The Palestinian Education system in Mandatory Palestine

Ali Jabareen

Quality education can lead to positive social change. Such education can be viewed as an asset for development, and as an essential element in helping individuals in a certain area adopt a more enlightened policy of economic development. When the population of a certain region are qualitatively educated, they become more effective in dealing with hindrances and obstacles in their way towards social advancement. Quality education, which helps promote the interests of society as a whole, can help introduce the desirable, positive factor of modernization, and at the same time help do away with negative, reactionary factors. The impact of education, however, has not been all that positive. Contrary to the afore-mentioned, positive effects of education, a brief review of the literature shows that education can become a two-edged sword. It can be manipulated by a dominant elite, political group or government to oppress and control the population at large. Oppressive elites or despotic governments have often used education as a tool for social control. Such education has often been misused and manipulated to serve only the narrow interests of those in power. Therefore, when one talks about a certain educational system, one must make clear what kind of educational policy he or she is referring to, the content of that education, the curricula, the intentions and policies of the decision makers, be it a dominant class, government, or state. Quality education is the backbone and basic pillar for any enlightened and progressive program of social progress and economic development.

This paper's objective is to trace the education system in mandatory Palestine, and to show how the educational policy adopted by the government of mandatory Palestine was practiced for three consecutive decades. The paper also aims at showing how the system was used by the authorities as a tool for social and political control. The paper will further attempt to point out the difference between mass education versus quality education, and the way in which the curricula and the content of the former have hindered the social and economic progress of the Palestinian Arabs between the years 1917 and 1947. The British government of mandatory Palestine had adopted different approaches and educational policies among the Arabs themselves, Muslims, Druze, and Christians, and on a larger scale between Arabs and Jews. Such inconsistent policies have reflected

themselves most negatively on the relationships among these communities up to this day.

Towards the end of the first world war, in 1917, General Allenby moved with his British forces from Egypt to Jerusalem. This move would put an end to Turkish occupation and mark the beginning of a three-decade period of the British Mandate over Palestine. In 1914, however, Palestine "composed of three administrative districts: the district (Sanjaq) of Acre and the district (Sanjaq) of Nablus, both of which formed parts of the province (Vilayet) of Beirut; the third district (Sanjaq) of Jerusalem was an autonomous one, in the sense that like the province it was directly connected with the central government in Istanbul and not connected with any provincial administration." (Tibawi, p. 7.) Besides such geographical divisions, Palestine was overwhelmed with political controversy and a lack of social and political certainty. Such facts played an essential role in shaping the educational system in mandatory Palestine.

The political controversy and the sense of restlessness in Palestine were strengthened by the conflicting and irreconcilable messages delivered simultaneously by the British government to both Arabs and Jews in the area. For example, how would one reconcile Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations with the Balfour Declaration of 1917? Article 22 says that "the well-being and development" for the peoples of certain territories formerly belonging to the Ottoman Empire formed "a sacred trust of civilization." The well-being and development of such peoples who were "not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world" was to be secured by placing them under the "tutelage of advanced nations who, by reason of their resources, their experience, or their geographical position, can best undertake this responsibility." (Tibawi, p. 57.) One wonders how any responsible or intelligent being would, unless he was a self-interested politician, reconcile this sense of responsibility and trust with the British declaration of 1917. On the one hand, Article 22 talks about British obligation responsibilities, and "sacred" duties towards developing, advancing, and helping Palestinian Arabs stand on their own feet, and on the other hand that same government committed itself to creating a homeland for Jews in Palestine. This double-standard and imbalanced approach on the part of the British government paved the road for a bitter conflict to follow years after the Mandate. One can also readily

perceive that the British educational policy in Palestine must contribute greatly to the sense of alienation and antagonism among both sectors, the Arab and Jewish.

Between 1920 and 1925, when Lord Samuel functioned as the High Commissioner in mandatory Palestine, he was quoted as saying that "the Arabs, a quick-witted people, are beginning to recognize how much they are handicapped by illiteracy. Not only in the towns, but in many of the villages as well, they are eager for the opening of schools, and displaying their eagerness by subscribing voluntarily considerable sums for their establishment." (Anibtari, p. 3). Such a statement, however, raises some questions: What kind of schools did Palestinian Arabs desire to establish? What kind of program should they have? What kind of schools or educational program did Lord Samuel have in mind to establish for the Arab people of Palestine?

Primary education has always been viewed as the most crucial step in the educational ladder. A quality primary education can help prepare intelligent, productive, and more capable individuals, who can work more successfully in the later stages of education. Was Lord Samuel really prepared to invest the necessary resources to create a good primary education system in Palestine? If the investment is inadequate, one would expect the primary schools to be insufficient.
"Poor primary schools compromise the entire system for human capital development. They produce graduates who are poorly prepared for secondary and tertiary education and ill-equipped for lifelong learning. The consequence is an insufficient number of truly educated managers, workers and parents who can efficiently contribute to development." (World Bank, p. 11.) The number of schools in a system is inconsequential as long as they produce ineffective and inefficient pupils.

According to Article 22, one would expect the mandatory government in Palestine, in line with the basic statements of the Article, "to concentrate resources on interventions that improve learning, are cost-effective, and can be widely implemented." (World Bank, p. 14.) Did the British really invest in the "human resources" of the Palestinian people in order to guarantee the desired economic and social development and progress? One also wonders whether the Mandatory government viewed the educational system as a merely mechanical tool to impart dry facts, or as a vital system which could

help meet their national and political aspirations. Quality education relates to the quality of teachers, the kind of facilities available, and the curricula introduced. The number of years of schooling provided at each level and state are also important. Upgrading existing schools can be more effective sometimes than simply increasing the number of schools.

It is probably useful to refer to the education system in Palestine during the Turkish occupation in order to have a deeper understanding of this system during the Mandatory government of Palestine. The following paragraphs will attempt to trace the system that started to take shape during the late 19th and early 20th century. During that time three different school systems existed side by side. These were the Arab-Muslim public school system, controlled by the government, the Christian school system, dependent on missionary efforts and foreign administration, and the Muslim private school system. The nationalistic feelings of Arabs, who felt strongly about the pre-eminence of their language, had strongly influenced their aspirations and struggle for further independence for years to come. Local people began to question the use of Turkish as the language of instruction in the Muslim-Arab public schools. The local communities had become irritated regarding this flagrant violation of their sense of dignity and attachment to their own language. They also suspected the quality of the education offered by that system. "But the conflicts between government and community regarding religious, cultural, and national qualities of education among Palestinian Arabs remained unresolved during the British mandate." (Mer'i, p. 13.) this conflict has its roots in the time when "The Ottoman government assumed, for the first time, responsibility over education services in the empire in 1846, when a special law was issued to institutionalize free education and employment of professional secular teachers in addition to the religious teachers." (Al-Hag, p. 37.) Under the pressure of Arab nationalists, however, the Ottoman government, through the law of 1913, introduced considerable change, such as making primary educational compulsory. The schools also went through a process of secularization, in which the Ministry of Education assumed more control. Al-Hag states that, in 1911, the school-age population was 38,053 boys and 35,374 girls. The government school system included only 6,104 boys and 1.504 girls. Private and foreign schools accounted for 6,974 boys and 2,673

girls. “A sorry picture that 25,000 boys and 34,400 girls were left without a ghost of a chance of learning the alphabet.” (Al-Hag, p. 41.)

As a centralized education system, the Ottoman was modeled after the French. The Education Ministry in Istanbul controlled public schools, both elementary and secondary schools.” Provincial government authorities supervised the operation of the system in higher elementary, lower secondary, and higher secondary schools, while the lower elementary schools were managed by lower education committees almost entirely independent of direct state control.” (Tibawi, p. 19.) In practice the Ottoman state education system included only Muslim children. Arabic was taught through the medium of Turkish. A system which claimed to be compuslory could not provide any decent education for the vast majority of boys or girls. The Ottomans built many elementary schools, but restricted the number of secondary schools. In 1914, there were 95 elementary schools and three secondary schools. They employed 234 teachers, and taught 8,248 pupils, including 1,480 girls. Only during World War I was a high school established in Jerusalem, in which both Arabic and Turkish were used as languages of instruction. In 1914, some private Muslim schools started to appear, the “Kuttab.” These schools were usually housed in mosques or other public buildings, and taught the Qur’an, precepts of Islam, and the “three R’s.” Teachers at these schools were trained in mosques or in Al-Azhar university in Cairo, and worked without state assistance or inspection.

As people of “Millet” or “Thimma,” (non-Muslims), the Christians and the Jews had their own school systems. “Both communities could well afford to ignore state facilities legally open to them.” (Tibari, p. 21.) The Jewish school system was divided into foreign schools, in which the language of the foreign body administering the school was used, and smaller schools run by Jewish settlers, which used the Hebrew language. To an extent, the education system of the Christian Arabs was also managed by foreign institutions, which also used their own languages. “Besides schools of Russian, French, German, and English affiliation, there were other Christian schools sponsored by Italian, AMer’ican, Austrian, and other bodies.” (Tibawi, p. 37.) “Jewish education in Palestine until 1914 was for the most part promoted by Jewish organizations and associations centered in other countries. Some of these concentrated on educational work, while others extended their activities to colonization, public health, immigration,

industrial development, and other fields." (Avilor, Moshe, 1957.) During the Ottoman period the Hebrew Board of Education ("Va'ad HaHinukh" was formed. "The schools formed by this committee were the nucleus of the Hebrew education system in the pre-state period." (Al-Hag, p. 53.)

Arab School Systems in the British Mandate

According to Article 15 of the Mandate, "the right of each community to maintain its own schools for the education of its own members in its own language, while conforming to such educational requirements of a general nature as the administration may impose, shall not be denied or impaired." (Tibawi, p. 11.) It would turn out later that the Muslim public schools were the only schools to conform to regulations and requirements imposed by the administration. Article 22 also stated that "English, Arabic and Hebrew shall be the official languages of Palestine." (Tibawi, p. 11.) "As de facto successors to the Turkish government they themselves assumed all responsibility for state education." (Tibawi, p. 24.) The administration, however, shared the burden of opening new village schools.

What is particularly striking about the Arab schooling system under the British Mandate is the extent of its quantitative increase. Also, the British Mandate authorities seemed to allow the original owners of Arab schools to maintain their control over their schools. The education system became free. However, it was never compulsory. In 1917 the number of governmental schools was 100; by 1947 there were 550. In 1917 only 8% of school-age children attended school; in 1947 more than 30% did. "Overall, Arab education in Palestine developed significantly under the Mandatory administration. Schools were established in many villages, making educational opportunities more accessible. Secondary school education increased and became strongly associated with the achievement of a white collar job, usually as a clerk or a civil servant who not only enjoyed economic mobility and security, but also a higher status due to his association with the rulers." (Mer'i, p. 15.)

Jewish Education in Palestine

Unlike the education system of the Palestinian Arabs, the Jewish educational system always moved towards further autonomy and independence. The number of Jews grew from 24,000 in 1882 to 60,000 in 1918 to 650,000 in 1948. Among the 85,000 Jews who lived in Palestine in

1914, 12,000 lived in 44 different agricultural settlements. During the years of WWI, some thousand Jews were forced to leave the country, while others were subjected to torture, mistreatment, and famine. Such experiences led to later conflict among the various communities in Palestine. "Thus, from the outset, there arose bitter controversy among the British, Arabs and Jews concerning the relative weight that was to be assigned to the conflicting purposes of the Mandate." (Kleinberger, p. 15.) The education system played an important role in this conflict, and helped shape the kind of community for years to come. "Under these circumstances, the Jewish community in Palestine was driven to rely more and more on its own autonomous institutions which constituted a veritable state within the state." (Kleinberger, p. 20. The main Zionist parties took stronger control over the education system. They created the "trend" system "Under which the educational philosophies and programs of the institutions of learning tended to reflect the outlook of the parties sponsoring them." (Abraham, p. 10). The bigger the Jewish community in Palestine grew, the more change the educational system witnessed. New kinds of schools and institutions "financed and maintained by Jewish philanthropic and Zionist organizations the world over" (Abraham, p. 16) became more prominent. Also, the Jewish community waxed more prosperous economically, socially, and culturally. Despite external and internal hardships and hostilities, one of the main elements that helped sustain that community and "contributed greatly to its development was the Jewish school system." (Avidor, p. 21.) Unlike the Muslim-Arab commuity, the Jews implemented compulsory schooling from the outset. Besides being financed by foreign bodies, "the community imposed substantial taxation upon itself and demanded tuition fees from parents in order to maintain its education system." (Avidor, p. 22.) A high percentage of the money needed to run a decent educational system was provided by the parents of the pupils. Since the early 20th century, the Jewish education system started growing both quantitatively and qualitatively. This growth was heavily reliant upon a supportive Mandatory government, which always the system to more autonomy and to the status of "private and missionary" schools. The major underlying factors for this growth can be summed up in the following: the Jewish community was itself more educated and more capable of exerting the required pressure upon the Mandatory government to guarantee further expansion and independence; the British government committed itself to supporting and helping the

Zionist movement; the Jewish community was economically much more prosperous than the Arab community, counting also on vast external economic resources.

Arabs and Jews in Palestine in the 1920's-1940's

Until 1948, Arabs were the majority in Palestine. Between the early 20's until the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, both communities "were involved in a continuous war which started on a semi-organized basis in the 1920's, and has escalated since then. The most noticeable fighting periods were the late 30's and the late 40's." (Mer'i, p. 1.) Between the years 1911 - 1948, the Arab population grew from 600,000 to 1,294,000. Among those, 89% were Muslim and 11% were Christians. 75% of the Muslim Arab population were peasants or "Fallaheen." Most of them were either landless or poor, living on manual labor. In the early 1930's, however, the "construction projects instigated by the Mandatory government" (Al-Hag and Rosenfeld; 1990, p. 10.) tempted the villagers to move to the towns. During that process of urbanization, the town dwellers among Muslim Arabs reached 32%. Christian Arabs, for their part, have long lived in towns. The Jewish population, which had historically dwelt in towns, started a move in the opposite direction, moving to agricultural settlements and away from the towns.

When discussing educational policy under the Mandatory government, one must take into consideration that this governmental educational system revolved around the villagers or "Qarawi." "The villagers were the selected peasant population and spread all over the country and constituted the bulk of the Muslim Arabs." (Tibawi, p. 16.)

Political and National Awareness

The educational policy adopted by the Mandate government was frustrating and disappointing to many Arabs in Palestine. Teachers and students alike became more aware nationally and politically o the deliberate attempt by the Mandatory government to deprive them of any autonomy and prevent the curricula from acquiring any content that might fan nationalistic feelings. "In many cases they came to express their disappointment and frustration at the lack of autonomy for Palestinian Arabs over their education, which was directed and supervised by British officials." (Mer'i, p. 16.) Arab educators felt that it was unfair to grant the Jews autonomy over

an education system which served less than 10% of the population and to deprive the Arab majority of the same right. Also, the various continuous wars that took place between Arabs and Jews in Palestine alarmed the Arabs, who started to question more actively the role of the British in Palestine. Educated Arabs felt that the British control over their education system posed a real threat to their future existence, as well as to their national unity and identity. The Arabs were infuriated when "the assistant of the director general of the Mandatory Department of Education opposed the demand for autonomy. His rationale was that a nation able to direct its education autonomously also needs political autonomy, and he saw the Arabs of Palestine as people who needed mandate." (Mer'i, p. 17.) This imbalance had certainly led the British to believe that only by controlling the Arab education system would they be able to preserve political and social stability in the area.

In order to maintain such control, "the Mandatory government tried to preserve and even to reinforce the local traditional system among the Palestinian community. This was aimed at minimizing the cost of the British control and maintaining social and political stability." (Miller, 1985.) The British officials attempted to maintain the status quo in Palestine in order to avoid any real changes. The results, however, were counterproductive. National conflicts increased. Demographically, economically and politically, the Palestinian Arab society witnessed rapid changes, contrary to the expectations of the Mandatory government. In their attempt to control Palestinian Arabs, the British based their policies "on a long experience of colonial rule. Thus, the Mandatory government was from the very beginning aware of the importance of controlling the education system." (Al-Hag, p. 47.)

Arab frustration and mistrust of the British government officials burst out immediately towards the end of WWI. Arab forces joined the Allies to fight the Turks, hoping that the Allies, especially Britain, would fulfill its promise to the Arabs. The British broke their promise, and on November 2, 1917, they issued the Balfour Declaration and decided to replace the Turks in the rule of Palestine. "The educated were most aware of these national feelings and political dynamics because of the national significance of their occupation as "nation builders." Therefore, when they were subjected to yet another kind of foreign rule they were extremely frustrated. (Mer'i, p. 16.)

In 1925, for example, when Balfour visited Palestine, Arab teachers and students protested his visit and went on strike. Teachers and students did the same on different occasions during the British Mandate to express their anger and frustration with the British policies in Palestine. Teachers often felt confused and perplexed. "On the one hand, they had to maintain their loyalty to a government whose policy they disliked at heart. On the other hand, they had to be patriots and models for the young in the raising of their national consciousness.' (Al-Hag, p. 49.) Arab teachers often found themselves caught amidst irreconcilable realities, and they often realized that "the balance between these loyalties was not always even, in times of crisis it sharply swung in favor of the national side." (Tibawi, 1956, p. 196.) In the grip of such "confusing and strongly conflicting loyalties," one finds it hard to talk about quality education.

British attempts to "denationalize" the Arab education system in Palestine was another source of fatigue and frustration to the Palestinian community, especially its educated members. Educated Arabs felt that the British Mandate promoted policies of denationalization in order to "prepare ground conducive to the establishment of the State of Israel." (Miller, 1985.) Therefore, Palestinian Arabs at that time tripled their nationalistic efforts, in order to help mold their sense of national identity. Also, the British thought that their denationalization policy would cost them much less in maintaining total control over the Palestinian population. The "mandate sought to 'immunize' the Arab population against nationalistic feeling that seemed threatening to their concept of order and stability." (Al-Hag, p. 48.) The Mandatory government viewed education as tool for controlling the population, but never as a means of social, economic, political and cultural change and development. The Mandatory educational policy aimed, on the contrary, at keeping "Arabs ignorant "Siasat Al-Jahil" (Said, 1984, p. 36.) How can any educational policy devoid of any "national content" be considered quality education or a tool for positive social change? This policy aimed at producing politically blind individuals, who were totally alienated from their own heritage, culture, and natural political concerns.

In order to have a closer look at the way the education system operated in Palestine, one can start with the Department of Education. In 1920, the civil authorities appointed the first director of education, who became responsible for the first Department of Education in Jerusalem. Both the director and his

assistant were British. The Director appointed six inspectors, two in the headquarters and four others, one for each district. "Within five years the structure of a directorate, an inspectorate and an executive and clerical staff was built up." (Tibawi, p. 28.) The directorate had many deficiencies, some of which were crippling and posed serious threats to any real educational progress in Palestine. The Director of Education in Palestine acted as one who "combines the powers and functions of Parliament, the minister of Education, the local education authorities and the national union of teachers." (Tibawi, p. 30.) This director had full control over major issues such as "educational legislation," appointments and dismissals of teaching staff and education officers, the curricula, and "said the final word in all professional matters." (Tibawi, p. 30.) People referred to the department as the personal property of the Director. His name was dominant and his word was final; no one could criticize him or even make suggestions to him.

In one of the annual reports which were issued between 1928-1938, the functions of the department were described as the following: "the department fulfills a triple function. In the first place, it supervises education in general, advises the central and district government authorities, inspect schools, government and non-government, distributes grants-in-aid, collects and collates statistical information, and conducts controls and supervises examinations. Next, it administers and maintains out of public funds the schools of the Arab public system, known as government schools employing therefore a considerable staff of teachers. Lastly, it controls inspection and otherwise, the Jewish public system to which a block grant-in-aid is assigned from public revenues." (Tibawi, p. 40.)

In the light of the above, one wonders whether any individual human being, an average or even a super-human director, could do justice to a position of such breadth. Faults and deficiencies multiplied, which negatively impacted the Arab educational system in Mandatory Palestine. Such deficiencies can be summarized as: discontinuity in top level leadership, especially the position of Director; lack of proper Arab representation, and the appointment of unqualified individuals to sensitive positions. All these contributed greatly to the confusion and low-spirited morale among Muslim Arabs in Palestine. The inadequacy of the educational system held especially true for women and Fellaheen, more than 95% of whom were Muslim Arabs.

Discontinuity at the top level was a most negative element in hindering true progress in quality education in mandatory Palestine. For example, Major Williams, who gained a lot of experience in India, was the first to take charge of the Department of Education. He occupied this position for one month, only to be replaced by Major Indman, who gained his experience in Egypt. During the military administration Major Indman held this position from October, 1918, to July, 1920. After the civil administration was inaugurated, he returned to work in the Ministry of Education in Egypt, whereupon his assistant, Major Legge, replaced him until November. Legge was replaced in turn by an Eton and Oxford graduate by the name of Humphrey Bowman, who was the first to be appointed Director of Education. Bowman, who was selected for his civil experience in inspection and school administration in Egypt, Iraq, and Sudan said: "I found myself responsible for formulating an educational policy for a country which had never possessed one." (Tibawi, p. 26.) It clearly says that all those who proceeded him had done actually nothing. Even Bowman had no clear policy to implement. "The first responsibility of the newly formed administration was to take over its heritage of Turkish state schools or to re-organized and improve them, to adapt them to modern conditions, and to increase their number." (Tibawi, p. 26.) Furthermore, this director, coming from a strong British policy background, was supposed to function in a school system that was originally modeled after the French education system.

In 1921, Legge resigned as an assistant director, to be replaced by an Arab called George Antonius. Antonius was a Cambridge graduate and a good diplomat, who had strong relationships with both the Arab community and the British authorities. In 1923 he became a director of the Department of Education, and Mr. Jerome Farrell was appointed as his assistant. Mr. George Antonius took his position seriously, and tried to introduce substantial changes into the Department of Education. In the mid 1920's, however, he was often asked by Sir Gilbert Clayton to leave his office and travel with him to various Arab countries, to hold negotiations with the leaders of those countries on behalf of the British government in London. During his absence, Farrell, who came from an intelligence background, carried out his duties and acted as a Director de facto. Farrell was promoted to "senior education officer" and then to "deputy director." "His meteoric

promotions resulted in ousting Antonius from his position who on his return found himself in a position similar to that of Michael Sadler to Robert Morton some quarter of a century earlier in the English Board of education." (Tibawi, p. 20.) Being subordinate to his "assistant," Antonius had no choice but to declare his resignation and return to Egypt. The Mandatory government hailed his resignation, and put an end to any attempt on the part of the Arabs to aspire to a top position in the department. The Directorate became a purely British domain until the end of the Mandate.

Another problem was the lack of fair representation for Arabs in any of the governing bodies of the Mandatory government. For example, in both the Advisory Council and the Legislative Council, which were created in 1920 and 1922 respectively, Arab representation was minimal compared to their actual percentage of the population. Arabs had seven of 20 seats in the Advisory Council, and ten out of 23 seats in the Legislative Council. Arabs were never satisfied, and their "demand for proportional representation continued to be made but was never granted." (Tibawi, p. 13.) It seems that every time the Mandatory government tried or pretended to introduce a better Arab representation, it would end up "on the Sadler-Morant pattern" (Tibawi, p. 30), in which the newly appointed Arab representative found himself subordinate and unable to function to an extent where he had to resign. "The Government did not seriously wish to secure real representation of the people." (Tibawi, p. 30.) In many cases, junior, inexperience, or unqualified candidates would be promoted over more experienced and qualified native ones. Such a professionally irresponsible and politically motivated approach would and did cause "irreparable damage to the esprit de corps of the department and teaching staff." (Tibawi, p. 30.) Regardless of the rank or qualification of the Arab appointed, he would still be "answerable to the British deputy director and director." (Tibawi, p. 31.)

Another destructive element in the educational policy adopted by the Mandatory government was the negligence and total lack of concern for the education of women, particularly rural women. An educated woman is the core of every civilized society. If a leader is keen to witness any serious social, political or cultural change and development, he or she must make sure that women are given the opportunity to obtain a substantial education. The government's major concern was to maintain social and political stability, and not to "defy" the feelings of religious or conservative sectors of

the population. This policy created an imbalance between the education of urban and rural women. Urban women became more educated, and therefore more socially and politically influential and effective. Although their educated was limited, they managed to engage themselves in various new professions and social services. Rural women, on the other hand remained uneducated, secluded, and socially almost crippled. The Jewish inhabitants of Palestine, especially the new immigrants, by contrast, were much more advanced technologically and economically, due in large part to universal access to education. An illiterate Arab woman was unable to influence her environment; she was instead always passively controlled by it. Even when schools for girls were opened in the Arab sector, "Women teachers, trained or untrained, were almost impossible to find among the Muslim community. Few among the Christian communities could be found with sufficient general knowledge and experience." (Tibawi, p. 25.)

In order to show the difference between declared policy and practiced policy, one can take a more detailed look at female education in Mandatory Palestine. The first center opened for girls' education in 1918 by the British military administration was in the charge of a British woman who acted as an "advisor on female education," "inspector of the girls school at the headquarters," and the "principal of the Women's Training College," simultaneously. Regardless of the fact that her background was entirely different socially, culturally and politically from that of her clients, she was assigned to carry out her duties in these three different posts and help build a system which ideally would require a great deal of work and dedication. Such missions were almost impossible to reconcile. Upon her retirement in the late 30's, she was replaced by two British women, who divided the work between them. Also, the only female to be appointed as an assistant director responsible for girls' education was a British woman. Arab females, both urban and rural, were under-represented and totally ignored at the higher administrative levels. This phenomenon led to a state of confusion and lack of progress in Arab education for girls, especially in villages.

Inspection and the appointment of inspectors was another hindrance to progress in the education system adopted by the Mandatory government. Most inspectors were unqualified, inexperienced, and unfit for their positions. As a tool in the hands of the Director of Education, the inspectorate began operating in 1920. Six Arab inspectors were appointed,

but their authority to genuinely influence the education system in their districts was almost minimal. For example, the inspectors who worked at the Headquarters and who had actual contact with the Director were a "former missionary" and a "former intelligence officer." (Tibawi, p. 31.) Such backgrounds indicate that the purpose of their appointment was far from educational. On many occasions, when Antonius asked their opinions on educational matters such as syllabi or curricula, they would reply with "I agree, over the initials of each inspector." Infuriated over such responses, Antonius once wrote, "Inspectors, I asked you to be good enough to give me your considered views, not your unqualified approval!" (Tibawi, p. 31.) What strikes one as even more surprising is that the number of university degree holders in the inspectorate from 1920-1948 remained the same; only one. Two inspectors could not write Arabic, but wrote some Turkish. One of them could not speak a word of English, while a fourth would write some indecipherable classical Arabic which did others no favor whatsoever. The fifth even doubted "that the earth was a sphere." (Tibawi, p. 31.) These inspectors were considered the "local directors of education," or as holding a function similar to the "chief education officer in an English country" (Tibawi, p. 32.) Operating under the control of the Director, they were supposed theoretically to be responsible for schools, staff, and the various materials utilized in education at school. They were supposed to report on conditions at schools to the Director, and to assume administrative positions as well. Even worse, assistant inspectors, an even lower-ranked and less qualified class of officials, were in charge of village and rural schools.

The way these inspectors operated at schools was also peculiar. "Inspectors usually arrived individually without notice and proceeded with their task for a day of two and rarely for more at one school." (Tibawi, p. 33.) The number of inspectors to visit each school was not determined by the need to do the job properly , but rather by the fact that a certain number of inspectors would be "comfortably seated in a small car." (Tibawi, p. 33.) The quality of the reports was low in most cases, containing nothing of substance. "Nothing specially wrong" was their "contagious formula." (Tibawi, p. 33.) The Department of Education failed to provide them with real guidance; their work was arbitrary and random. As Tibawi puts it: "They did not rely on a solid basis of general culture and a sound knowledge of educational principles." (Tibawi, p. 33.) Tibawi also adds that "culture

and knowledge of pedagogy was always a rare combination to find in a member of the inspectorate." (Tibawi, p. 34.) Under such circumstances any real, substantial changes leading to the development of quality education could not be expected to take place.

The curriculum was another obstacle in the way to achieving quality education in Palestine. The Mandatory government attempted to maintain complete control over the curriculum. Arab nationalists viewed such a policy as restrictive and suffocating. On the other hand, it was clear to them that "it is natural for a centralized education administration that controlled highly selective schools, in which the majority of the teachers were unqualified and untrained, to exercise complete control of the curriculum and text books." (Tibawi, p. 77.) Such control was manifested in the French model, which was adopted by both the Turks and the Egyptians. For example, "contemporary history and the geography of the Arab countries were excluded from the official syllabus." (Tibawi, 1956, p. 196; Al-Hag, 1994, p. 48.) This attempt on the part of the Mandatory government to quench the legitimate nationalistic feelings of the Arabs proved counterproductive. "The oppression of the national element in the formal curriculum resulted in a vacuum which was soon filled by national organizations." (Al-Hag, p. 48.) Yousuf, who criticizes the curriculum in the public schools, says that "a mere glance at the curriculum of the Arab schools in Palestine would show its static nature and the attempt to preserve stability or even to reduce the status of the Arab society, or at least to fix it at a certain level of development." (Yousuf, 1956 p. 182; Al-Hag, 1994, p. 48.) Abu-Ghazaleh adds that the "Mandatory government did not take into consideration the development of the Arab population in social and educational fields." (Abu-Ghazaleh, 1973, p. 92; Al-Hag, 1994, p. 48.)

The curricula offered to Arab schools in general were inadequate and ineffective. Their main purpose was to allow the Mandatory government to have social and political control. Another issue which worsened the situation was that "the curriculum offered to rural areas also differed from that used in town schools. The main aim in the rural schools was to teach basic skills. Before 1935, very few village schools taught English." (miller, p. 85; Al-Hag, p. 49.) This made it almost impossible for villagers to keep up with urban students, or to be able to pursue higher education. Also, agricultural and technical education were introduced to the curriculum, an

introduction which, while useful in theory, was always inadequate and insufficient in practice. No tangible results were produced, due to the lack of trained teachers or well-equipped trade and technical schools.

In practice, the Director of the Department of Education was All-in-All. "The Inspectorate and the department as a whole, were little more than a collection of un-coordinated individuals ruled by an autocratic head, who maintained a steady flow of instructions and rulings ex cathedra." (Tibawi, p. 36.) Despite the intentions to expand the Department of Education, it remained virtually handicapped as far as the introduction of substantial and qualitative change was concerned due to certain elements. Any quantitative expansion was not supported by expertise in the field, for example: the "absence of certain specialists on its staff," the lack of "certain important ancillary services," the inability to introduce even one trained psychologist or qualified statistician. (Tibawi, p. 40.) Furthermore, the school system underwent a selection process which was controlled directly by the Director. Most often highly qualified students at all stages were deprived of the opportunity to pursue their education due to this unscientific selection process, which was not in "harmony with the results of modern psychological research." (Tibawi, p. 41.) Statistical tables were prepared by novices and clerks. The Director never cared to train qualified statisticians and psychologists, although he had the means to do so. During the years of the Mandate, nothing or real value to the students was published. The "total absence of any research in any field of the department's activities during its entire life" (Tibawi, p. 40) is rather surprising, in light of the fact that research of all kinds was being carried out all over Europe.

While reviewing the literature, however, one cannot claim that all the Mandatory government did was negative. Actually, there were some positive aspects worth mentioning. The Department helped local committees in villages operate to start new schools. "The encouragement of the local education committees that functioned under the Turks to resume their activities," (Tibawi, p. 25) made it a little easier for people to work towards expanding the education system in the villages. Even when these committees were faced with severe financial problems, the military administration helped them through grants. Such grants, together with money raised by the villagers, helped pay for teachers and open new schools. The administration also introduced Arabic instead of Turkish as the

language of instruction; this was a good step towards establishing Arabic as the first language of the natives. Also, the foreign schools, which were re-opened and permitted to operate using the language of the country sponsoring the school, helped promote tolerance and understanding between Muslims, Christians, and the foreigners who ran those schools. This encounter was a civilized one at the seats of learning, rather than a destructive one on the battlefield. Although the number of Muslim students who attended these foreign schools was limited due to their costs, the outcome was one of deeper appreciation and understanding of each other's heritage and traditions. The foreign schools inspired Arab nationalists to conceive a new school model different from the religious or traditional standard. In the new schools, pupils learned that "religion is for God, the mother country is for all." (Tibawi, p. 66.) These schools used Arabic as the language of instruction and introduced more material on Arab history, ancient and modern, and the geography of the Arab world.

Conclusion

For the purpose of this paper, I will conclude by saying that the negative aspects of the Mandatory Government's educational policy far outweighed the positive ones. Its overall policies aimed at maintaining control and political and social stability among the natives, at the expense of real issues which could have promoted development and genuine progress. The British Director was the final authority and ultimate power, applying British rules to a French system developed by the Turks and managed by British individuals to subjugate the native Arab population. The Department aimed at physical expansion and promoted quantity over quality as the measure of achievement. True training, specialization and expertise in the various fields of education remained mere dreams. The after-effects of these policies are still strongly felt today in the Arab society in Israel, especially in the rural areas, where more than 80% of the Israeli Arabs live. The gaps between male-female, rural-urban, Christian Arab and Muslim Arab, still remain. Native industries and crafts are still nascent, where they exist at all. The disempowering educational policy adopted by the Mandatory Government has left its imprint on generations to come.

جهاز التربية والتعليم الفلسطيني تحت الانتداب

يهدف هذا المقال إلى تتبُّع أثر جهاز التربية والتعليم الفلسطيني تحت الانتداب ليبيِّن كيف مورست السياسة التعليمية التي تبنّتها حكومة الانتداب في فلسطين لمدة ثلاثة عقود متتالية.

كذلك يحاول المقال أن يظهر كيف أن السلطات قد استعملت هذا الجهاز كأداة للسيطرة الاجتماعية والسياسية. كما ويشير إلى الفرق بين ما يسمى بتربية جماعية "mass education" وتربية نوعية ذات جودة "quality education".

يسعى المقال أيضا أن يبيّن كيف أن مناهج ومضامين التربية الجماهيرية أو العامة قد لعبت منذ 1916–1947. كذلك فإن حكومة الانتداب الإنجليزي في فلسطين قد تبنت توجهات وسياسات تعليمية مختلفة بين العرب أنفسهم من مسلمين ودروز ومسيحيين، وعلى نطاق أوسع بين العرب من ناحية واليهود من ناحية أخرى. مثل هذه السياسات الغير ثابتة قد عكست نفسها بشكل سلبي على العلاقات بين هذه المجتمعات المذكورة حتى يومنا هذا.

תקציר

מערכת החינוך הפלסטינית בתקופת המנדט הבריטי

המטרה של נייר עמדה זה היא לעקוב אחרי מערכת החינוך הפלסטינית בתקופת המנדט הבריטי ולהראות איך יושמה מדיניות חינוכית שאומדה ע"י ממשלת המנדט בפלסטין, במשך שלושים שנה של המנדט, הנייר מתכוון גם כן להראות איך השתמשה ממשלת המנדט במערכת החינוך ככלי של השתלטות פוליטית וחברתית . המאמר ינסה להצביע על הבדלים בין חינוך כולל "Mass education" וחינוך איכותי " Quality education" ולהראות שתוכנית הלימוד והתכנים שלהם היוו מכשול בפני התקדמותם הכלכלי והחברתי של הערבים הפלסטינים משנת 1917-1947 . ממשלת המנדט הבריטי אימצה גישות שונות ומדיניות חינוכית שונה בין הערבים עצמם , מוסלמים , נוצרים ודרוזים ובין הערבים בכלל ויהודים. מדיניות הלא יציבה זו השביעה בצורה שללית על אוכלסיות אלה.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Al-Hag, Majid. **Education, Empowerment, and Control: The Case of the Arabs in Israel**. State University of New York Press, 1995.

Anabtawi, Samir N. **Palestinian Higher Education in the West Bank and Gaza: A Critical Assessment**. KPI Press Ltd., 1986.

Avidor, Moshe. **Education in Israel**. Jerusalem, 1957.

Bentwich, Joseph S. **Education in Israel**. Joseph S. Bentwich Press, 1965.

Braham, Randolph L. **Israel: A Modern Education System**. U.S. Government Printing Office. Washington, 1966.

Kleinberger, Aharon. **Society, Schools and Progress in Israel**. Pergamos Press, 1969.

Lockheed, Marlaine E, and Bloch, Deborah. "A World Bank Policy Paper: Primary Education." The World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1990.

Mar'i, Sami Khalil. **Arab Education in Israel**. Syracuse University Press, 1978.

Tibawi, A.L. **Arab Education in Mandatory Palestine: A Study of Three Decades of British Administration**. Luzac & Co. Press Ltd., 1956.