**The location of a University in the urban area and the factors that influences it**

**The Hebrew University of Jerusalem between 1914 and 1958**

Even if you don't know the story of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, after looking at these three pictures you would be able to say a few things about the university, its development and its location in the urban space. All the findings of my lecture could be presented right here.

The first picture shows us that the university was built in an elevated topographical area and its buildings stood out in the landscape. The second picture was taken a few years later. Here we can see that the university is inside the built-up urban space, without any prominent architectural features, and perhaps even more noticeable is that it used the existing buildings. The third picture was taken at the third site of the university's wanderings, and here you can see that the university has become like an American campus, but the question is, "Where exactly is it?"

The purpose of my lecture is to explain the changing locations of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and to examine those changes on the background of the existing research into the relationship between the university and the city and in relation to the university's history.

The location of universities in their surrounding area is a classic question in historical geography. As historical geographers it is our obligation to show the various considerations that affected the location of the university, as well as to reveal the university's effect on and connection with the city over the ages.

Lawrence Brockliss examined the relationships between the university and this city between 1200 and 2000. In his research, Brockliss presents several examples of locales throughout Europe and the United States and proposes a generalization that can explain the connection between the type of university - how it was organized, the main subjects studied there and its teaching method - and its location in its surroundings. In keeping with that objective, he describes the difference between the medieval and Renaissance universities and universities built in the modern era, when the university became not only an educational institution, but also a research institute.

Brockliss states that from their inception until the 1800s, universities were in cities but were not part of them. This closedness on the part of the universities is expressed both in their physical structure and of course by the nature of the relationships between the university and local institutions and communities.

Starting in the 19th century, the university and the city maintained close ties and developed alongside one another, each one affecting the other. The modern university, on the other hand, had an urban address in designated buildings that were integrated into the urban space.

Brockliss also presents the American model of university campuses, which were built adjacent to cities or beside small cities, but as isolated institutions. He discusses the varied relationships that developed between the universities and the cities and the growth of the cities toward the campuses. Later in his research, Brockliss presented the model of the open universities. Where were the open universities? Wherever there were students.

The complex connections between the universities and the cities over the years and the educational-cultural space in which they developed prompt us to ask what influenced the location of the Hebrew University in the area of the city of Jerusalem?

Even before we address the question of the Hebrew university, it is important to address questions regarding Jerusalem. This city is probably familiar to most of you here in its religious context and its importance to the three monotheistic religions. In addition to the city's religious importance however, over the past 100 years Jerusalem has become a flashpoint for nationalist conflict. Thus there is also the issue of what comprises Jerusalem? To which parts of the city are we referring, and is Jerusalem only the Old City - where the holy sites are located, or is the city perhaps the entire jurisdiction defined by the State of Israel as the city of Jerusalem?

There is not enough time during this lecture to address that question, but for now we will explain that during the period of the development of Hebrew University, the city had a few different boundaries. During the British Mandate period, municipal boundaries were delineated for planning purposes. With respect to those boundaries, the Hebrew University that was displayed in the first picture, up on the mountain, was outside those boundaries. The second time the city's boundaries were demarcated was following the war in Palestine-Eretz Yisrael in 1948. Following that war the city was divided. The western part of Jerusalem was under the control of the State of Israel, while the eastern part of the city was controlled by the Kingdom of Jordan, and the university on the mountain was beyond Israel's borders.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem was founded by the Zionist movement in the early 1920s. It was a national university whose purpose was to advance the consolidation of the national idea, and as a solution to the problem of anti-Semitism. Following the decision to establish the university, but before any decision on the academic structure of the university and the identity of its senior faculty, the Zionist movement sent emissaries to Jerusalem to buy land for the campus. Throughout Jewish history, Jerusalem has been known for its supreme importance. This is the holy city in which the biblical Israelite nation built a temple that was visited by Jewish pilgrims on their religious festivals. After the destruction of the temples the Jews yearned to return to Jerusalem, which became a symbol of Jewish life and the continuation of national life. The Zionist leaders however, viewed Jerusalem as a symbol of everything that was not good in the Jewish People - an attitude that must be rectified. The pre-state Jewish community in Jerusalem was poor and depended largely on donations from Diaspora Jewry. This reality contradicted the Zionist idea that was developing, and which was based on the creation of a new Jew - one who could work and take responsibility for his freedom. Accordingly, the Zionist leadership wanted to buy land near the city; a place that would overlook the city, but not be a part of it. In keeping with this philosophy, buildings on Mt. Scopus were purchased for the university.

Thus the first location chosen for the university was close to the city, in a symbolic place overlooking the city, and to a great extent this model is consistent with the closedness of the medieval universities. In contrast to those universities, however, which taught professions, Hebrew University was more general in nature, and was involved in both research and instruction. The connection with the city therefore developed based on the movement of students and faculty members from the university to the city. Even so, this movement could not blur the fact that the university was cut off from the city.

During the rule of the British Mandate in Palestine a nationalist conflict developed between the Zionist movement and the country's Arab residents - the Palestinians. This conflict is still with us today. With the departure of the British, a war erupted in Palestine. This war included the invasion of Eretz Yisrael by armies from the surrounding Arab countries. During the war the area of the Hebrew University, on Mt. Scopus, was cut off from the western part of the city and following the war that area became an Israeli enclave within the territory controlled by the Kingdom of Jordan. That reality forced the university to leave Mt. Scopus and search for a new site for its activities. All that remained at the Mt. Scopus campus was a small military presence and a few faculty members. Between 1948 and 1958 the university was scattered among a large number of buildings inside the city, based on available space and without any advance planning. This is ostensibly similar to the European universities that were built inside cities, except that in the case of Hebrew University, there were a few differences: the university was not interested in being spread out, or in having such a presence in the city. Being scattered prevented the university from functioning properly, and hindered the university from presenting its unique nature. One of the reasons for this inability to show its uniqueness stemmed from the fact that the university was forced to use existing buildings that were not suitable for being centers for research and instruction. The university had many addresses throughout the city, and not a prominent, significant location. In the early years of that period, the university was still struggling to return to Mt. Scopus, but when it became clear that this was not possible, the university's administration began to search for an alternative location. The university wanted to maintain its connection with the city, but still wanted to be separate from it.

Thus the second site of the university in the city was chosen due to constraints, and not by design. Despite these constraints, the university continued to operate and to expand. Throughout this period, the heads of the university constantly sought a new, prominent, unique and separate location.

In December 1949, the Israeli government and the Israeli parliament decided to move the state's institutions to the western part of Jerusalem. This decision was very significant on the international level, but even more important was its influence on the spatial development of the city of Jerusalem. In order to build the government compound, the state appropriated a large area inside the city from the municipality. The processes involved in the construction of the government buildings began but progressed quite slowly due to budgetary problems and other issues. In the meantime, the heads of the university, who were searching for an appropriate site for themselves applied to receive part of the area designated for the government compound for the construction of the university campus. At first there was some opposition to this idea, but eventually the government agreed to give up part of the area in favor of the university. On that site, near the historic city and near the entrance to the city, the university managed to build a campus in the spirit of the American model. The uniqueness of this campus was that it again isolated the university from the within the city. This time the students had dormitories on the campus and there was very little travel to the city.

In conclusion, the Hebrew University situated itself in the urban space but apart from it, again similar to the medieval universities. The presence of the university in the urban space was very clear and prominent, but still disconnected.

Thus the location of the Hebrew University inside Jerusalem naturally raises the question of what is Jerusalem. Even though the city's name appears in the university's name, it is evident that the relationship between the university and the city were more complex.

The reasons for the university's location within the urban space were not academic and were not connected with academic structure. Rather, the reasons for this location were connected with the university's desire to distinguish itself from the city and from the community. Still, as we can see, these were not the only reasons for the choice of this location. The war that took place in the city affected the university's location, as did the availability of buildings.

In the context of Brokliss's research, the story of the location of the Hebrew University in the urban space of Jerusalem between 1914 and 1958 is the exceptional that sheds light on the rule. Although the Hebrew University is a modern (national) university, it's spatial behavior shares similarities with the medieval university. The fact that the Hebrew University was involved in both instruction and research was not a significant factor in determining its location in the urban space, unlike European universities. As for the American model, although it had some influence, there was one difference - the campus was inside the municipal boundaries, as a prominent and isolated space.

This, however, is not the end of the story, because after the war in 1967 and the renewal of the connection with Mt. Scopus, the question arose regarding the return to that site. *That* is a subject for another lecture.