Although Sultan Abdülhamid II was generally opposed to liberal and constitutional ideas, he took several steps to modernize the empire, e.g., supporting the establishment of settlements alongside railroad lines. The international and political circumstances in Palestine motivated the planning of additional settlements and their public spaces were evidence of their Western approach. Nevertheless, the 33 Hebrew colonies established in Palestine between 1878 and 1918 evoked mixed reactions. On the one hand, the Jewish immigrants were perceived as a threat to the Arabs’ ownership of the land. On the other hand, the immigrants’ economic and professional strength was transforming desolate areas of Palestine into flourishing gardens and agricultural fields. Occasionally the Hebrew colony, like its German counterparts in Palestine, was conceived not as an agricultural settlement but as a modern urban quarter, and they indeed evolved into regional hubs, their public places, buildings and open spaces serving and supplying the surrounding rural communities.2

In this article we focus on the first four decades of these colonies - years of revolution, disease, natural disasters and the exigencies of war. We will first review their historic circumstances. Next we will observe the colonies themselves: how they were planned and how they were perceived by neighbouring communities, by visitors, and by leaders of local authorities. We will argue that the resilience of the colonies’ public spaces as they faced natural and man-made disasters was related to their inherent vitality, largely derived from their modernity, their multicultural adaptive design, and their functional flexibility.

On the basis of new, as yet unpublished archival evidence, we will present a few case studies of public spaces in the colonies. We will discuss public buildings, parks, and street elements in a few colonies in the country’s centre, including Petah Tikva and Rishon LeZion, in colonies along the Mediterranean coast such as Zichron Ya’akov and Hadera, and a few of the Galilee colonies, among them Rosh Pina, Menachmia and Metulla, the most northern and isolated of them all.

THE COLONIES: AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

THE YOUNG TURK REVOLUTION

While the Hebrew colonies saw themselves as examples of modern technology and progressiveness, they struggled against everyday bureaucracies and local corruption as they tried to realize their building plans. The Young Turk Revolution in 1908 aroused hopes for change, for progress, prosperity and modernity throughout the Ottoman Empire. However, circumstances proved otherwise: the new regime was soon fighting for its life, using its civilians as the fodder of that fight.3
WORLD WAR I

Turkey joined the World War in November 1914 as an ally of Germany and Austro-Hungary, shaking the settlements in Palestine and halting the flow of normal life. The recruitment of Ottoman citizens throughout the country tore the men, most of them farmers, from the colonies and Arab villages and created an involuntary army that lacked basic supplies. Turkish commanders, later followed by the British, chose to locate their camps next to colonies, relying on the facilities and provision they had to offer (Figure 1). A few colonies such as Rosh Pina (the first in the Galilee) became centres of military activity and major crossroads for the forces that were being organized in the North. Despite themselves the Hebrew settlements became the suppliers of a large army that made free use of their spacious public buildings, their crops and running water.

In March 1917 the Ottoman administration issued a deportation order to all inhabitants of the Jaffa district. Many residents first headed to Petah Tikva, the largest colony at the time, but since it too faced potential deportation, most evacuated (approximately 9000 inhabitants) to Zichron Ya’akov and the Galilee colonies. Overnight, these settlements’ public buildings and spaces became shelters for immigrants. The situation challenged these small communities’ strength and the resilience of their public assets.

NATURAL DISASTERS: DISEASES AND LOCUSTS

The colonies’ early years were scarred by illness and death, much of it related to contaminated water and the swamps that covered much of the countryside. Dysentery and malaria epidemics were part of daily life, and killed many soldiers in both the Turkish and Allied armies. Roughly a year after the war began, swarms of locusts invaded the country, devouring all greenery and stripping the fields, the colonies’ main food source. Trees, too, were severely damaged: their fruit totally consumed by the insects and ornamental trees turned overnight into skeletons.

All these had a huge impact, particularly in the colonies’ open spaces and public buildings, which needed to demonstrate functional flexibility, adaptive design, and structural resilience.

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF RESILIENT PUBLIC SPACES

Architectural historians like Anderson, Carmona, Heath, Oc and Tiesdell, who investigated public spaces, defined the characteristics that made an environment capable of enduring over time. Stanford Anderson classified the ‘resultant environment’ according to its capacity to support and maintain ongoing activity despite extreme changes and or even complete makeovers.

Carmona and others distinguished between the resilience of public buildings and that of open spaces, arguing that open spaces were confronted with fewer challenges and had more physical flexibility, which could thus adapt more easily. They defined the resilience of buildings as ‘robustness’ resulting from their design and their ability to absorb functional changes, which allowed a wider range of uses and activities.

Additional characteristics of the resilient environment can be derived from the work on built environments by Lewis Mumford, Kevin Lynch and others. They maintain that the resilience of public spaces depends on how they are created and defined, and the extent to which they evoke a sense of ownership and belonging.

In this article, the term ‘resilience’ will refer to the long-term durability of a public place resulting from its physical and spiritual vigour. We will examine the characteristics that enabled the public spaces in the Palestine colonies to persist and survive a volatile historic period.
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Figure 1. Metulla colony’s plan, showing a British military camp (rectangle at top of plan), 1924

Figure 2. Zichron Ya’akov, Ohel Ya’akov Synagogue, between 1898 and 1920

Figure 3. Zichron Ya’akov, Administration House,

Figure 4. Kalman Kantor’s plan for park in Zichron Ya’akov, 1888; at the corner of the street - Ohel Ya’akov
DESIGN OF THE PUBLIC SPACE IN THE HEBREW COLONIES

Public spaces were figured in the earliest stages of the Hebrew colonies’ planning and were discussed in several statute books. Specified as communal property, public spaces were considered part of all private lands purchased. E.g., when land was acquired for a settlement, it was divided into 101 parcels: 100 allocated to settlers (the buyers), and one reserved for public use (buildings, parks, etc.).

Taking their cue from European cities, the colonies’ planners tried to include public parks within the built environment in order to ensure air quality. The location of parks made them an integral part of daily life and gave each colony a unique ambiance.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS: PHYSICAL AND SPIRITUAL VITALITY

The Hebrew colony’s major building, often prominently located at the end of its high street, was the synagogue, asserting the religious character of its founders. Since it demanded many financial and human resources, it often needed external support, such as Baron Edmond de Rothschild’s (Figure 2).

Another significant building was the colony’s school. It sometimes served other functions: in the Menachmia colony the school also housed the synagogue. In several colonies, the school stood at the end of the high street, its facade occupying the entire width of the street - a reflection of both the schools’ growing importance and the approval of the Ottomans, who eagerly used them as a sign of their own enlightenment.

The third colonial building with exceptional presence, dubbed the ‘administration house’, was most common in Baron Rothschild’s earliest settlements. Along with smaller buildings around it for the local doctor, the head agronomist, and other functionaries, its size and style exhibited the human resources invested in the colonies’ professional support, and inspired awe in residents and visitors alike.

These public buildings were constructed by engineers, architects and builders with diverse ethnic, religious and national roots. German engineers and architects working in Palestine surveyed the land, parcelled it and built the original public structures. Gottlieb Schumacher, from the Templar colony in Haifa, measured and sketched the future site of Zichron Ya’acov and its environs and planned its first administration house. Baruch Papirmeister, who studied engineering in Berlin, planned a number of public buildings including the ‘Saraya’ (the Ottoman government’s quarters in Jaffa), and buildings in the colonies, such as the synagogue of Rishon LeZion. Architects who came from France or had studied there - among them Abraham (Adolf) Starkmeth, Eliyahu Cantors and Varon - planned schools, administration houses, etc. Other planners, such as Kantor Kalman and Daniel Lipshitz, were from Russia. The new colonies offered architects and entrepreneurs a rare opportunity to plan and implement a host of creative, complex ideas.

The major buildings being erected in Palestine matched the spirit of the time, a period of many styles including Neoclassicism (Italian, German, etc.), that drew inspiration from Ecole des Beaux-arts; they were influenced too by deluxe Arab buildings, e.g., Zichron Ya’akov’s second administration house, modeled on the ‘liwan house’ (Figure 3). Like contemporaneous public buildings elsewhere, these were emblems of civic pride.
FIGURE 5 Zikhron Ya'akov, a Sebil attached to Benjamin's Pool, built in 1891

FIGURE 6 Zikhron Ya'akov, Women are sitting next to Sebil, 1912,
PUBLIC PARKS AND BOULEVARDS

The centre of the colonies, especially those established in the 19th century, often featured a tree-filled park near the main public building, providing a respite from the bustle of the colony’s high street. The earliest colonies set aside huge plots for open public spaces, alternately called jardins, promenade, or refinement gardens, vegetarian, jardins et aires, etc. - names that indicated their planners’ origins and the aspirations and values they attached to these places.

Baron de Rothchild’s representatives, mostly French agronomists and landscapers, played an important role in the colonies. Planners like Justin Dugourd and Jill Deshays drew up elaborate designs for parks with trees, fountains, floral parterres, long paths, and even wide boulevards (Figure 4). In a land of scarce, critical water resources, these gardens and their ornamental functions contrasted sharply with traditional Arab gardens and visibly demonstrated ‘progressive’ Western ideas.

This early period of landscape architecture in Palestine was part of the international discourse among horticulturalists and designers concerning the identification of local and imported plants, their habitats, and the possibilities of their adaptation to foreign climes. In many colonies, the park was divided in two: a promenade, and an experimental nursery for the acclimatisation and breeding of imported species. The colonies’ impressive parks and tree-lined boulevards were the setting for many a photograph of visiting dignitaries.

STREET ELEMENTS: SEBILS

Though their original plans envisioned modern plumbing - iron tubes as in European cities - a few of the colonies had to manage at first without running water indoors. Water was obtained from wells or sebils, stone structures housing a public water fountain. Historically viewed as the hallmark of a beneficent ruler, a few sebils were located at the settlement’s focal points, serving functional and symbolic purposes.

Large sebils, erected next to public buildings as was common in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century, combined Ottoman architecture with Western motifs (Figure 5). Smaller ones which served a few households were characterized with modest design. They reflected the vernacular architecture of the period and added a new, human dimension to the colonial street. A few cast-iron sebils, in the French style, were placed in parks.

The colonies’ sebils, like those in many Turkish cities, were social hubs proffering hospitality to a diverse, multicultural population.

Passers-by with camels or horses, pedlars and workers from neighbouring Arab villages, settler housewives and children all gathered round these watering points (Figure 6).

PUBLIC SPACES, FUNCTIONS AND TRANSFORMATIONS

The usage and transformations of the colonies’ public places reflected radical local and global changes: secularization, the rise of the bourgeoisie and the development of new political systems. The synagogue, for instance, originally served as a community center, used for praying and other functions: boys’ religious school or weddings venue. Occasionally, holiday celebrations and funerals were held in front of the building’s façade. The religious/secular struggle that eventually developed among community members brought changes in the synagogue’s structure and use, maintaining only its religious uses. During World War I, when other public buildings were occupied by military forces, synagogues were used as meeting halls and temporary accommodations.
The multi-purpose administration houses frequently contained the home and offices of the colony’s administrator and perhaps a library, reading room, or conference hall. Colonies that began with just one small office building often built another, more luxurious one after some years, or added a second storey, challenging the height of the synagogue. Administration houses expressed their communities’ national hopes. During the war, the size, appearance and role of the administration houses were coveted by the army, and many were requisitioned by the Ottomans as local military headquarters or hospitals.32

Many of the community schools were attractive examples of modern design, with wide windows for natural ventilation and lighting. A few, captured by the Turkish army, became the quarters of Ottoman officers, despite residents’ strenuous objections to evacuating a school.

The parks, used primarily as agricultural nurseries and field schools by day, were filled with strollers in the evenings and on Saturdays. Located close to the centre of the colony, with shade from the burning sun and a source of running water, the parks offered benefits to armies: in Zichron Ya’akov and elsewhere parks were occupied by Turkish military camps and field hospitals.

Contrary to reports about trees being uprooted to supply wood for Turkish locomotives, the colonies’ parks were in fact highly regarded by the Turks. General Jamal Pasha, Military Governor of the Ottoman troops in Syria, believed they exemplified modernity and progress, two of his favourite values.33 Before the war he held a celebration at Rosh Pina’s administration house; important Arab leaders were invited to a balcony to observe the garden designed by French designer Jill Deshays, where 100 stairs were flanked by two rows of cypress trees. Its floral parterres and ornamental pool created a duly heroic setting for Jamal Pasha.

At the war’s end, the British army was keen to take over these open spaces and spacious buildings. Zichron Ya’akov’s administration house and Metulla’s school became accommodations for high-ranking officers. When the British Mandate was sufficiently established, the colonies adapted their public assets to the new regime.

CONCLUSION

Robert Venturi quotes Kahn’s claim that the design of buildings should be flexible enough to adapt to change: “It is the role of design to adjust to the circumstantial”34. In this article we have shown how modern, progress-oriented public spaces in the Hebrew colonies of Palestine adjusted to circumstances and accommodated changing needs. They served variously as military headquarters (both Ottoman and British), hospitals, celebratory venues, etc. This functional flexibility resulted from planning and building that gave them vitality and strength.

The diverse ethnic and sometimes opposing groups living nearby fostered the colonies’ resilience: their public spaces were geared to serving different purposes at any given moment, to simultaneously represent Ottoman and Eastern European space, as well as French, British, and local Arab space. As researchers have noted, the robustness of buildings lies not only in form and function, but also in those values, meanings and symbols that give them special charm.35 In terms of their intensive cultural and public life, the colonies were towns, while their desire to be close to the earth and fresh air made them villages. Evolved from previous models, their public spaces changed through reform and refinement rather than revolution.36 Besides their functionality and comfort, the design of the colonies’ public places inspired collective pride and granted them a certain immunity to the larger issues whirling around them.
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Endnotes

1 For the neighbourhoods outside the walls of Jerusalem see Ruth Kark, Jerusalem Neighbourhoods, Planning and By-Laws (1855–1930) (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991); for rural settlements developed in this period see David Grossman, Expansion and Desertion, the Arab Village and its Offshoots in Ottoman Palestine (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1994).
4 For example, the British camp located next to Metulla colony (Meditule), CZA (The Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem) J15/189.
5 Army locations are depicted in German aerial photos taken during World War I, as presented in Benjamin Z. Kedar, Looking Twice at the Land of Israel, Aerial Photographs of 1917-18 and 1987-91 (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi & Ministry of Defense, 1991).
6 Alter Druyanov, Tel Aviv Book, vol.1 (Tel Aviv, 1936). 239.
7 In September 1918, Ottoman rule in Palestine ended and, with the start of the British Mandate, a new era began
9 Anderson, On Streets, 7: ‘Such environments can support the multiple and overlapping patterns of ecological sympathy [sic]. This resilience at any moment can also operate over time and thus contribute to a condition of homeostasis despite an extensive restructuring of activities within the environment.’
10 Carmona et al., Public Places, 203.
13 Colonies that had failed to integrate public parks in their initial plans explored ways to correct their absence. For example, see a letter from Efron, Hadera to Vilna, National Library, Jerusalem, v. 379/1.
15 CZA, J15/4154/1m.
16 First name is not known. The only information we have about this architect is that he was brought specially from France to create elaborate buildings.
17 For more information about the professionals hired by Baron Edmond Rothschild see Ran Aaronsohn, Offshoots in Ottoman Palestine, The Baron Edmond Rothschild and the Colonies, Cathedra 90 (1998): 65.
20 Waddesdon archive at Windmill Hill, PIC12/5/12
22 See a sketch of Hadera colony and public park in a letter from Efron, Hadera to Vilna, National Library, Jerusalem, v. 379/1
23 Rishon LeZion Museum’s maps collection.
24 In a map drawn by Adolf Starkmethe, 1905, Rosh Pina Archive, maps collection.
26 See photographs of receptions for General Jamal Pasha, 1915 and for Hon. Chancellor, the British Mandate commissioner, 1931, in the palm-lined boulevard of Rishon LeZion, Rishon LeZion Museum’s collections.
30 Chattopadhyay and White, City Halls, XXI.
32 Ya’akov Epstein’s memoirs, Zichron Ya’akov Archive, A.M.S 666, file 123-5.
33 Impression one gets from his memoirs: Djemal Pasha, Memoirs of a Turkish Statesman, 1913-1919, New York, 1922.
35 Carmona et al., Public Places, 198.
36 It is possible to think about these colonies as a precursor to Howard’s garden city model. Contrary to Howard’s circular model, however, these colonies were usually planned on a linear basis, divided between public and residential streets.
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