A beach of their own: The creation of the gender-segregated beach in Tel Aviv

Shayna Weiss

Published online: 16 Feb 2016.

Submit your article to this journal 🗗

View related articles 🗗

View Crossmark data 🗗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

A beach of their own: The creation of the gender-segregated beach in Tel Aviv

Shayna Weiss [iD]

Department of Jewish History, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

ABSTRACT

This article examines the struggle for gender-segregated sea bathing in Tel Aviv from the first calls for gender segregation in the 1920s until 1966, when the city of Tel Aviv established a beach for men and women to swim separately. The most effective demands for gender segregation were framed in a civic and not religious discourse. Rather than claiming that gender-segregated swimming was against Jewish values, the ultra-Orthodox party Agudat Yisrael effectively argued that a lack of separate swimming violated their rights as taxpayers who had the right to bathe in the sea just as any other Israeli citizen.

Every Jew – myself included – has two requests from God: a place in paradise in the afterlife and a place on Tel Aviv's beach in this world.

Sholem Asch[1]

In 1966, the municipality of Tel Aviv announced the founding of the gender-segregated Sheraton Beach on its northern shores, near the defunct port, after a trial run the previous year. Inspired by Tel Aviv, several other cities such as Haifa established separate beaches shortly thereafter. In the Knesset, the ultra-Orthodox (Haredi) political party Agudat Yisrael sponsored and passed a 1979 law requiring every waterfront municipality to provide a gender-segregated beach to the public. The movement to establish gender-segregated swimming across Israel was a resounding success. Today, there are approximately a dozen gender-segregated beaches in Israel. Due to reasons of modesty and expediency, the beaches mostly feature a rotating schedule of alternating days between men and women instead of an internal divider between genders. The beaches are walled on three sides to visually shield bathers. The ability of the Haredi community to shape the public sphere of the seashore, even if only partially, speaks to their power in the Israeli political and cultural sphere.

In the following pages, I analyze the struggle for gender-segregated swimming in Tel Aviv, from the earliest complaints about the moral state of the seashore in the 1920s until the establishment of the gender-segregated Sheraton Beach in 1966. The multi-decade struggle over the character of Tel Aviv's seashore included religious leaders, British Mandate bureaucrats, and local politicians. The Rabbinate's attempts to convince the municipality to prevent

---

CONTACT Shayna Weiss ✉ shaynamalka@gmail.com

mixed swimming because it violated Jewish values failed. The non-Zionist Agudat Yisrael shifted its tactics to effectively argue that a lack of separate swimming violated their rights as taxpayers who had the right to bathe in the sea just as any other Israeli citizen.

The history of the Sheraton Beach demonstrates that calls for gender segregation are not recent creations but inherent in the fabric of Israeli culture, dating back to the nascent period of the state and even earlier to the near genesis of Zionist settlement in Palestine. In reconstructing the history of the Sheraton Beach, I draw upon Henri LeFebvre's theories, which argue that the social production of space reflects competing systems of power and domination.[2] The pace of the struggle was not consistent – sometimes dormant and sometimes dominating local political agendas. The article is based mainly on city council records, municipal correspondence, and citizen complaints in the Tel Aviv Municipal Archives, along with relevant newspapers, official histories, and memoirs. With the exception of one ethnographic work, scholars have not yet turned their attention to the Sheraton Beach or any other gender-segregated beach in Israel.[3]

Examining the Sheraton Beach also fills a lacuna in the history of Tel Aviv. A recent boom of scholarship focuses on 1920s and 1930s Tel Aviv. In contrast, there are few studies devoted to the later periods of the Mandate and the two decades immediately following statehood – precisely when the battle for gender segregation on the shoreline was at its height.[4] The multi-decade struggle for the separate beach highlights the development of an urban Zionist discourse amidst the backdrop of a rapidly expanding city as the municipality struggled to satisfy the wishes of all its citizens. The battle for gender segregation carried symbolic weight beyond the beach's borders. In its founding myth, the conquest of the sea metonymized Tel Aviv's victory over the natural landscape, a necessary first step to building the first Hebrew city. Religious attempts to influence the seashore correlated to a willingness to engage the Zionist project and in particular to attempts to ensure its Jewish character.

A note about Jewish law and bathing is necessary. Traditional rabbinic sources are almost silent on issues of mixed swimming because the rise of swimming as a pastime is a relatively modern invention and postdates the foundational sources of Jewish law by several hundred years.[5] Modesty is not a new virtue in Jewish thought, and it is referenced as a positive trait across the Jewish canon. Nevertheless, there has been an increased interest in the particular dictates of female modesty as part of a revival in Jewish observance. As is generally understood in contemporary Orthodox Judaism, modest dress for women requires, at minimum, a covering of the body until roughly the elbows/upper arm, the knees, and collarbone.[6] There was and is a large variation in observance, including the propriety of pants and the requirement to cover one's legs with stockings. Nevertheless, mixed swimming remains a violation of female modesty according to the majority of Orthodox rabbinic figures.

Orthodoxies of ultra-Orthodox scholarship

Many studies of Haredim in Israel are devoted to their ideological relationship with Zionism. While valuable, the focus on thought mirrors earlier Israeli historiography, which relied heavily on imported Zionist ideology to explain historical events in Mandate Palestine and Israel.[7] Scholars such as Gershon Shafir argue instead for a focus on local conditions, especially while analyzing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. A similar shift is taking place in the scholarship dedicated to Haredim, away from ideology and towards the conditions of everyday life. Additionally, while earlier studies focused on the supposed quietist nature of

Haredi Jews, recent scholarship examines the integration of Haredim into general Israeli society, reflecting similar emphases on Israelization in the study of Israeli Palestinians.[8] However, I am sympathetic to the claims of Yoel Finkelman, who worries that the construct of Israelization forces a linear narrative that reduces multiple processes to one predetermined endpoint. He argues instead:

> Israelization imagines a community as a whole drifting in a linear fashion in one direction, while, to my mind, richer description would identify swirling currents moving in multiple directions simultaneously. The paradigm of ambivalence is, I think, an improvement on the Israelization one. It suggests that signs of openness can be different than the ones that existed in the past, without requiring scholars to suggest that there is quantitatively *more* openness than existed in the past. It allows us to look at ways in which the Haredi community is moving simultaneously in several directions.[9]

In addition to recognizing the possibility of several contradictory processes, his paradigm, most importantly, avoids the often unhelpful dichotomy of insularity and integration. More openness to Zionist tools of engagement can paradoxically lead to greater isolation from Israeli society. Of particular importance is the avoidance of reified categories as the basis for analysis and a call to examine more deeply areas of Haredi life ignored by those who tend to research religious leaders rather than community activists. The history of the gender-segregated beach demonstrates the flexibility of discourse and testifies to the need for local histories that carefully examine the political dimensions of Haredi daily life.

Facing the sea

The seashore as a source of leisure is a recent invention. Bodies of water, previously regarded as dangerous, quickly transformed into modern tourist destinations. Enlightenment cultural shifts eventually led to the creation of seaside resorts in the mid-nineteenth century, the predecessor of the contemporary beach. Equally important was the rise of the spa and its relative the swimming pool, a place to experience the waters in places where the climate or distance from the sea precluded other opportunities. The modern beach resort is a British invention, and much of the research focuses on British efforts to develop the seashore. The waterfront administrative system and the very notion of separate beaches display the British influence on the Israeli shoreline.

The seashore became a leisure site for the industrial class which suddenly found itself with time and money to spare. The appeal of the beach lay in a nexus of pleasure and public health, particularly in its English iteration. Often, therapeutic license served as a cover for greater freedom between the sexes.[10] From its inception, the modern beach was wrought with gendered anxieties, particularly for female bodies. Men's swimming was an expression of virility, while women's bathing was eroticized.[11] Concerns of racial and class mingling only complicated the matter further. To maintain a proper atmosphere at the seaside, procedures developed to protect female purity. Bathing machines were common in the time of hydrotherapy, before the advent of swimming as a leisure activity. Consisting of large wooden huts on wheels, the contraptions rolled out to the sea with the bather and a few attendants. In the hut, women could prepare for bathing and disrobe privately. Once in the water, a trap door opened for immersion following a prescribed order, depending on the ailment. In addition to blocking the male gaze, the huts also protected women who most likely did not know how to swim. However, unsavory men often gathered at the shore hoping to gain a peek.

Even more so, the clunky bathing machines were a logistical nightmare, requiring several employees for each machine as a long line of women waited for their immersion.[12] The quick rise and fall of the bathing machine shifted concerns about morality on the seashore to dress and physical separation. Gender-separate beaches were common before World War I. However, due to lack of popularity and difficulty of maintenance, enforcement of separation was sporadic at best. Gendered bathing was a nuisance both to families wanting a seaside outing and young adolescents who relied on the relaxed nature of the seashore to rendezvous with the opposite sex.[13]

As tools of middle-class acculturation, beaches and spas played a special role in the lives of European Jews.[14] Orthodox Jews also enjoyed taking the waters. During the high season, several spas offered kosher food, synagogues, and anything else an observant traveler might need. Prominent Hasidic leaders, including the Belzer and Gerer rebbes, visited with their followers. The combination of religious pilgrimage and secular tourism set a precedent for Hasidic leaders in Israel who wanted to bathe in the Mediterranean. In 1937, Marienbad, one of the most popular spas for European Jews, hosted the third meeting of the World Congress of Orthodox Jewry, sponsored by Agudat Yisrael. The spas of Europe provided inspiration for the creation of Tel Aviv's shore. Many of Tel Aviv's prominent residents had swum in Marienbad, and dreamed of transferring its magic to Palestine.[15]

Old and new in Tel Aviv

As the first Hebrew city, Tel Aviv's creation was a declaration of Zionist conquest, an experiment in Jewish self-government and social engineering. The city's novelty facilitated the formation of an identity separate from traditional Jewish practice and the local Palestinian population.[16] Topography also played a role in the self-fashioning of the city, a coastal plain as a foil to the rural countryside. While Tel Aviv is often described as having its back to the sea, urban planners always regarded the seafront as an important site for development. The Geddes master plan for Tel Aviv, issued in 1925 and approved two years later, decreed that the new seashore follow a European model. Buildings were designed to face west so that they could benefit from the cooling sea breezes.[17] While the more remote parts of the shorefront were reserved for manufacturing and shipping, the majority of the seashore was directly accessible to Tel Aviv's residents as a leisure space. Zionist ethos and European norms often conflicted as planners sought to liberate leisure from its bourgeois trappings in order to serve nationalist goals. Scores of fights ensued regarding what was appropriate for the beaches, including a tiff regarding Café Casino which sharply divided residents because of its reputation for low-class nightlife. The fight for gender-segregated swimming was one of many struggles about what could, or should, be allowed on the shores of Tel Aviv, but with far-reaching implications beyond its boundaries. Separate beaches were the first non-religious spaces (i.e., not a synagogue) that were gender segregated in the State of Israel, and an example of religious influence in what many would consider the most secular of spaces.

Despite the presence of a gender-segregated beach, scholars have largely disregarded interactions between Jewish religious communities and the seashore.[18] Furthermore, the self-definition of Tel Aviv as a secular foil to religious Jerusalem neglects its Orthodox Jewish past. If religious history is presented, it is a counterweight, a reactionary force to either the Zionist or bourgeois ethics that challenged traditional Jewish observance. Attempts to create a Hebrew city in line with Orthodox Jewish values, such as the separate beach,

are often overlooked. Judaism was not solely a limiting force in Mandate Palestine and the State of Israel. Even when defending traditional Jewish observance, self-proclaimed gatekeepers adopted Zionist discourse to create new modes of engagement with shifting political realities.

While exact numbers are difficult to obtain, the city's Orthodox population in the 1930s was roughly 6 or 7 percent of the population or about eight thousand people.[19] Most lived in the city's center and southern neighborhoods. The religious population included a Haredi community which at its peak consisted of five thousand mostly Hasidic Jews, many of whom relocated to Bnei Brak in the late 1940s and 1950s. Minus the significant Hasidic emigration, the religious population of Tel Aviv grew in tandem with the city's population boom until the city's population began to drop in the 1960s. In 1955, twenty thousand people voted for Religious Zionist and Haredi parties in Tel Aviv, 5 percent of the population.[20] The success of Haredi Jews in Tel Aviv politics is surprising given their relatively small numbers. While other minorities such as Mizrahi Jews have also been successful in municipal politics, their success is usually relative to population percentages – such as Mizrahi mayors of development towns.[21] The creation of a separate beach is a physical testament to the disproportional influence of the Orthodox minority.

Tel Aviv's seashore: The first two decades

The history of the Tel Aviv shoreline is inherently linked to two facets of life in Mandate Tel Aviv. First was the rapid growth of Tel Aviv's population, which numbered roughly 15,000 in 1922 and reached 230,000 by 1948. By 1935, it was the largest city in Palestine. The crowded seashore, like much of Tel Aviv, was in a constant state of disrepair because demographic growth far outpaced the construction of municipal infrastructure. During the Mandate period, the city struggled to pave roads, provide signage, and establish a municipal sewage system – all of which affected the rather unpleasant condition of the beach. Second was the host of municipal bylaws that regulated the behavior of private citizens in the public sphere, including Sabbath observance and noise regulations. Following British norms, the entire Tel Aviv shore, the first developed seashore in Palestine, was gender segregated. Like most municipal bylaws, these decrees were never strictly enforced. Lackadaisical concern about gender segregation was due to scarcity of resources, lack of British interest, and limited Yishuv jurisdiction. While Tel Aviv functioned largely as an autonomous city-state during the Mandate period, its powers of enforcement were not unlimited.[22]

Residents upset at the lack of shorefront morality expressed their displeasure at the opening of the beaches in the 1920s and 1930s. These letters of complaint from Mandate Tel Aviv, despite the tendency for hyperbole, offer a valuable source of daily life not otherwise captured in formal sources.[23] The complaints reveal a lofty vision of an ideal Tel Aviv contrasted with the unpleasant realities of a rapidly growing urban center lacking the necessary resources to meet its residents' needs. The missives also display a sense of entitlement felt by Tel Aviv residents, that the sacrifice of working and living in the first Hebrew city merited the assistance of the municipality, regardless of the power of the municipality to provide it.[24]

While many complaints about the beach focused on the general state of disrepair due to constant overuse, others focused on critiques of beach behavior seen as untoward and immoral. Offenses included public nudity, refusal to use changing rooms, inappropriate bathing suits, and other uncouth behavior. Concerns of embarrassment and shame appeared

frequently in the letters of worried citizens. Jewish residents of Tel Aviv expressed their fears that behavior at beaches in the Land of Israel would be viewed as unseemly by the non-Jewish world and would cast doubts on the viability of a Jewish national home. Sexual immorality on the seashore symbolized bourgeois decadence instead of Zionist fervor. For the moralists of Tel Aviv, every aspect of behavior mattered, especially in the first Hebrew city. These citizens worried that those skeptical of the Zionist cause would recoil at the lack of morality on the seashore. If the Zionists could not control their own beaches, how could they effectively build a new society in the Land of Israel? Fear of a *shanda fur di goyim,* a scandal that could draw the attention of the non-Jewish world, was a constant motif when worrying about the state of the sea shore and its accompanying sexual immorality. The widespread nature of the concern, appearing in almost every missive to the municipality on this topic, revealed the anxieties involved in refashioning the Jewish body.

While diverse parties aired grievances, religious individuals and organizations were particularly well represented. Among these, the local Rabbinate was the most vocal in both numbers of complaints and level of concern. As early as 1926, the Tel Aviv-Jaffa Rabbinate demanded that the municipality take action because the seashore was "an embarrassment and shame to our city in particular and the Jewish Yishuv in general."[25] According to their reasoning, immorality functioned liked a contagion that, unless contained, would spread beyond the sand to influence Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel. The Rabbinate argued that Tel Aviv could not afford to be ruled by the relaxed moral conduct of the seashore, that the sea should remain an exception and not the norm. The open sea, and the open behavior accompanying it, must be contained by civilizing laws that prevented the spread of behavior like donning bathing suits in cafés, a frequent complaint of moralists. Citing the aforementioned statutes, the Rabbinate placed the onus on the municipality for enforcement, for regulating a public space in line with the greater good of creating a New Moral Jew. It drew inspiration from traditional Jewish thought which linked sexual morality to possession of the Land of Israel, regarding the former as necessary for obtaining God's favor in order to achieve and maintain the latter.[26] Behavior mattered not only for the international stage but for the divine stage as well.

Beaches were not the only sphere in which the Rabbinate registered its displeasure. The Rabbinate complained frequently about public violation of the Sabbath, non-kosher restaurants, and inappropriate art. In its self-appointment as the Yishuv's moral conscience, the Rabbinate both acknowledged its own limitations and articulated a vision of a direct link between Jewish norms and civic spaces. With its frequent complaints about the public sphere, the Rabbinate assumed (or hoped) that sympathy for its moral program coupled with a gentle reminder would be enough to convince the municipality to fulfill its part of the bargain in building a Zionist and Jewish Tel Aviv.

The Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of Palestine Isaac Hakohen Kook beseeched the city of Tel Aviv to improve the moral state of the beach, arguing that the shame there was unmatched by all cities of the world.[27] He was humiliated that the dubious honor belonged to the only Jewish beach in the world. Kook used a mix of religious and national language in his appeal to the municipality to argue that mixed swimming was a desecration of the Torah and the Land of Israel. His appeal reversed the then popular contemporary liberal Jewish hierarchy: "transforming the idea that the state permits religion to exist as long as it does not interfere with the state into the notion that religion permits the state to exist."[28] For the Chief Rabbi, Judaism necessitated the State of Israel, but the state, in deference to its true master, must

enable those faithful to the Torah to observe its aims. In its ideal form, the state was to be a modern version of a light unto the nations, to inspire the world over with its return to Jewish settlement in the Land of Israel. Immorality on the beaches ran contrary to that mission. Despite perfunctory promises from the municipality, the majority of Yishuv officials did not share the same levels of teleological concern and little changed.

Furthermore, limited attempts to regulate public behavior relied on cooperation with British Mandate officials, who viewed these efforts as a waste of time and resources. In one response to the Tel Aviv City Council, the District High Commissioner explained his reluctance: "I am not in favour of the Council passing Bye Laws which cannot be adequately enforced. It is well known that all last summer many persons habitually bathed without costume to the north of the Abd El Nebi Cemetery, and that the prohibition of undressing on the beach was far more honoured in the breach than in the observance."[29] The inability to enforce municipal statutes highlighted the weakness of the semi-voluntary Tel Aviv Yishuv, an irritating reminder of its limits of power.

Nevertheless, attempts to manage the seashore continued as the population of the first Hebrew city boomed. The official designation of Tel Aviv as a city in 1934 increased the powers of local Yishuv governing bodies. In 1935, the city council formalized segregated swimming areas for men and women at Tel Barukh along the northern border of the city as part of a general initiative to improve conditions at the seashore.[30] With the creation of a zone for separate swimming, the municipality tacitly admitted that only a small minority of its citizens wanted gender segregation. With the new separate beach, the city abandoned any pretenses of segregating the entire shoreline. The beach was an immediate failure, with no mechanisms in place to enforce gender segregation. Distance from the city center and lack of public transportation increased the beach's unpopularity. However, despite its failure, it created a precedent for later municipal actions. After the founding of the state, supporters of separate beaches argued that the pre-state existence of separate swimming meant that it was protected by the 1947 status quo agreement – the accord that regulated religious-state relations in Israel. Therefore, separate swimming was a right guaranteed to the religious community. Its ex post facto inclusion demonstrated the flexibility of the status quo as a mediating framework rather than a fixed agreement. In this argument, the need for a separate beach signified both the respect of Jewish law in public places and the special sensitivity to the needs of the Haredi population in Israel. While Tel Barukh was a failure, its existence paved the way for future accommodation.

The entrance of Agudat Yisrael

In the 1940s, the municipality struggled to keep the beach safe and clean for its ever-growing citizenry. The previous decade had seen a massive influx of immigrants (the Fifth *Aliyah*) due to worsening conditions in Europe, including a large number of central European Jews who had settled in Tel Aviv. As cultural mores shifted, concern for seashore morality waned among non-religious Jews. The difficulties of day-to-day operations, along with relaxed social codes, meant that gender segregation was even less of a priority for municipal officials. Sensing the lack of interest, the advocates of separate beaches regrouped. In addition to various yeshivas and social organizations, the ad hoc coalition for gender-segregated swimming widened to include Chief Rabbi Isaac Halevy Herzog and Mizrahi member David Tzvi Pinkus. The most significant component was Agudat Yisrael, which had begun

in 1912 as the political arm of ultra-Orthodox Jewry across Europe as "an attempt by non- and anti-Zionists to use modern techniques of organization and influence in its running battle with the excesses of modernity."[31] Not all Orthodox groups agreed to Agudah representation, arguing that the founding of an Orthodox Jewish party was itself a betrayal of tradition. In Mandate Palestine, the Agudah promoted toleration and cooperation with the British and Zionist actors and joined Israel's first government in 1948. While their ideology is complex, a moderate, accommodationist approach became the Agudah's trademark, in contrast with the separatist Neturei Karta who eschewed any cooperation with the Zionist state. The Agudah's pragmatist orientation facilitated cooperation with Zionist bodies to order to achieve tangible goals for its constituency, such as military exemptions for males studying in yeshivas.[32]

In addition to communal politics, the Agudah supported a network of schools and social services. One branch, Po'elei Agudat Yisrael, supported several Haredi agricultural settlements across Palestine. While overall favoring a moderate approach, the local leadership of Agudat Yisrael exhibited different attitudes towards Zionism. The Jerusalem branch had many members from anti-Zionist elements in the Old Yishuv, and was more conservative in its opposition to Zionist urban development. The Tel Aviv Agudah consisted largely of east European immigrants who displayed a more favorable attitude towards settlement in Palestine.[33] While the Tel Aviv Agudah supported the creation of the first Hebrew city, albeit in a more Jewish version, Jerusalem members looked on Tel Aviv as a doomed symbol of secularization. In addition to the sale of non-kosher food and public desecration of the Sabbath, the Agudah in Jerusalem frequently pointed to mixed swimming as one of the signs of the inherent immorality of the Zionist project.[34]

The Agudah's inherent pragmatism spurred a new strategy: a demand for a single separate beach, with physical demarcations along the shore. The shift signified a loss – a recognition that demands for a completely segregated seashore would never be met. However, practical concerns outweighed idealistic visions of Tel Aviv. Simultaneously, the rationale for gender segregation transformed from a religio-moral to a civic argument. The Agudah argued that a lack of separate beaches was unfair to the Yishuv's religious citizens as everyone had the inalienable right to go to the beach. Unlike the Rabbinate's rhetoric, the civic discourse was not predicated on investing moral standing in settling the Land of Israel. The shift allowed for the inclusion of non-Zionist actors who could approach the Yishuv (and later the State of Israel) as a neutral body, just as any other interest group. Without this stated religious importance, the issue of separate swimming became one of minority accommodation and allowing diverse groups access to the sea, a perceived benefit for all.

The municipality received its first communiqué about gender-segregated swimming from Agudat Yisrael in 1946.[35] The letter claimed to represent the cries of thousands who wished to swim on the beaches of Tel Aviv, described simultaneously as a divine wonder and a municipal service, but were prevented from doing so for religious reasons. It explained that the current reality was unfair, and unjust. According to the Agudah, the city of Tel Aviv was obligated to enable Haredim to access the beach just as their secular brethren, because members of the ultra-Orthodox community were tax-paying citizens. If they required special assistance to do so, the city was obligated to accommodate their needs. Agudat Yisrael lacked the missionary and policing tendencies of the Rabbinate, and instead appealed to minority rights and fairness to champion its cause. Religion became marginal, as a civic discourse was adopted to argue the value of a separate beach. In its embrace of the previously

mentioned citizen entitlement, the Agudah indicated its belonging to the collective body of Tel Aviv, regardless of its non-Zionist ideology. Rather, its presence in Tel Aviv and willingness to cooperate with the Yishuv meant that the Agudah felt it too deserved a seat at the table. The use of entitlement indicated a deep cultural assimilation on the part of the Tel Aviv Agudah, the adoption of an urban Zionist rhetoric in which residence in Tel Aviv proved Zionist sacrifice and was therefore deserving of municipal assistance as just reward.[36]

Due to the relative autonomy of Tel Aviv, the formal creation of the state did not largely affect the mechanics of beach administration. But the difficulties of the 1948 war combined with the lingering aftereffects of World War II wreaked financial and organizational havoc. Swimming in the sea was banned for significant periods of time, when Tel Aviv was a target for attacking armies. Funds were suspended for non-emergency projects, including beach repairs. One municipal memo proposed male-only access to the bathhouses before 8 a.m. because there was no possibility of establishing fully separate access at that time.[37] Without mentioning the events of the past months, Agudat Yisrael complained in September 1948 that much had been promised and little had been done recently to implement gender segregation.[38] The establishment of the state signified an opportunity to create new standards for how an independent Israel behaved, especially on the beach. Both the Agudah and the Rabbinate urged the municipality to take advantage of its independence from foreign powers that had not been particularly interested in enforcement of public morality. In one especially passionate missive to the mayor, the municipal Rabbinate argued that the immediate months following independence were a special opportunity to segregate the seashore and sanctify the name of God by giving the new state a truly Hebrew character.[39] Independence was no excuse for mixed swimming.

The advocates for a separate beach expanded their scope beyond the municipality. Promises were made to notify national and other officials, whether government ministers, the Chief Rabbinate, or international Zionist bodies. Occasionally, the municipality did receive communications from outside actors, indicating the importance of separate beaches for non-Tel Aviv residents. Haim-Moshe Shapira, the Minister of the Interior and a United Religious Front party member, reminded Mayor Israel Rokach in 1949 of his duty to provide separate beaches.[40] The minister based his comments on the 1935 bylaw. Rokach, a General Zionist party member, had served as mayor of Tel Aviv since 1936, during the transition to statehood, and was aware of the struggle for gender segregation. Shapira, a religious Zionist, continued the Rabbinate strategy of nudging the municipality in hopes of spurring further action. Like the previous requests, Rokach responded with a perfunctory promise to examine the situation, and little else was done.

Yeshiva students also deserve to be healthy: The creation of the Sheraton Beach

Little progress was made until Yehuda Meir Abramowitz, Agudat Yisrael city council member and eventual Tel Aviv deputy mayor, made the creation of gender-segregated beaches his personal crusade. Unlike the ill-defined Rabbinate activism, the focused lobbying of Abramowitz and Agudat Yisrael created facts on the ground enforced by the municipality. His involvement in local politics was part of a larger strategy of Agudat Yisrael to better achieve their goals on the municipal level – a strategy for which Tel Aviv was the test case.[41] When speaking to the city council, Abramowitz used a civic discourse to emphasize that

Haredi Jews were part of democratic Tel Aviv. When addressing his own constituency, he used religious language to assure them that the actions of the Agudah carried rabbinic approval. Abramowitz often related that the Hazon Ish (Avraham Yeshaya Karelitz), the unofficial leader of the ultra-Orthodox community from his arrival in Palestine in 1933 until his death in 1953, had expressed his jealousy when informed of the Agudah's plans for a separate beach because the reward for enabling thousands to fulfill a commandment was beyond measure. Karelitz, known for his fondness for the seashore, was particularly concerned about the health of yeshiva students. The Hazon Ish gave the councilman a blessing to continue his work.[42] The story reinforced one of the central tenets of Agudat Yisrael: that Torah sages set policy via *da'at torah* – the notion that due to their exceptional Torah learning, rabbinic leaders have special insight into realms beyond strictly Jewish legal questions, including the political. Its lay leaders and elected officials frequently described themselves as vessels for rabbinic will.

The vignette also highlighted two features of the struggle for gender-segregated swimming. First, it championed the use of state mechanisms for religious ends. While this approach is more often associated with the religious Zionist followers of Kook, the Hazon Ish endorsed a version without the messianic associations of hastening redemption. Rather, he promoted the use of bureaucracy to create a Haredi subculture in Israel, a cultural separatism created by political activism.[43] Partial spatial segregation enabled his vision of separatism, in which beaches could play a small role in the creation of ultra-Orthodox enclaves.[44] The Haredi community fought for a particular type of geographical separatism, which the Israeli government acknowledged as a communal sphere midway between private and public. While the 1947 status quo agreement guaranteed some degrees of Jewish observance in the public sphere, Tel Aviv's separate beach was the first site outside of traditionally religious spaces in which Jewish law was strictly applied.

The second feature of the struggle was arguments concerning public health. The Agudah avoided discussions of the beach as a leisure site, a value alien to the Haredi community, but highlighted the health benefits of bathing. Like European rabbis who visited Marienbad to take the waters, the Hazon Ish affirmed the Mediterranean's healing properties. His endorsement led support to the notion that beach going could be a proper Haredi pastime. According to the Agudah, the lack of gender-segregated swimming contributed to a lower level of health for Haredi Jews and harmed not just the ultra-Orthodox community but the entire State of Israel.

Abramowitz first raised the issue of separate beaches during his inaugural term as city councilman in 1951. As head of religious services, he asked Mayor Rokach for two separate swimming areas, with a distance between them of about two city blocks.[45] Another attempt was described in a 1953 communiqué that proposed separate swimming for the observant by fixing Sunday, Tuesday, and Thursday for women and Monday, Wednesday, and Friday for men. On the Sabbath, the beach would be open to all.[46] Nevertheless, plans for the separate beach languished under municipal neglect.

In 1965, Tel Aviv embarked on a massive beachfront renovation scheme that improved facilities, renovated the promenade, and increased the amount of shoreline suitable for leisure activities.[47] The renovations came at a point when the city's population was at an all-time high, and the need for improvement was dire. Advocates of gender segregation convinced the municipality to include the construction of a separate beach within the general improvements for the seashore. In city council meetings discussing the proposal,

Abramowitz spoke of the right to enjoy a day at the beach with his children, a right that he could not exercise.[48] Mayor Mordechai Namir, the first Labor Zionist to head the city since the brief tenure of David Bloch Blumenfield in the 1920s, announced his support. He explained that gender-segregated beaches were a common phenomenon worldwide, especially in Europe and Latin America. The proposed beach was therefore in line with the types of facilities that any city provided to its citizens, and not a novel development.[49] The mayoral use of language similar to Abramowitz's indicated the success of the Agudah's civic approach over the Rabbinate's attempt at religious shaming, which was dismissed as annoyingly archaic. While the support of Namir was crucial to the proposal's success, the Agudah's continued persistence combined with the opportunity provided by the 1965 renovations were the main factors in the establishment of a separate beach after forty years of wrangling. By using a civic discourse that crossed party lines, Abramowitz and the Agudah bypassed ideological battles and focused instead on the mechanics of municipal politics. For non-Zionists, distinctions between General and Labor Zionist were meaningless.

Abandoning pretenses to salvage the polluted and often closed Tel Barukh beach, the municipality included in its plans a new gender-segregated beach, just south of the defunct port and closer to the city center. City officials also promised formal supervision to ensure segregation. Located near the Sheraton Hotel, it quickly became known as the Sheraton Beach. Deputy Mayor Simha Ehrlich informed the police chief of the new arrangement effective as of June 1, 1965. The first season functioned as a trial run.[50] The following summer, the municipality made the separate beach permanent.[51] The new separate beach was one of five official beaches on the Tel Aviv seashore, and relatively removed from the others. The city instructed the police to inform bathers that the majority (i.e., 80 percent) of the shoreline was mixed, and this remote area was now for the benefit of the religious population. The municipality also informed the police that its actions were justified by citing the 1935 ordinance that gave the city the power to establish a gender-segregated beach, a claim it repeated on several occasions.[52] By invoking pre-state ordinances, the municipality of Tel Aviv asserted that it was not granting the ultra-Orthodox community new privileges but rather properly fulfilling decades-old promises.

Reactions to the "beach of Rabbi Abramowitz"

Not all were pleased, particularly Mayor Namir's liberal base. In letters to the city and newspaper editorials, Labor supporters expressed their disappointment with the Sheraton Beach. The northern location in a secular stronghold, rather than the more religious southern neighborhoods, added insult to injury – an insult Labor voters Benny and Roma Abiol promised would be remembered during the next elections.[53] Opponents viewed the gender-segregated beach as the work of an overly powerful religious minority who had unfairly imposed their will on a secular majority. The arguments of minority and majority were not just a dispute about demography, but a conversation about the status of Orthodox Jews in Israel. For those opposed to the separate beach, the concept of the religious community as a protected minority violated notions of fairness and equal representation. The Sheraton Beach was therefore a physical manifestation of the preferential treatment of the religious community, proof that even the most liberal areas of Tel Aviv were not immune from Haredi control. Namir responded to his critics by reminding them of the 1935 laws and that he was simply making good on old promises to the city's religious community. He repeatedly

emphasized that the new beach simply improved access to the seashore and did not represent new constellations of power. It was also reported that Ora Namir, wife of the mayor and identifiably secular, preferred the separate beach in Tel Aviv.[54]

For the religious community, Sabbath operation was a frequent point of contention. Religious leaders demanded that the Sheraton Beach be completely closed on Saturday. The city felt it had done enough to accommodate its religious population and insisted on opening the beach on the most popular day of the week for mixed swimming. But for the Haredi community, separate beaches represented a sphere bound by halakhah. The Agudah, following the mandate of the Hazon Ish, worked to create time and space under the control of religious communities and Jewish law as much as possible. Mixed swimming at the separate beach, even when no Orthodox Jews were present, violated that mandate because it underscored the shoreline's true owners – the secular state.

For separatist Neturei Karta, the separate beach symbolized the faults of the accommodationist approach of the Agudah. Relations between the two groups during the Mandate period had previously been cordial. The first serious split occurred in the late 1940s, when Agudat Yisrael decided to accept Zionist financial assistance in resettling Orthodox refugees from Europe. Further contributing to the tensions was the fallout from the 1958 Jerusalem pool controversy. The Haredi community in Israel and abroad virulently opposed plans for the city's first public pool due to its mixed swimming and Sabbath operation. While both groups opposed the pool, notions of how to fight the pool differed. Agudat Yisrael leaders favored behind-the-scenes negotiations and peaceful protest. The presence of an Agudat Yisrael deputy mayor in both Jerusalem and Tel Aviv indicated a preference for working within established governmental channels, especially at the municipal level. The organization's leaders loudly condemned Neturei Karta for its unorthodox tactics, which included kabalistic death curses and marches on the White House. Neturei Karta responded by attacking Agudat Yisrael's Haredi qualifications and labeling them heretics for cooperating with the Zionist state.[55]

From then on, relations between the two groups were tense at best. While the separatist Neturei Karta was not particularly active in Tel Aviv, the organization used the separate beach as an opportunity to attack its rival Agudat Yisrael. The more liberal nature of the Tel Aviv chapter of Agudat Yisrael, as previously mentioned, made the beach even more suspect. Neturei Karta proclaimed that the separate beaches were separate in name only, proof of the Agudah's inherently flawed nature and a pretext for the party to rest on its laurels without effecting any actual change. Furthermore, Neturei Karta argued that Agudat Yisrael's piecemeal approach to gender segregation was offensive for believing Jews and advised that anyone who cared for his soul should stay far away from the Sheraton Beach.[56] For Haredi separatists, the entire shoreline remained forbidden despite the existence of separate beaches. The city's small concessions were therefore not a favor, but a slap in the face, reminding the Haredi Jew that apostates controlled the Land of Israel. Opposition to the separate beach symbolized the difference between a minority of separatists and the majority of accommodationists in the Haredi community. The tangible benefits of the accommodationist approach also increased popular support for the Agudah, whether it was the separate beach or other initiatives such as increased educational funding.

Despite the complaints, the Tel Aviv religious community was largely grateful for the new beach. Rabbi Abramowitz reported in 1966 that the Sheraton Beach was used daily by thousands of religious people, including "*admorim* [Hasidic leaders], rabbis, and judges."[57]

The local branch of Agudat Yisrael sent the municipality a formal letter of gratitude after the close of the first official season of the Sheraton Beach to express their appreciation.[58] The Agudah thanked Mayor Namir for overcoming the financial and administrative challenges in order to relieve the suffering of thousands of men, women, and children previously unable to bathe in the sea. Additionally, the letter thanked Abramowitz for spearheading the project. Reinforcing their earlier arguments of responsibility and fairness, Agudat Yisrael ended by congratulating the city of Tel Aviv for its dedication to all of its citizens, wishing it success in years to come. Later, the local Haredi community unofficially referred to the separate beach as the "the beach of Rabbi Abramowitz" in recognition of his efforts.[59]

Conclusions, or what we talk about when we talk about gender segregation

The Rabbinate's mobilization of Jewish values to argue for segregating the entirety of the Tel Aviv shoreline failed. Officials did little more than make perfunctory promises in response. Employing a different approach, Abramowitz and the Agudah convinced the municipality to establish a gender-segregated beach in northern Tel Aviv using a civic discourse that asked for a separate beach as an exception to the rule of mixed swimming. They framed the request as the obligation of the municipality to a minority. The Agudah argued that the separate beach ensured equal access to city services in order for the Haredi community to exercise its right to the seashore just as any other citizen of Tel Aviv. To further support its argument, the Agudah drew on popular discourses of hygiene and hydrotherapy and stressed the public health benefits of bathing in the Mediterranean. In an era before air conditioning, the seashore offered one of the few reliefs from the relentless Tel Aviv heat. Agudat Yisrael frequently reminded the city of the tribulations of its Haredi residents, including the prominent rabbis who were suffering because their piety prevented them from bathing.

The city accepted and adopted the arguments of Agudat Yisrael. Both downplayed the Jewish nature of the Sheraton Beach. They praised the beach as a symbol of democracy and tolerance, arguing that many Tel Avivians, regardless of religious affiliation, preferred segregated swimming. The municipality explained to its citizens that the separate beach fulfilled its goals to serve as many of its residents as possible and demonstrated its commitment to diversity in a multicultural and liberal society. After initial voices of critique, the beach ceased to be controversial and became a curiosity for secular passersby. The lack of real opposition to the separate beaches stemmed from the nature of its arrangement as a local, ad hoc solution that affected few outside of the Orthodox community. Inspired by the success of the Sheraton Beach, Yehuda Meir Abramowitz, now an Agudat Yisrael Knesset member, sponsored a 1978 bill in the Knesset that obligated every seashore municipality to have a gender-segregated beach. The bill became law with few detractors.

The creation of a separate beach in Tel Aviv fits Asher Cohen and Bernard Susser's model of consociationalism, which typified relations between Jewish religious communities and the state until the rise of the Israeli right in 1977. Its features include the avoidance of explicit decisions regarding controversial issues, disregard for simple majorities in policy making, granting autonomy to various camps in clearly defined areas, and the preference for local and administrative solutions for contentious issues – all of which played a role in the creation of the Sheraton Beach.[60] Via the establishment of the Tel Aviv gender-segregated beach, Agudat Yisrael successfully used local and administrative politics to create an autonomous sphere in which the ultra-Orthodox community could be free to bathe in

the sea despite the reality that the majority of Tel Aviv's citizens had no interest in separate swimming. The establishment of separate beaches was an ad hoc process that worked because it encouraged a functional and not moral agreement, a "muddling through argument" rather than a principled, decisive outcome.[61] While the Agudah was no less morally outraged than the Rabbinate about the lack of modesty, the lack of a formal commitment to Zionism allowed it to speak as an interest group, advocating on behalf of an important minority who deserved this special accommodation in order to benefit from the seashore just as every other Israeli citizen. City ordinances and other policies were selectively read in service of the consociational process, in which negotiations and unofficial agreements were the true inspiration behind policy making.

Israel's gender-segregated beaches embodied the partial separatism of the Hazon Ish, manifesting the creation of an ultra-Orthodox identity enabled by bureaucratic cooperation – a Haredi version of the Zionist strategy of "facts on the ground," which emphasizes creating political realities that later form the basis for policy. The radically moderate approach enabled Haredim to reconcile two seemingly incompatible spheres: the freedoms granted by modern nation-states and the cultural separatism inherent in Haredi identity. In the reconciliation, Haredi Jews prospered.[62] Positive efforts for separate swimming, campaigns to create spaces amenable to Haredim, were more effective than negative campaigns against widely accepted behaviors, whether it be mixed swimming or Sabbath desecration. The former presented ultra-Orthodox Jews as willing to integrate into the larger Israeli society by virtue of the Haredi use of a civic and democratic discourse, while the latter reinforced associations of Haredi Jews with seemingly archaic religious values. The argument for separate services emerged from what is now labeled a right to culture: "A culture essentially requires a group, and the right to culture may involve giving groups a status that contradicts the status of the individual in a liberal state."[63]

A full discussion of the connections between the Sheraton Beach and contemporary forms of Israeli gender segregation, particularly in public transportation, is outside the scope of this article. Nonetheless, the case of the Tel Aviv separate beach, suggests that the Labor Party's loss of hegemony in the 1977 elections may not have been as crucial a turning point as previously argued. More important than party affiliation is the framework of local politics in relevant instances of gender segregation. An aggregate use of local history highlights the development of conflicting discourses about the nature of a self-defined Jewish and democratic state and demonstrates how administrative policies often were the preferred solutions.

The scholarly discussion regarding contemporary gender segregation consists mostly of legal analyses. By virtue of the genre, the dominant analysis ignores historical precedent and flattens the discussion to exclude factors outside the legal realm. Meanwhile, current public discussions about gender segregation raise important questions about the limits of multiculturalism, feminism, liberalism, and tolerance, dilemmas not unique to Israel. Nonetheless, these debates ignore the local nature of gender segregation, often treating such practices as sui generis, removed from contexts of space and time. My hope is that a history of the Sheraton Beach adds a needed element of historical attention to the current scholarly and popular discourse regarding gender segregation. This article pushes back the origins of gender segregation to the early periods of Israeli statehood, demonstrating how effective varying strategies of political mobilization have been for the imposition of religious Jewish values on the public Israeli sphere. Efforts at gender segregation, whether successful or not,

cannot be viewed in isolation. A focus on administrative and local history highlights the larger interaction between varying state and individual actors, all attempting to determine the Jewish nature of the Israeli public sphere.

Notes

1. Sholem Asch, "Tel Aviv," *Yedi'ot Iriyat Tel Aviv* (1936–1937): 117; cited in Azaryahu, *Tel Aviv*, 194.
2. See Lefebvre, *The Production of Space.*
3. Ginsberg, "Regulating Public Space."
4. Shavit and Biger, *Ha-historiyah shel Tel-Aviv*, 2:10.
5. The most cited source is BT Gitin 90b, which argues that a man who observes his wife bathing in a river with men has grounds to divorce her due to her violation of accepted modesty norms.
6. For a Haredi formulation of modesty rules, see Falk, *Modesty, an Adornment for Life*. For a response from a prominent Modern Orthodox rabbi, see Henkin, *Understanding Tzniut*. Observance of these precepts varies, as many self-described Orthodox Jews in Israel and abroad participate in mixed swimming. Religious kibbutzim sanction mixed swimming and remain an exception to the general ban.
7. Shafir, *Land, Labor.*
8. One work that focuses on Haredi integration is Stadler, *A Well-Worn Tallis for a New Ceremony*. For a discussion and critique of the Israelization narrative for Israeli Palestinians, see Robinson, *Citizen Strangers.*
9. Finkelman, "The Ambivalent Haredi Jew," 287–88.
10. Corbin, *The Lure of the Sea*, 76–77; Payne, "Seaside Visitors," 90–91.
11. Corbin, *The Lure of the Sea*, 3.
12. For more on bathing machines, see ibid., 81.
13. Walton, "The Seaside Resort."
14. Triendl-Zadoff, *Next Year in Marienbad*, 5.
15. For more on the connection between Marienbad and Tel Aviv, see ibid., chap. 13.
16. Feige, "The Names of the Place"; Schlör, *Tel Aviv*, 58.
17. Biger, "A Scotsman in the First Hebrew City," 8.
18. For one exception, see Helman, *Or ve-yam hikifuha.*
19. Shavit and Biger, *Ha-historiyah shel Tel-Aviv*, 2:276.
20. Ibid., 3:160. It is not clear if the statistics refer to local or national elections. While my focus is on mostly Ashkenazi religious Zionists and Haredim, less attention has been paid to the Mizrahi traditional population of Tel Aviv whose religious observance does not easily fall into the aforementioned categories.
21. Hannah Herzog, *Gendering Politics*, argues that women have also seen the most political success on local councils.
22. For more on Tel Aviv's autonomy during the Mandate period, see Fireberg, "Mi-otonomiyah le-ir."
23. I follow the approach taken in Helman, "Dirt, Noise, and Misbehavior."
24. Ibid., 103.
25. Chief Rabbinate of Tel Aviv to the Municipality of Tel Aviv, May 13, 1926, box 3 file 12b/553, Tel Aviv Municipal Archives (hereafter TAMA).
26. One of the most cited examples comes from Leviticus 18. After enumerating a long list of sexual prohibitions, Leviticus 18:28 promises "And if you defile the land, it will vomit you out as it vomited out the nations that were before you."
27. Abraham Isaac Hakohen Kook to the Municipality of Tel Aviv, June 30, 1930, Rehitzah ba-yam [Sea bathing] collection, box 1343, folder 4-3734 a, TAMA.
28. Batnitzky, *How Judaism Became a Religion*, 97.
29. District Commissioner Southern District, "Municipal Bye Law Bathing on Tel Aviv Foreshore," January 12, 1927, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1181, folder 4-2854, TAMA.

30. For more on the plan, see Azaryahu and Golan, "Contested Beachscapes."
31. Mirsky, *Rav Kook*, 120.
32. For more on Agudat Yisrael, see Mahla, "No Trinity"; Fund, *Pirud o hishtatfut*.
33. Fund, "Tel Aviv be-itonut Agudat Yisrael," 82.
34. Ibid., 83.
35. Pinhas Mondary and Rabbi M. Yafeh-Schlesinger, to the City Council of Tel Aviv, to the Mayor, August 9, 1946, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1343, folder 3736, item 670, TAMA.
36. Helman, "Dirt, Noise, and Misbehavior," 111.
37. Memo to the Chief Municipal Supervisor, September 8, 1948, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1344, folder 4-3747, doc. 831, TAMA.
38. Yehuda Meir Abramowitz, M.D. Lowenstein, and Central Agudat Yisrael in Eretz Yisrael, "Rehitzah be-hof ha-yam" [Bathing on the seashore], September 6, 1948, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1344, folder 4-3747, doc. 826, TAMA.
39. Chief Rabbinate of the Jaffa and Tel Aviv District to Mr. Yisrael Rokach, Mayor, August 23, 1948, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1344, folder 4-3747, doc. 817, TAMA.
40. Moshe Shapira to the Mayor of Tel Aviv, May 11, 1949, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1344, folder 4-3747, doc. 855, TAMA.
41. Abramowitz, *Hazon u-ma'as be-Agudat Yisrael*, 2:16.
42. Ibid., 2:231.
43. Brown, "Ha-Hazon Ish," 413.
44. Rosen-Zvi, *Taking Space Seriously*, 97. The inclusion of gender-segregated beaches into his categorical analysis is my own.
45. Yehuda Meir Abramowitz to Mr. Y. Rokach, Mayor of Tel Aviv, June 28, 1951, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1344, folder 4-3734, doc. 997, TAMA.
46. Hayim Halperin, "Ha-tayelet me'ever ha-nahar Yarkon" [The promenade beyond the Yarkon River], July 9, 1953, Rehitzah ba-yam, box 1344, folder 3738, doc. 188, TAMA.
47. Shavit and Biger, *Ha-historiyah shel Tel-Aviv*, 3:33.
48. Protocols of the Meetings of the 9th City Council, Meeting 104, August 22, 1965, 24, Protokolim ha-hahlatot, box 2678, folder 18, TAMA.
49. Ibid., 24–25. Supporters of separate beaches often pointed to unnamed foreign locales as precedent, even though at the time gender-segregated swimming had largely ceased to exist.
50. Simha Ehrlich, "Sehiyah lo me'urevet ba-sheraton, Habakuk" [Non-mixed swimming on Sheraton, Habbakuk], June 9, 1965, box 6104, folder 3742, doc. 45, TAMA.
51. Y. Weiner, "Hof nifrad la-datiyim" [Separate beach for the religious], May 29, 1966, Rehitzah ba-yam/Tipul ba-hofim [Beach maintenance], Collection 25, box 7924, folder 2601, TAMA. For the complete text of the pronouncement, see Tel Aviv City Council, "Hakamat hofim nifradim le-gvvarim ve-nashim" [Establishment of separate beaches for men and women], June 1, 1965, Collection 7(13), box 415, folder 275, TAMA.
52. Simha Ehrlich, to Mr. Y. Kind, Representative of the Chief of Police, Tel Aviv, June 11, 1965, box 6104, folder 3742, doc. 48, TAMA.
53. Benny and Roma Abiol, to the Mayor of Tel Aviv, June 20, 1965, box 6104, folder 3742, doc. 48, TAMA.
54. Abramowitz, *Hazon u-ma'as be-Agudat Yisrael*, 2:238.
55. I examine the history of the Jerusalem pool more fully in my dissertation. See Weiss, "A Beach of Their Own."
56. *Ha-homah*, 20:233.
57. Yehuda Meir Abramowitz, "Hofim le-rehitzah nifredet" [Beaches for separate bathing], November 29, 1966, Rehitzah ba-yam/Tipul ba-hofim, Collection 25, box 7924, folder 2601, TAMA.
58. Agudat Yisrael, Tel Aviv Branch, to Mr. M. Namir, Mayor of Tel Aviv-Jaffa, August 21, 1966, Rehitzah ba-yam/Tipul ba-hofim, Collection 25, box 7924, folder 2601, TAMA.
59. Abramowitz, *Hazon u-ma'as be-Agudat Yisrael*, 2:18.
60. Cohen and Susser, *Israel and the Politics of Jewish Identity*, 7–13.
61. Ibid., 20.

62. Batnitzky, *How Judaism Became a Religion*, 183.
63. Margalit and Halbertal, "Liberalism and the Right to Culture," 529.

Acknowledgments

Disclosure statement

Notes on contributor

Shayna Weiss is currently the Schlesinger Family Postdoctoral Research Fellow at Tel Aviv University. She is working on a book about gender segregation in the Israeli public sphere.

ORCID

Shayna Weiss 🆔 http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2774-0020

References

Abramowitz, Yehuda Meir. *Hazon u-ma'as be-Agudat Yisrael* [Vision and deed in Agudat Yisrael]. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Mashabim, 1986.

Azaryahu, Maoz. *Tel Aviv: Mythography of a City*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2007.

Azaryahu, Maoz, and Arnon Golan. "Contested Beachscapes: Planning and Debating Tel Aviv's Seashore in the 1930s." *Urban History* 34, no. 2 (2007): 278–95.

Batnitzky, Leora Faye. *How Judaism Became a Religion: An Introduction to Modern Jewish Thought*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011.

Biger, Gideon. "A Scotsman in the First Hebrew City: Patrick Geddes and the 1926 Town Plan for Tel Aviv." *Scottish Geographical Magazine* 108, no. 1 (1992): 4–8.

Brown, Benjamin. "Ha-Hazon Ish ve-kvi'at darkah shel ha-yahadut ha-haredit" [The Hazon Ish and the establishment of the path of Haredi Jewry]. In *Shnei evrei ha-gesher: Dat u-medinah be-reshit darkah shel Yisrael* [On both sides of the bridge: Religion and state in the early years of Israel], edited by Mordechai Bar-On, 364–416. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2002.

Cohen, Asher, and Bernard Susser. *Israel and the Politics of Jewish Identity: The Secular-Religious Impasse*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.

Corbin, Alain. *The Lure of the Sea : The Discovery of the Seaside in the Western World, 1750–1840*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Falk, Pesach Eliyahu. *Modesty, an Adornment for Life : Halachos and Attitudes concerning Tznius of Dress and Conduct*. Gateshead, UK: Feldheim, 1998.

Feige, Michael. "The Names of the Place: New Historiography in Tamar Berger's *Dionysus at the Center*." *Israel Studies Forum* 19, no. 2 (April 1, 2004): 54–74.

Finkelman, Yoel. "The Ambivalent Haredi Jew." *Israel Studies* 19, no. 2 (July 1, 2014): 264–93.

Fireberg, Haim. "Mi-otonomiyah le-ir: Ha-shinui be-ma'amad iriyat Tel Aviv ba-ma'avar mi-mandat le-medinah" [From autonomy to city: The change in the status of the city of Tel Aviv in the transition from Mandate to state]. In *Ezrahim ba-milhamah: Kovetz Mehkarim al ha-hevrah ha-ezrahit*

be-milhemet ha-atzma'ut [Civilians in war: A collection of articles on civilian society during the War of Independence], edited by Mordechai Bar-On and Meir Chazan, 380–408. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, and Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2010.

Fund, Yosef. "Tel Aviv be-itonut Agudat Yisrael" [Tel Aviv in Agudat Yisrael newspapers]. *Kesher* no. 39 (2009): 82–91.

Fund, Yosef. *Pirud o hishtatfut: Agudat Yisrael mul ha-tziyonut u-medinat Yisrael* [Separation or participation: Agudat Yisrael confronting Zionism and the State of Israel]. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1999.

Ginsberg, Yona. "Regulating Public Space: The 'Religious' Beach of Tel Aviv." *PaRDeS, Journal of the Association for Jewish Studies* 15 (2009): 112–23.

Ha-homah: Yalkut ma'amarim mi-anshei Neturei Karta [The wall: Collection of articles from Neturei Karta members]. Vol. 20. Jerusalem: Lebenstein, Binyamin, 1970.

Helman, Anat. "Dirt, Noise, and Misbehavior in the First Hebrew City: Letters of Complaint as a Historical Source." In *Tel-Aviv, the First Century: Visions, Designs, Actualities*, edited by S. Ilan Troen and Maoz Azaryahu, 94–114. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Helman, Anat. *Or ve-yam hikifuha: Tarbut Tel Avivit bi-tekufat ha-mandat* [Urban culture in 1920s and 1930s Tel Aviv]. Haifa: Haifa University Press, 2007.

Henkin, J. H. *Understanding Tzniut: Modern Controversies in the Jewish Community*. Jerusalem; New York: Urim, 2008.

Herzog, Hanna. *Gendering Politics: Women in Israel*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991.

Mahla, Daniel. "No Trinity: The Tripartite Relations between Agudat Yisrael, the Mizrahi Movement, and the Zionist Organization." *Journal of Israeli History* 34, no. 2 (Fall 2015): 117–40.

Margalit, Avishai, and Moshe Halbertal. "Liberalism and the Right to Culture." *Social Research* 71, no. 3 (Fall 2004): 529–48.

Mirsky, Yehudah. *Rav Kook: Mystic in a Time of Revolution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014.

Payne, Christiana. "Seaside Visitors: Idlers, Thinkers and Patriots in Mid-Nineteenth Century Britain." In *Water, Leisure and Culture: European Historical Perspectives*, edited by Bruce H. Tabb and Susan Anderson, 87–104. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2002.

Robinson, Shira. *Citizen Strangers: Palestinians and the Birth of Israel's Liberal Settler State*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013.

Rosen-Zvi, Issachar. *Taking Space Seriously: Law, Space, and Society in Contemporary Israel*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate, 2004.

Schlör, Joachim. *Tel Aviv: From Dream to City*. London: Reaktion Books, 1999.

Shafir, Gershon. *Land, Labor, and the Origins of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict, 1882–1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Shavit, Yaacov, and Gideon Biger. *Ha-historiyah shel Tel-Aviv* [The history of Tel Aviv]. Vol. 2, *Me-ir-medinah le-ir ba-medinah (1936–1952)* [From a city-state to a city in a state]. Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv, Ramot Press, 2007.

Shavit, Yaacov, and Gideon Biger. *Ha-historiyah shel Tel-Aviv* [The history of Tel Aviv]. Vol. 3, *Ir mithadeshet (1952–1973)* [A rejuvenating city, 1952–1973]. Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv, Ramot Press, 2013.

Stadler, Nurit. *A Well-Worn Tallis for a New Ceremony: Trends in Israeli Haredi Culture*. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press, 2012.

Triendl-Zadoff, Mirjam. *Next Year in Marienbad: The Lost Worlds of Jewish Spa Culture*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012.

Walton, John K. "The Seaside Resort: A British Cultural Export." *History in Focus*, no. 9 (Autumn 2005). http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/Sea/articles/walton.html

Weiss, Shayna. "A Beach of Their Own: The Origins of Gender Segregation in the Israeli Public Sphere." PhD diss., New York University, 2015.