

The Jewish Colonisation Association and a Rothschild in Palestine

Author(s): Anne Ussishkin

Source: *Middle Eastern Studies*, Oct., 1973, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Oct., 1973), pp. 347-357

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4282496>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Middle Eastern Studies*

JSTOR

The Jewish Colonisation Association and a Rothschild in Palestine

by Anne Ussishkin

The following¹ is an attempt to clarify the nature of the 'partnership' formed between Baron Edmond de Rothschild and the Jewish Colonisation Association² (henceforth referred to as ICA) in 1899 for the development of their work in Palestine. The relevant literature does not deal with this aspect, but a more thorough and balanced examination of the subject must await the opening of the private archives of the Rothschild family and the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association.

The beginning of Rothschild's active interest in the Palestinian settlements dates to 1882.³ At that time there were a few struggling colonies in Palestine, which were mainly settled by followers of the Chovevei Zion and the Bilu. In 1883 Rothschild established his administration there under Elie Scheid, and by 1889 a system of contracts and direct aid had brought Rishon-le-Zion, Zichron Yaacov, Rosh Pina, Petah-Tikva, Yessod Hamaalah and Ekron (founded by the Baron) under his control. During the following years Rothschild founded two small settlements near Zichron Yaacov, Bat Schlomo and Meir Shfeya and the colony of Metulla. These were mainly settled by the sons of farmers in the older colonies which suffered from insufficient land. The administration concentrated primarily on developing the cultivation of grapes. From 1895 the settlers in the so-called independent colonies of Gedera, Rehovoth and Ness Ziona were allowed to sell their produce at the Rishon-le-Zion wine press for the same artificial price as that paid to the colonists under the Rothschild administration.

The Baron's philanthropic regime demanded total obedience from the settlers, and their lack of independence and the friction created by bureaucratic domination led to several revolts in the colonies. During the last years of the Rothschild administration various reforms were initiated, administrative expenses were reduced, and the settlers were increasingly associated with the agricultural administration. A number of workers became colonists and some of the settlers became owners of their vines, though most continued to depend entirely on the monthly subsidies of the Baron.

By 1899, when the settlements were transferred to the ICA administration, there were nine colonies dependent on Rothschild. These were primarily based on the cultivation of grapes and oranges, and covered over two-thirds of the Jewish-owned land in Palestine.⁴ The regime was to last until the colonies became self-supporting and the settlers owned their land, but what had been established as a transient organization made relatively little progress towards independence during the period of the Baron's administration.

ICA's approach to work in Palestine forms the background to its connections with the Rothschild interests. It should be noted that the question

of activity in Palestine was not raised by the ICA Administrative Council⁵ until after the death of Baron Maurice de Hirsch on April 20, 1896.⁶ Before the founding of ICA, Hirsch himself had given some aid to settlers in Rosh Pina in 1883, but the arrival of his representative in Palestine at the time was regarded by Rothschild as an intrusion on his domain.⁷ It seems probable that ICA would have worked in Palestine to some extent even if Rothschild had not been on the scene.⁸

However, all the early efforts of ICA were directed towards South America. The 'Articles of Association' of the society did not specifically mention Palestine,⁹ and their lack of definition meant that the early sessions of the Administrative Council were primarily devoted to defining the aims and interests of the Association. On October 14, 1896 the Council passed a motion to support agricultural work 'equally in extra-European countries other than Argentina, and especially in Algeria, in Tunisia, in Asia Minor and in Palestine'¹⁰ A motion presented by Rabbi Zadoc Kahn,¹¹ that ICA should provide loans for needy colonies in Palestine was passed by a small majority on October 15, 1896.¹² This vote marked the beginning of ICA's work in the Holy Land,¹³ and during the following three years this was carried out by its representatives there, Joseph Niego, Albert Antébi and others. Over no question was the ICA Council so deeply divided as over this issue, and throughout the years prior to World War I, the opposition was led by the English members of the Council.

On November 12, 1899 Narcisse Leven, the president of ICA, reported to the Council on Rothschild's suggestions that ICA should take over the management of his colonies in Palestine.¹⁴ The decision to transfer the colonies had been made primarily owing to their weak economic position, the growing criticism of Rothschild's work and his own poor health. In January 1899, the Baron had paid his third visit to Palestine, and had made his only official reference to the intended transfer when he visited Rishon and declared that from then on the settlers would have to fend for themselves. He had added that they should not imagine that the administration had influenced him in his decision.¹⁵ Rothschild had intended to form a society similar to ICA, but because of ill-health he decided to transfer the management of the colonies to ICA, with whose policy he did not entirely agree.¹⁶ The ICA Council sent a delegation of three¹⁷ to discuss the proposition with the Baron, and accepted the final version of the agreement by seven votes to two, with two abstentions.¹⁸

The agreement of 1899 was initially welcomed by the settlers. It established a partnership which was to last until after World War I, and which did not involve ICA in any financial obligations for the first six years, after which period the contract was to be renewed. Under the agreement the Palestine Commission, the body responsible for the management of the colonies, was established in Paris in January 1900, with six members, of whom ICA chose three and the Baron two, while he himself functioned as president until his death.¹⁹ The Palestine Commission was given considerable administrative powers, but was unable to create new colonies or extend existing ones without the permission of ICA. The Baron provided a fund of 15 million francs for the work in Palestine,²⁰ agreeing to donate a further two million for the expansion of the colonies when the need arose. If it seemed to ICA that the results of the Palestine colonization did not justify the sacrifices involved, or which would be called for in the future, the Palestine Commission could decide on the liquidation of its

work in Palestine. In the first five years Rothschild's permission for this move was needed, unless the total deficit exceeded ten million francs, in which case the ICA Council could make the decision alone. After ten years ICA could demand liquidation if the results in the colonies did not seem to justify the expense.²¹ No reports of the meetings of the Palestine Commission are known to us, and its work can best be studied through the reports and correspondence of Emile Meyerson, a director of ICA and the member of the Council responsible for Palestinian affairs. The members chosen to represent ICA on the Palestinian Commission were among those more favourable to developments in Palestine, and this fact underlined the division of opinion existing in the ICA Council from the start.

The administrative system established in 1899 was essentially clumsy. The available archival material gives little indication as to the extent of Rothschild's influence on ICA's work in Palestine.²² The Baron's primary role was to authorise the budgets and cover the deficit. Contact between ICA and the Palestine Commission was in the form of reports presented by the latter to the ICA Administrative Council and the members of ICA who were not members of the Commission were often ill-informed on its work in Palestine (see below).

Local officials in Palestine served both ICA and the Commission simultaneously, corresponding with whichever body was responsible for the case in question, and local officials complained of a lack of consistency in ICA's policy and administrative difficulties caused by the cumbersome machinery established to carry it out.²³ In Palestine four local centres were established, based on Rosh Pina, Zichron Yaacov, Jaffa and Nazareth, while a central office was set up in Beirut. Rothschild's candidate, Shemtov Pariente, was nominated in September 1900 to direct this office.²⁴ All correspondence from the local offices to Paris went via Beirut, and budgets presented by local officials and based on estimates for the coming year were voted on in Paris and supervised by the members of the Palestine Commission, few of whom had ever been to Palestine. The Palestine Commission only dealt with the development of the former Rothschild colonies and the new settlements, mostly in Lower Galilee, which were founded under its aegis.

ICA's independent work in Palestine, the development of the farm in Sedjera, afforestation and drainage in Hedera, and various forms of aid to these settlements and to Mishmar-Hayarden, Gedera, Wadi Hanine and Rehovot continued as before.²⁵ Apart from its colonization work, ICA also gave loans to private individuals, and financed building and charitable work in Jerusalem under its representative there, Albert Antébi.

The initial emphasis in the work of the Palestine Commission was on continuity rather than change. The programme of reform drawn up by ICA on accepting the administration of the colonies,²⁶ proposed a simplification of the administration by reducing the personnel, the reduction or suppression of all expenses which were not productive in character, a reduction of cultivation expenses, the development of sales, the introduction and development of remunerative types of agriculture, and the addition of land for mixed farming. Most of these reforms were initiated by Rothschild.

During the first three years of the administration, the basis was laid for the founding of a number of colonies dependent on the cultivation of wheat, and the land-purchases in the Lower Galilee, initiated under the

Baron, were sorted out and completed by a leading official of the administration, Haim Margalith Kalvarisky. In these colonies, Yavneel, Kfar Tabor, Menachemia, Kinneret, Beit Gan and Mitzpa, the settlers were largely sons of settlers in the older colonies, where the land was now redivided among those who remained. In these new colonies tenants received 300 dunams per family, this being more than the area allotted in the old settlements, and ICA provided equipment and long-term loans at low interest. However, the settlers' status was not clearly defined and entailed many obligations but few specific rights. Several small settlements were formed elsewhere, notably Attlit, which was established on land earlier acquired by the Baron.

In the older colonies, many vines were pulled up and different and more varied crops encouraged. The reorganization of the colonies meant that a number of settlers and workers were forced to leave after they were refused further assistance, and in June 1900 ICA made its first grant to aid industrial and agricultural workers leaving Palestine.²⁷ ICA opposed the encouragement of immigration throughout the pre-war years and made repeated declarations against aiding immigration to Palestine.²⁸ The opposition of the settlers to this and other aspects of the new administration's policy resulted in a number of delegations being sent from the colonies to Europe. Several of these approached the Baron over the head of ICA, but they were received coldly by both and achieved nothing.

The deficiencies of the system did not remain unnoticed in Paris. Emile Meyerson and Rothschild's representative Gaston Wormser visited the colonies in March-April 1905, primarily to study the question of independence for the wine industry. Their report²⁹ concluded that the colonies should direct all of the services themselves, and the administrative apparatus should be further reduced. They also proposed the abolition of the office in Beirut. This suggestion had also been made earlier by David Cazès, who toured the Middle East on behalf of ICA in the autumn of 1904 and who in his report³⁰ to the Council had also proposed the establishment of a unified administration for the colonies under the Palestine Commission and those dependent on ICA. The latter suggestion was rejected, but the Beirut office was closed in November 1905 and a central office opened in Jaffa,³¹ where Henri Frank, an official of the Rothschild administration, was placed in charge. He was not a Zionist but understood the aims of the Baron and Zionist aspirations, and although he lived in Paris he spent much time in Palestine and retained a firm control of the administration there.³² The main subsidiary offices were situated in Haifa and Rosh-Pina.

The agreement with Rothschild was renewed in May 1905 in accordance with the original contract, and no changes were made.³³ During the discussion on the contract in the ICA Council,³⁴ Eduard Lachmann proposed the liquidation of the former Rothschild colonies, unless the Baron covered the surplus expenses, claiming that the deficit by now exceeded the limit of ten million francs. Leven stated that Lachmann's financial estimate was incorrect, but nevertheless the Council voted in favour of liquidation, with reservation for the Baron's intentions. Rothschild awaited the return of Meyerson and Wormser from their tour of investigation in Palestine, and then announced his intention of delaying the process of liquidation for a further four years, granting the credit required.³⁵ It seems that the vote by the Council and the ensuing letter to

the Baron were primarily tactical moves. The majority in the Council had no real wish to liquidate the work in Palestine; and Franz Philippson expressed the fear that the Council's letter to the Baron might be misinterpreted and not elicit the desired reply.³⁶

In June 1908 the agreement was again renewed and the terms were slightly altered.³⁷ According to the new version, if after five years Rothschild did not wish to continue to finance the colonies, ICA could liquidate the work or transfer all of the property to the Baron and his descendants. This seems to represent Rothschild's first move to re-define and to strengthen his control of developments in Palestine.

In 1906 Rothschild established a co-operative for the wine-growing colonies, providing a fixed sum and passing the management of the wine-industry to the colonists' independent control, a move which rapidly justified itself.³⁸ Despite considerable improvement and consolidation in the colonies, however, debts were scarcely repaid, and as the report for 1908 unequivocally stated:³⁹ 'If one takes into account the expenses entailed by the installation of one colonist, one must conclude that this business is far from being remunerative'. From 1910–1912 ICA tried to formalize its relationship with the colonists, and contracts were signed both in the new colonies and with many members of the old settlements. This attempt to bring everyone under a unified system met with much opposition in the older colonies. The contracts bound the settlers to ICA for some twenty years, during which time the debts were to be repaid according to a fixed scale. Ownership of the land was conferred only after the total debt had been eliminated.

During the years preceding World War I Rothschild was drawn closer to the Zionist approach to developments in Palestine. Many felt that the Baron was held back by the clique surrounding him, and in particular by a number of members of the ICA Council.⁴⁰ This was the initial period of colonization by the Zionist Organization, mainly based on the principle of mixed farming for workers with limited means, and there were several attempts at co-operation between ICA and the Zionist Organization, such as in the case of Jehoshua Hankin's purchases in the Valley of Jezreel.⁴¹ The Zionist Organization also raised the possibility of employing a lawyer in Palestine jointly with ICA, but this was rejected by the latter.⁴²

In March 1912 Arthur Ruppin, founder of the Palestine Land Development Company, met Henri Frank, Isaac Starkmeth and Julius Rosenheck, officials of the ICA/Rothschild administration in Paris.⁴³ Before the meeting Rothschild told Henri Frank to examine the possibility of co-operating more closely with the Zionists.⁴⁴ The final outcome of this meeting was that the Palestine Land Development Company received a loan of 350,000 francs from the Palestine Commission, primarily for the purchase of Kerkour.

Victor Jacobson⁴⁵ had been in contact with Meyerson at least since October 1911,⁴⁶ and was on good terms with several other members of the ICA Council. In June 1913, when in London together with Felix Warburg, they met Herbert Lousada, Claude Montefiore and Alfred Cohen, all members of the ICA Administrative Council, and showed them the latest report of the Palestine Land Development Company, where this loan was mentioned in connection with ICA's activities.⁴⁷ This move resulted in an immediate protest to Paris by the English members of the ICA Council, who evidently had no idea that the loan had been granted.

Although the funds were provided by Rothschild, the extremist members of the ICA Council strongly opposed such a close association of their society with the work of the Zionists. Meyerson worried about his position as director, and feared that a majority in the Council would insist that there would be no further deals of this kind.⁴⁸ Finally an agreement was reached and a new version of the Palestine Land Development Company report was published in which the Palestine Commission was briefly noted as being the donor of the loan, no mention being made of ICA in this connection.⁴⁹ In the ICA annual report of 1913, the grant appears rather inconspicuously as an unspecified loan 'to a private company'.⁵⁰

This incident illustrates one of the weaknesses in the ICA/Rothschild partnership. The members of the ICA Council who were not on the Commission often knew little about its work and the developments in Palestine, and yet their vote could be decisive in these matters. The ICA Council remained divided in its opinions, while the Baron was increasingly attracted by the Zionist achievements.

On February 1, 1913, the agreement between ICA and the Baron was once more renewed.⁵¹ This time too, several changes were introduced. The Palestine Commission gained wider administrative powers, the right to establish colonies at the instigation of the Baron, and the right to buy land, which would be under the management of the Rothschilds. The Baron was to control any profits resulting from this work in Palestine. To what extent these changes depict a system already in practice is not clear, but they represent a further stage in the changes initiated in 1908. Rothschild extended his control over the Palestine Commission. The change indicates that the post-war developments and the establishment of the Palestine Jewish Colonization Association (PICA) by the Baron were not only a result of the new political scene, but had their roots in the earlier history of ICA.

By now both sides openly admitted the need for a change. In 1914, the ICA Council discussed the possibility of eventually passing all of ICA's independent work in Palestine to the control of the Palestine Commission, and this idea was also raised during discussions between the Palestine Commission and the directors of ICA.⁵² Meyerson himself was becoming increasingly aware of the need for close relations with the Zionist Organization and the possibilities of development in Palestine under a new and more congenial regime.⁵³

The outbreak of war interrupted the process of change. During the war the administration in Palestine was cut off from the source of funds in Paris, France being an enemy country, and the only progress made in colonization was solely the work of Kalvarisky.⁵⁴ After his organization of the land purchases in Lower Galilee at the beginning of the century (see above) Kalvarisky was transferred to Upper Galilee, where he worked from his office in Rosh Pina. During the war, acting on his own initiative, he borrowed money from local sources and purchased the land on which he founded Kfar Giladi, Tel Chai, Hamra and Ayelet Hashahar, which were based on a collective form of settlement.

In the new post-war situation ICA began to feel a growing responsibility for the future of Palestine. A letter of June 24, 1919, to the British Foreign Office from the directorate of ICA stated: 'Now that the Turkish Government has disappeared, the Association thinks that it is particularly

qualified to make a contribution to the economic and agricultural development of Palestine.⁵⁵

In April, 1919 Rothschild and ICA temporarily renewed their previous contact.⁵⁶ In October, 1919, Rothschild gave ICA his views on the need for a stronger organization as a result of the new political reality in Palestine, and again introduced new elements into the contract which anticipated the establishment of PICA.⁵⁷ The Palestine Commission was to have nine members, the additional three being co-opted by the six, while Rothschild would remain as president. The Commission was again given wider powers and the right to assist the economic development of Palestine in any way within its means. After the political future of Palestine was settled, the commission was to submit a plan to ICA for the foundation of a new organization to administer the colonies. ICA would then transfer all its rights in Palestine gained from the agreements of 1899, 1905, 1908, 1913 and 1919 to the new society and liquidate this part of its work in Palestine. In October 1920, a letter from Rothschild to ICA proposed to transform the Palestine Commission into a Palestinian society with the power to develop agriculture and industry and this was accepted by the Council and formed the basis for the foundation of PICA.⁵⁸

Financially supported by the Baron, ICA had succeeded in reorganizing the Rothschild colonies and directing their development during this period. A certain stability had been reached in the settlements, and in 1923 ICA's Annual Report was optimistic, foreseeing that the colonists would become independent and manage without outside help, though few would be able to repay a significant part of their debts.⁵⁹ Now the course of events necessitated a change, and the existing administration was replaced by two stronger units, namely PICA, registered in January, 1924, and functioning under the leadership of the Baron, and from 1930 also ICA, which returned to direct work in Palestine with a renewed and independent approach. ICA transferred to PICA the administration of those colonies of which it retained the ownership, namely Sedjera, Mishmar Hayarden, Hedera, Ness Ziona and Gedera; these were administered at ICA's expense and under PICA prospered and reached autonomy.

The years 1920–1930 were virtually a dead period from the point of view of ICA's work in Palestine, and it was mainly occupied with problems of post-war emigration, especially to South America and Canada. After the 1929 riots in Palestine ICA returned to work there, and together with the Emergency Fund for Palestine founded Emica on July 28, 1933, with the aim of assisting the immigration or settlement of needy Jews to or in mandatory Palestine.⁶⁰ A number of settlements were established, and since Emica became 'ICA in Israel' in November, 1955, it has continued with this work and with the support of industry, agriculture and education in Israel. Meanwhile PICA established new colonies, aided industries, and undertook various development projects. PICA also cancelled the debts of many colonists and settlements during the 1930's, formalizing the position with contracts, and in August, 1957, this part of its work was liquidated and the property transferred to the State of Israel.

NOTES

1. This article is primarily based on a study of the documentary material and minutes contained in the volumes of the *Séances du Conseil d'Administration*, 1896 – of the

Jewish Colonization Association (henceforth identified as SCA), which were read at the National Library, Jerusalem, and of archival material deposited at the offices of the Association in London (henceforth identified as ICA London) and the Central Zionist Archives, Jerusalem (henceforth identified as CZA). The work was done under the auspices of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. The writer would like to express her thanks to Dr Israel Kolat of the Institute, whose help in the preparation of this article was invaluable. Thanks are also due to Dr Haim Avni for reading and commenting on the manuscript, and to the staff of the above-mentioned archives.

2. The Jewish Colonization Association was incorporated in London on September 10, 1891, and endowed by the Baron Maurice de Hirsch with 20,000 shares of £100 each. Seven shares were held by Jewish leaders in London and Paris (E. de Rothschild, J. Goldsmid, E. Cassel, F. D. Mocatta, B. S. Cohen, S. H. Goldsmid, and S. Reinach), and the rest were owned by Hirsch, who distributed them in 1893 between the Anglo-Jewish Association, and the Jewish communities of Brussels, Berlin and Frankfurt. Baron Hirsch quadrupled the endowment of £2 million before his death in April 1896.

3. For a description of Rothschild's work in Palestine and the development of the colonies cf. Israel Margalith, *Le Baron Edmond de Rothschild et la Colonization Juive en Palestine*, 1882-1899, Paris, 1957.

David Druck, *Baron Edmond de Rothschild, The Story of a Practical Idealist*, New York, 1928.

Moshe Smilansky, 'PICA veMifala Be'Aretz' (PICA and its work in Palestine), in *Kamah*, 1948, pp. 151-168.

Ahad Ha'am, 'HaYishuv ve Apotropsav' (The Yishuv and its Guardians), in *Kol Kitvei Ahad Ha'am*, Jerusalem, 1947, pp. 211-245.

4. Margalith, op. cit., p. 145.

5. During the period under discussion the members of the Administrative Council were, with slight variations: Julius Blau (Frankfurt), Alfred Cohen (London), Salomon H. Goldsmid (London), Zadoc Kahn (Paris), Georges Kohn (Paris), Eduard Lachman (Berlin), Herbert Lousada (London), Claude Montefiore (London), Arnold Netter (Paris), Carl Netter (Berlin), Julius Plotke (Frankfurt) and Salomon Reinach (Paris). Hirsch, the first president, was succeeded for one year by S. H. Goldsmid (1896-1897). He was followed by Narcisse Leven, president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, who was president of ICA until 1919, when he was succeeded by his deputy, Franz Philippson (Brussels). Émile Meyerson was a director of the Association from 1900 to 1923. His co-directors were Théodor Adler (until 1904), and Sigismund Sonnenfeld (until 1911). In 1911 the latter was succeeded by Louis Oungre and David Cazès (d. 1913).

The responsibility for reporting to the Administrative Council on the various fields of ICA's work was allotted to different members of the Council. During our period Rabbi Zadoc Kahn, Chief Rabbi of France, a friend and advisor of the Baron de Rothschild and a leading member of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, presented the reports on ICA's independent work in Palestine. After his death in 1905 this task was undertaken by Arnold Netter, also a prominent leader of the Alliance Israélite Universelle.

6. Hirsch retained the voting rights of the shares given to the Anglo-Jewish Association until his death, in order to be able to direct the affairs of ICA as its chairman; cf. Kurt Grunwald, *Türkenhirsch, A Study of Baron Maurice de Hirsch, Entrepreneur and Philanthropist*, Jerusalem, 1966, pp. 72-73. Hirsch had several direct contacts with Zionism, such as his meeting with members of Chovevei Zion and others in 1891, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 122-126, and his meeting with Herzl on June 2, 1895, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 76-85. Cf. also *Theodor Herzl's Tagebücher*, Berlin, 1923, Vol. I, May 26, 1905, p. 20. The same lack of success marked Rothschild's historic meeting with Herzl in July 1896, cf. e.g., David Druck, op. cit. pp. 150-155, and *Tagebücher I*, op. cit., July 19, 1896, p. 490 ff. It should be noted that Herzl regarded the transfer of the colonies to ICA as a victory for his own ideas, cf. Adolf Boehm, *Die Zionistische Bewegung*, Tel Aviv, 1955, Vol. I, p. 245, and his reference to *Tagebücher II*, op. cit. March 20, 1899, pp. 284-286.

7. Margalith, op. cit., p. 88.

8. cf. *ibid.*

9. *Memorandum of Association of the Jewish Colonization Association*, London, 1891. Clause 3a states that the aims of ICA are 'to assist and promote the emigration of Jews from any parts of Europe or Asia and principally from countries in which they may for the time being be subjected to any special taxes or political or other disabilities, to any other parts of the world and to form and establish colonies in various parts of North and South America and other countries for agricultural, commercial and other purposes'.

This was widened by a Special Act of Parliament on July 21, 1903, by which the aims of ICA were enlarged to include the establishment and maintenance of educational and training institutions and the support of other associations dealing with the emigration of Jews and their settlement in various parts of the world other than Europe. This Act aroused considerable opposition as it entailed the division of ICA's aid between a number of causes.

10. SCA, October 14, 1896.

11. Cf. note 5 above.

12. SCA, October 15, 1896. Lousada led the opposition, claiming that intervention in Palestine was against the statutes of ICA. The motion was actively supported by Plotke, Lachmann and Leven during the discussion.

13. By this vote ICA granted 150,000 fr. to Mishmar Hayarden and Wadi-Hanine and 7,000 fr. to Gedera, and established the principle of giving assistance to Jews already settled in Palestine. ICA strongly opposed the encouragement of immigration to Palestine. Meyerson to D. Hayon, ICA Agency, Jaffa, January 4, 1898, ICA London/257/1-43.

14. SCA, November 12, 1899.

15. Margalith, op. cit., p. 140.

16. Margalith, op. cit., p. 141. Rothschild's attitude was idealistic. He looked forward to a future which would justify his plans for extensive land purchases, cf. *ibid.*, p. 172. ICA's business-like attitude persisted even after the colonies' development and progress became evident. Therefore in 1909 Meyerson was able to write: 'It is sufficient to compare the price of land in Palestine with the profit actually gained from it and the interest rates charged in that country, to see how ridiculously exaggerated the prices are. They are purely fictitious charges, only explained by the feverishness of Jewish colonization.' Meyerson, Paris, to Haim Margalith Kalvarisky, Rosh Pina, April 8, 1909, CZA, JIS/3949.

17. They were Zadoc Kahn, Narcisse Leven and Georges Kohn.

18. JSA, November 12, 1899. Before this vote the Council rejected a notion of Cohen and Montefiore against accepting Rothschild's proposition.

19. The members initially chosen to represent ICA were Franz Philippson, Salomon Reinach and Zadoc Kahn, while Gaston Wormser, one of the Baron's officials, and James de Rothschild represented the Baron; E. de Rothschild to Leven, December 24, 1899, ICA, London, 36/36.

20. The fund was 'exclusively reserved for the improvement of the Palestinian colonies, and of the social and moral situation of the Jews in Palestine.' SCA, November 12, 1899.

21. This clause (No. 9) in the agreement between ICA and Rothschild is somewhat ambiguous, but its meaning is presumably as stated here. The relevant part of the clause states: 'Au cas où il apparaîtrait à la J.C.A. que le résultat de la colonisation palestinienne ne justifie pas les sacrifices que cette colonisation a déjà imposés ou pourrait imposer à l'avenir, la liquidation de ces colonies pourra être effectuée par la J.C.A.'

22. There are few indications of direct interference by the Baron. Lands bought by the Palestine Commission were registered in the name of persons designated by ICA, and ICA was to have full possession of them. SCA, Rothschild to Leven, March 18, 1903. In 1924 all these rights passed to PICA. However, Rothschild did insist that land purchased should be registered in the name of foreign subjects. Ruppin to Zeev Gluskin, October 26, 1911, CZA, L1/20.

23. For example: Elie Krause to Leven, October 18, 1901, ICA London/270. Kalvarisky to Shemtov Pariente, November 1, 1901, ICA, London/257/1-42.

Kalvarisky to Leven, March 27, 1904, CZA/J 15/3302.

24. Meyerson to Schalit, August 17, 1900, ICA London/256/1-42. Pariente was formerly head of the school of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Tunis.

25. From the available material it is impossible to obtain a clear picture of the extent of ICA's financial commitment in Palestine and its relationship to commitments elsewhere. The printed annual reports of the Central Administration give us no indication of the figures involved, and annual budgets were not published. It is only possible to obtain a very approximate idea of the sums involved from the information given in the minutes of the sessions of the Administrative Council. From these we see that, for example, the budget of ICA for 1911/12 was roughly as follows (SCA, Jan. 6, 1912, pp. 10-11);

| | |
|--|-------------|
| (a) Expenses for Jaffa Office | 7,730 frs. |
| (b) Wadi-Hanine (orange groves) expenses | 34,812 frs. |
| receipts expected | 42,900 frs. |

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| (c) Mishmar Hayarden expenses | 18,895 frs. |
| receipts | 7,802 frs. |
| (d) Sedjera (farm) expenses | 54,470 frs. |
| receipts | 31,250 frs. |
| (e) Credit for loans to Hedera | 10,000 frs. |
| (f) Credit for school in Artuf | 10,000 frs. |

It must be remembered that this involved only a very small part of ICA's total budget, which was directed to many causes with varied results. In Argentina in 1911/12, for example, receipts just exceeded expenses (SCA, January 6, 1912, p. 3), while in Brazil in 1912 expenses exceeded receipts by 340,000 frs. (*ibid.* p. 5.) In both of these countries, however, the receipts were channelled to a special fund to be used for land purchases. Throughout this period ICA continued its work in America, Canada and Europe, in the fields of education, agriculture, commerce and emigration.

The budget of the Palestine Commission for 1911/12 was strikingly larger than that of ICA in Palestine. Expenses were 792,634.75 frs. and receipts totalled 261,604.50 frs. The deficit was, of course, covered by the Baron (*ibid.*, p. 20).

26. Jewish Colonization Association, *Rapport de la Direction Générale au Conseil d'Administration pour l'année 1900*, pp. 49–50 (henceforth identified as ICA. *Rapport de la Direction Générale . . . pour l'année . . .*)

27. SCA, June 9, 1900.

28. Cf., e.g., SCA October 31, 1903.

29. Report on Palestine, E. Meyerson and G. Wormser, May 20, 1905. This report is contained in Annex III of the SCA, 1905, pp. 1–22. These supplementary volumes, containing documentary material (henceforth identified as Annex) were read in the London Offices of ICA.

30. 'Rapport de M. D. Cazès sur son voyage en Orient', Nov. 26, 1904, ICA London/Dossier 5.

31. CZA/JI5/3682, correspondence October–December 1905. This change was a step towards decentralization. From then on the local offices corresponded directly with Paris except on financial matters which were dealt with via Jaffa.

32. On Henri Frank, cf. Smilansky, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

33. Rothschild to Leven, May 20, 1905, SCA July 1905, Annex II, p. 21.

34. SCA, February 18, 1905.

35. Rothschild to Leven, *op. cit.* (note 32 above).

36. SCA, March 19, 1905.

37. SCA, February 22, 1908, and Rothschild to Leven, June 30, 1908.

38. Cf., e.g., ICA *Rapport de la Direction Générale . . . pour l'année 1911*, p. 289, and Smilansky, *op. cit.*, p. 154.

39. ICA, *Rapport de la Direction Générale . . . pour l'année 1908*, p. 88.

40. Arthur Hantke, Berlin, to Yehiel Tschlenow, Moscow, July 5, 1912, CZA/Z3/521/Bif.

41. Arthur Ruppín, *Perakei Chai'ai*, 1907–1920 (Chapters in my Life, 1907–1920), Tel Aviv, 1968, pp. 126–128.

42. Ruppín to members of the Central Zionist Office, Berlin, December 15, 1911, and further correspondence, CZA, DI a/1447.

43. Ruppín to members of the Zionist Action Committee, Berlin. March 12, 1912, CZA/Z3/1447/D Ia1.

44. *Ibid.*

45. Jacobson had been the political representative of the Zionist Organization in Constantinople since 1908.

46. Cf. correspondence in CZA/Z3/521/Bif.

47. Jacobson to Ruppín, June 22, 1913, CZA/Z3/1513/DIIc4.

48. Ruppín wrote that Meyerson played a doubtful role in this transaction, *Perakei Chai'ai*, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

49. Ruppín to Thon, July 10, 1913, CZA, L13/245/6. Cf. also.

Die Jüdische Kolonization Palästinas, München, 1914, Appendix 17, pp. 532–534. Geschäftsbericht der Palestina Land Development Company für 1912.

50. ICA *Rapport de la Direction Générale . . . pour l'année 1912*, p. 122. As stated here the money was to be used to settle immigrants with means on the land, a development in which ICA showed considerable interest.

Two further points well illustrate the nature of the ICA/PLDC relationship. Warburg was afraid that if the PLDC became legally dependent on the Zionist Organization,

the latter would lose any chance of closer relations with ICA during the coming years. Warburg to unknown addressee, c. July 1912, CZA/Z3/1516/DII c 4.

Ruppin allowed 'Die Welt' to publish an article on the negotiations with ICA and the loan to the PLDC. This caused concern among the Zionist leaders, who were afraid that publicity might destroy the new relations between Rothschild, ICA and the PLDC. Editor of 'Die Welt', to members of the Action Committee, March 2, 1913, CZA LI/23.

51. SCA, February 1, 1913.

52. SCA, January 10, 1914.

53. Cf. Meyerson's report 'La Colonization Juive en Palestine', Paris, December 13, 1914, and lecture 'L'oeuvre palestinienne et le Sionisme' June 30, 1914. Both of these were read at the National Library, Jerusalem.

54. For the war-time correspondence of Kalvarisky see CZA, A113/25/1.

55. SCA, October 11, 1919, Annex I, p. 40.

56. SCA, April 11, 1919.

57. SCA, October 11, 1919.

58. SCA, October 23, 1920. ICA agreed to assist the new society, which was registered on April 15, 1924. PICA's constitution provided for an administrative council of seven; two were to be chosen by ICA, two by the Baron, and two by both together, while Rothschild functioned as president.

59. ICA, *Rapport de la Direction Générale . . . pour l'année 1922*, p. 85 ff.

60. ICA, *Rapport de la Direction Générale . . . pour l'année 1933*, p. 75.