

A Municipality Seeking Refuge: Jerusalem Municipality in 1948

Haneen Naamneh

The municipality did not fare any better than the rest of Jerusalem's residents. After the departure of the British forces before noon on 14 May, we were surprised by the attack of the Jewish forces. We left the municipal offices and the bullets all over the city and entered the walls [of the city]. We found on the morning of 15 May that while being inside the walls, the enemy had surrounded us, and bombs were falling everywhere.¹

On 26 December 1950 *al-Difa'* newspaper published extracts of a "Detailed report of Jerusalem Municipality's work after the termination of the mandate," which was authored by Anton Safieh, a senior employee of Jerusalem Municipality during the British and the Jordanian rule. *Al-Difa'* added the sub-headings: "Facts and figures demonstrate the difficulties it [the municipality] encountered and the valuable tasks it undertook"; "The difficult period that followed the departure of the Mandate government"; "The remnants of the municipality and its finances"; "Gradual restitution of life to normal."

Between mid-May and late November 1948 a municipal council composed of senior Palestinian administrative employees led by Safieh undertook the municipal tasks in Jerusalem after the city's administrative center fell under the control of the Zionist forces. This municipal council functioned until 22 November 1948 when the military commander, Abdallah al-Tal, appointed the first official municipal council under Jordan in Jerusalem.²

The historical account introduced in this paper sheds light on some of the

Ibrahim Dakkak Award for Outstanding Essay on Jerusalem is an annual award launched in 2017 to commemorate the memory and work of Ibrahim Dakkak (1929–2016), former chairman of the Advisory Board.

municipal challenges that Jerusalem encountered between May and November 1948, based on historical press and archival research in the Arab Municipality files, which are located at the Israeli Jerusalem Municipality Archive. Despite the loss of the Jerusalem Municipality town hall in 1948, which had devastating effects on the city's essential services, some municipality employees attempted to revive the municipal work. However, neither the town hall's loss nor the history of its labor have been included in the narratives about Jerusalem in 1948.

This paper approaches the municipality as a refugee-institution and traces its loss as part of the narratives on displacement and survival in 1948. Approaching the municipality as a refugee transcends conventional analysis of the mere material loss and captures its political, social, and quotidian meanings. Furthermore, it creates a communal and local context for interpreting the municipality's loss and revival and allows us to better understand post-1948 Jerusalem.

The Rise of an Arab Municipality

The Jerusalem Municipality was an essential institution that gradually gained status in local and national politics after its establishment in 1863³ under Ottoman rule. It became a heated site for contentious politics during the Mandate period, reflecting "in miniature the paramount problem of the whole country."⁴ Against the backdrop of rapidly increasing Jewish immigration, a crisis related to the right of mayoralty arose in Jerusalem in August 1944. Following the death of the mayor Mustafa al-Khalidi, the Mandate government appointed the Jewish deputy Daniel Auster as acting mayor. The Palestinian members of the municipal council, as well as the political leadership across Palestine, protested the appointment since they perceived it to be a violation of the precedent established under the Ottomans, which preserved the position of Jerusalem's mayor for a Muslim resident.⁵

The Mandate government had been pressured by the Jewish municipal council's members to overturn the Muslim mayor precedent. Therefore, the Mandate government attempted to negotiate the terms of mayoralty through a system of triple rotation between Christian, Muslim and Jewish residents, but eventually both parties rejected these suggestions. Starting in March 1945, the Palestinian members refrained from attending the municipal meetings. As a result, they were disqualified in July 1945 as council members, thus creating a lack of quorum that prevented the Jewish members from having legal assembly of the council⁶. Consequently, the government dismissed the council and appointed a Municipal Corporation Commission composed of five British government officials, and appointed chief justice William Fitzgerald to inquire into the local administration in Jerusalem and to make recommendations.⁷

In late March 1948 Richard Massie Graves, the chairman of the Municipal Commission, addressed the Jerusalem district commissioner suggesting that "the present commission might be dissolved and the High Commissioner to be asked to appoint two emergency committees from the Arab and Jewish Communities, with himself [Graves],

the chairman as a neutral coordinator.” However, this suggestion “broke down” as the Palestinian leadership rejected it.⁸

Earlier that month on 6 March 1948 Graves addressed Husayn Fakhri al-Khalidi, an ex-mayor of Jerusalem who was then the Secretary General of the Arab Higher Executive, pleading with him to encourage the Palestinian residents to pay their dues to the municipality given its degraded financial situation. In his letter, Graves also invited the Arab Higher Executives to create an *Arab* committee to deal with municipal affairs:

I do not for a moment anticipate cooperation between the communities [Arab and Jewish]. What I propose as far as the Arab population of Jerusalem is concerned is that a small Committee should be formed under the auspice of the Arab Higher Executive to take some part in the responsibility for municipal affairs. I realise that such a committee would not wish to become coopted members of the Commission [Municipality Corporation Commission], (which, of course, is likely to disintegrate within a few weeks as most of the members are Government officers), and suggest that they should act as my advisers on all important matters connected with the Arab areas and Arab personnel.⁹

The following day al-Khalidi on behalf of the Arab Higher Executive rejected the proposal as the Arabs refuse “to participate or cooperate with an appointed municipal commission installed in the municipality against the will and the wishes of the Arab tax-payers in Jerusalem.”¹⁰ This position emphasized the intensity of the 1944 mayoralty crisis for the Palestinians in Jerusalem, and the symbolic value of the municipality in the national discourse over self-determination and political representation. In the last meeting of the Commission on 6 April 1948 before it was dissolved, Graves reported on the breakdown of his attempts given the Palestinians’ rejection, and the commission “felt that nothing further could be done in regard to this matter until a decision had been announced by Government.”¹¹

However, an *ad hoc* municipal division had already been underway since December 1947 as Graves reported that there was an “absenteeism problem” among the Jewish staff, and that

. . . the Jewish community are obviously doing everything in their power to force us [the government] to open a branch office in the Jewish part of the town. This would be most inconvenient, and would be interpreted by the Arabs as the first step towards “partition” in the city. I shall certainly resist this pressure, unless it is demonstrated beyond a doubt that attendance of the Jews at the present office is definitely dangerous.¹²

On 29 December an attack targeted the Jewish staff while they were passing through Jaffa Road to reach the town hall, located at the old post-office building opposite to Barclays bank.¹³ As a result, the Commission decided to establish a Jewish branch of

the municipality in a building located in Mahneh Yihuda.¹⁴ For the next few months, “the Arab employees, abandoned by their colleagues, anticipate[d] being blown up by the Jews”.¹⁵

The municipal order and workforce were severely affected by the security situation even before the termination of the Mandate in mid-May. By the beginning of April, at least three municipal employees were killed in violent events while on duty, and the Commission allocated fifty Palestinian pounds as compensation for their dependents.¹⁶ On the administrative level, some Palestinian employees had to take over the tasks of their Jewish colleagues. For instance, Salah al-Din Jarallah, who was an assistant to the head of clerks in the municipality, stated that he had to cover the position of the Jewish head of clerks, Ibrahim Franko.¹⁷

Starting mid-April 1948 the Commission’s members and all other British municipal employees began to leave Palestine. The municipal affairs of the Palestinians and the Jewish community had to be transferred to the auspices of their leadership. In light of the High Arab Executive’s rejection to cooperate with the Commission, the deputy of the Commission J. A. Hilton appointed Anton Safieh to lead the Arab municipal affairs until a new municipal order arose. Similarly, Hilton asked Daniel Auster to lead the Jewish municipal affairs.¹⁸

The Municipality as a Refugee-Institution

Upon the occupation of the western neighborhoods of Jerusalem in May 1948, the city lost essential institutions, including “the post office and telephone exchange, all hospitals, the bus terminal, sanitation equipment, and the wholesale vegetable market,”¹⁹ as the administrative center was concentrated in these neighborhoods. The institutional crisis in Jerusalem was aggravated by thousands of refugees who sought shelter in the city during the months of massacres and displacement in Jerusalem and the surrounding villages.²⁰ Most prominent was the loss of the municipality town hall and resources, including money, records, and vehicles. As was articulated in the report in *al-Difa’*, the fate of the municipality was not any better than others who lost their homes. Below we consider the consequences of the municipality’s losses and analyses the attempts to revive the city’s essential services.

On 13 May 1948, J. A. Hilton, the deputy of the Commission attended the town hall for the last time. The following day, Palestinian employees, including Safieh and Jarallah, encountered difficulties in reaching the town hall given the heavy fighting in the area²¹ and they would never be able to resume their work in that building. Despite the great loss Safieh formed with other employees a temporary municipal council [hereafter: the municipal council].²² The council included Saba Sa‘id as the municipality’s advocate, Yusif Budiri as the head of the engineering department, Mufid Nashashibi as the head of the health department, Jamil Ahmad Nasir as the head of the water department, Mahmoud al-Shu‘aybi as the head of the inspection department, Mohammad Totah as the head of the finance department, and Salah al-Din Jarallah as the head of clerks.²³

These municipality employees worked to respond to urgent challenges, such as preventing epidemics and ensuring public order, while their work took place under conditions of continuous fighting rendering the future ambiguous and uncertain.²⁴ The municipal council described the situation as a “crisis” and announced that “the country is in a state of chaos” and that it was not possible to “influence anyone or to achieve justice for anyone.”²⁵ The municipal council was unsure how to approach the situation from an administrative point of view and considered the situation to be “a change of the administration in Palestine.”²⁶

Throughout the first weeks following the loss of the town hall, the municipal council had to operate from different locations. Safieh described in an internal report in 1958 how “we [the employees] sought *refuge* inside the walls together with the residents who remained’ and then “we took *refuge* in two rooms of The Islamic Orphans House” [emphasis added].²⁷ Jarallah’s testimony further explains the journey as he detailed the several buildings in which the municipality sought refuge “first in al-Frier school for four or five days and then in The Islamic Orphans House for a month or two, from there we moved to Murkus estate, known as the Citadel Hotel and we stayed there for about a month.”²⁸ Safieh reported that the Municipality moved to the Citadel Hotel when the first Truce was announced, and before it ended they moved to the building of the Greek hospital.²⁹

The displacement of the municipality and its workforce generated a shared fate between the institution and the public given the desperate need for essential services. Similar to the public who sought to survive the crisis by turning to the city’s material and social infrastructure – even if it was largely in ruins – the Municipality sought the assistance of other local institutions that survived the war to establish temporary sites of authority.

Moreover, the municipality shared with other refugees not only the loss of homes and buildings but also of deeds and documents. In mid-May 1948, some employees managed to save maps, documents including property tax registrations, vehicles, and fuel just before the fall of the town hall.³⁰ Yet, they were not able to get hold of one particular check which was the most crucial for the functioning of the municipality. Upon the termination of the Mandate about sixty thousand Palestinian pounds remained as a surplus fund in the Jerusalem Municipality’s Barclays bank account. The Mandate government decided to divide the amount between the anticipated Palestinian and Jewish municipal councils in Jerusalem. Accordingly, two checks were issued³¹ and handed to Safieh and Auster in their capacity as the leaders of post-Mandate municipal councils. Safieh signed the check and kept it as was normal procedure in the metal safe of the municipality. On 30 June 1948 Safieh crossed under the auspices of the Truce Commission to examine the town hall hoping to retrieve the check,³² but the safe could not be found and the traces of the check were lost. Safieh believed that the Israelis took over the safe when they occupied the town hall, which included in addition to the check, “about 100 pounds and a number of promissory notes from tenants of municipality property.”³³

In June 1948 Safieh contacted the British Colonial Office and the Department of Clearance of the British government in Cyprus, seeking their assistance to retain the

check and release the money. In August 1948 he met with United Nations mediator in Palestine Count Folke Bernadotte³⁴ – just before Bernadotte was assassinated by *Lehi*, the Zionist militia. Bernadotte expressed his sympathy with Safieh but explained that his role was limited to political affairs.³⁵ In the same month Safieh travelled to Cyprus to meet with Barclays bank officials, but he fell ill while he was there and was unable to resume his role as the head of the municipal council until December 1948.³⁶

During these months of hunting for the lost check, the municipal council sought to overcome its empty treasury – it had only 15 pounds in August 1948!³⁷ – through other channels, including collecting taxes from monasteries and pleading with the Jordanian central government for financial support. However, as time passed the council became hopeless, realizing they were unlikely to obtain immediate support from the government despite the “misery and destitution”³⁸ that prevailed. Therefore, the check represented a deed for a future, without which neither the municipality nor the city could revive. This sentiment was repeatedly expressed during municipality meetings, referring to the check as the only thing that could save the municipality from its severe financial crisis.

For the next six years Palestinian, Jordanian, and British officials would attempt to obtain the check and release the money from Barclays bank. The Israel Exchange Controller declared that it “would not in any case release the funds in question” to the Arab Municipality. In 1949, following instructions from the Israeli government, Barclays bank released the money to the Israeli Municipality of Jerusalem.³⁹ In 1952 the Arab Municipality sued Barclays bank in the Jerusalem Magistrate Court (in Arab Jerusalem), won the case in 1954 and finally received its share of the Mandate Municipality treasury, a total of 27,500 Palestinian pounds.⁴⁰

Unemployed Municipality

One of the direct consequences of the municipality’s financial crisis was its inability to pay the salaries of its workforce. Municipality workers did not consider that their employment was officially terminated after the termination of the Mandate. Consequently, many of them continued to attend the municipality’s provisional seats in order to prove their availability for employment even when no work or money was available, since they worried that nonattendance would lead to their dismissal.⁴¹

In August 1948, only 130 to 150 Palestinian technical and administrative municipal employees – of the total number of 300 to 350 – were active.⁴² After two months of working without being paid, some employees protested and performed disorderly acts [*shaghab*]. Therefore the municipal council met with their representative and pointed out that the employees who were paid until the end of May 1948⁴³ were asked to refrain from coming to work, as the municipality had no money to pay them. It further clarified to them that given the “change of administration” in Palestine, salaries would not be paid until the new government had determined a salary scale and secured the necessary financial resources.⁴⁴

Following the employees' threats of a strike, the council met in mid-August 1948 with the employees' representative and explained the hardship of the municipality and the challenges of health hazards that city was facing.⁴⁵ Although the employees initially expressed their understanding and agreed to cooperate with the municipality and to receive only a partial payment, they announced a strike on 20 August which they suspended on 25 August when they learned about Safieh's travel arrangements to Cyprus to release the money from Barclays bank. Upon his return without success to obtain the money, the desperate employees resumed their threats to strike.⁴⁶

During this period the municipal council members played the role of mediator between the central government and the employees. The council members demonstrated an understanding attitude towards the employees, that could be explained as derived from a sense of bureaucratic solidarity and communal responsibility towards the destroyed city. Amidst the workforce crisis, Safieh met with the Administrative Committee of the Transjordan government who "paid no attention at all to the problem of the municipality and was not even willing to discuss it." Nevertheless, Safieh insisted to speak in front of the Administrative Committee and described the situation of the municipality while emphasizing the strike of the employees.⁴⁷

The zenith of the workforce crisis was when the Jerusalem military commander's only solution to offer to the municipality was to dismiss most of the employees. Safieh who represented the municipal council in the talks with the military commander refused such a solution, and so did the council members once he reported back to them on 21 August 1948. The following day the council met after the military commander had met Safieh again and ordered him to dismiss employees and prepare a brief budget proposal accordingly.

At that note, the council members agreed that any decision to dismiss employees depended on the "acceptance of the employees who are the operating hand of the municipality and if they refuse then there is no need to prepare neither a brief nor a detailed budget." The employees' representative was called at once and was briefed on the crisis, which the council members described as a quandary [*wurta*], yet "the public good which demands that we sacrifice everything, is on the top of all."⁴⁸

The representative went back immediately to consult with the employees, who agreed to conditional dismissal of some of their number until the situation changed, so long as: their late salaries for June, July and August would be paid, that they would not be considered permanently dismissed, and their accumulated rights would be guaranteed. Accordingly, the municipal council prepared a brief budget to hand to the military commander.⁴⁹ The negotiations over this issue did not stop there and after two months of correspondence with the central government, it was agreed in October 1948 to grant the municipality a loan of five thousand pounds to secure some basic salaries.⁵⁰

The workforce crisis only emphasized to what extent the check was essential for the municipality during that crucial phase. Above all, its loss limited the municipality's capacity to provide services and to develop the ruined city, but it also affected its political authority and status and made it fully dependent on the "new administration," which

was not yet aware of or attentive to its needs and priorities. Despite this, the municipal council, which was equipped with local knowledge and bureaucratic experience, alternated between material and legal continuities and interruptions to negotiate its terms through the crisis.

Law, Order and the “Public Good”

Alongside its attempts to retain administrative order, the municipality was also busy leading the city throughout these chaotic months as it became crowded with deprived refugees, in addition to a large impoverished population of native residents following the war. In late May and early June 1948, the municipality was preoccupied with issues of public health and hygiene to prevent spread of diseases and epidemics.

Among its first tasks was the preparation of some workers' groups to spread DDT all over the city after a few cases of typhoid were diagnosed in refugee houses, while other groups were prepared for the clearance of water wells by spreading lime in the city's alleys.⁵¹ Other health hazards were caused by the loss of crucial infrastructure and public spaces, like the loss of the slaughterhouse in Shu'fat after it became a dangerous area, forcing butchers to slaughter their cattle in their shops inside the Old City. Consequently, the municipal council established an alternative slaughterhouse in Wadi al-Joz, and by 16 June 1948 at least eight butchers were fined for failing to use the new slaughterhouse.⁵²

Improvised usage of the city's public spaces were common during that period, as we can learn from Safieh's call to his “fellow citizens” on 9 June 1948,⁵³ in which he pleaded with the general public as well as particular sectors to keep the city clean and in order. In an earlier call that was broadcast on *al-Rawda* radio, he addressed street vegetable vendors to resume selling their goods in the bazaar market that the municipality opened on 7 June 1948.⁵⁴

Disorder seemed to be common not only in public spaces among merchants and manual workers, but also among individuals in private places:

As for the residents, I hope you keep your houses clean and do not throw garbage in the streets, but rather put it in tightly-closed containers until it is gathered by the municipality workers and do not drop dirty water in the streets so that you prevent flies from spreading in front of your houses bringing with them different kinds of fatal bacteria. As for urination in the streets, it has very bad effects on all of us and therefore I ask you to avoid doing it and each one of you should help the municipality workers to do their job appropriately.⁵⁵

Lack of law enforcement and communal compliance with urban regulations constituted a challenge for the municipality, but to what extent did it have any executive force to implement the law? In its meeting on 2 July 1948, the council concluded that it

would plead with the military commander to formally recognize it as a national charity institution “in order to continue to meet its obligations and apply Municipality Ordinance and by-laws in Jerusalem.”⁵⁶

Beyond the importance of the rule of law, the municipality was also seeking to collect some revenue through taxes and municipal licenses to overcome its financial crisis. As early as 13 June 1948, the municipality turned to merchants, manual workers and handicraft workshops’ owners and ordered them to renew their expired licenses immediately, and to start paying their taxes accordingly, stating that its employees had started collecting taxes and lack of cooperation would be followed by legal steps.⁵⁷

On 31 July 1948 the municipal council dedicated a meeting to discuss the question of urban licensing procedures. The meeting was attended by the municipal council members, the head of inspectors and representatives of the health division and the police. Safieh retrieved the Mandate municipality’s procedures for issuing licenses and collecting taxes, and the attendees assessed the situation on the ground concerning law enforcement.⁵⁸

New bars and cafes, including mixed (male and female) cafes, opened during the few months after the war; the police representative indicated that some of these became targets for thieves. It was therefore decided to refrain from issuing licenses to new bars or cafes, especially those located outside the walls, without referring to the police first. New shops like handicrafts and manual workshops also worked without licenses during this period. But given the public’s degraded economic situation, Safieh suggested that no strict policy would be enforced in issuing licenses to these workshops, as long as health rules were followed. Yet the council and the police decided to cooperate to ensure that unlicensed workshops would be fined and closed.⁵⁹ The municipality also decided not to intervene in the work of the female farmers [*fallahat*], as long as they were away from main streets. Interestingly, these *fallahat* were distinguished from vendors (mainly male), as the municipality decided to hold a separate meeting to discuss their situation in detail.⁶⁰

To what extent did vendors, merchants, butchers, *fallahat*, and cafe and bar owners comply with municipal regulation of health, safety, licensing, and tax payment? The dearth of sources available make it difficult to understand, especially since the local press was temporarily suspended⁶¹ during these months. Municipal disorder was not unusual to the municipality due to different political and administrative circumstances under the Mandate.⁶² Yet given the drastic changes in the city’s life after mid-May 1948, citizens’ cooperation with the local municipal council becomes a crucial entry point to learn about the city’s local political and social dynamics.

Retrieving Jerusalem in 1948

Throughout the six months following the destruction of Jerusalem in May 1948, residents, refugees, administrators, butchers, cafe owners, municipal employees, vendors, and others had to find their way despite the ruins, trauma, and uncertain future. To retrieve the various ways in which this locality, including individuals, economic sectors, and institutions responded to the crisis – with order and disorder, improvisation and

regulation, and continuities and interruptions – it is necessary to reinsert it within the multiple narratives of Palestinian life after al-Nakba. Beyond the historical value of narration, retrieving Jerusalem as a locality in crisis, framing the municipal institution as a refugee, and describing the urban crises in detail, this account has embarked on the uneasy task of constructing a sociological and political context for the city that emerged between 1948 and 1967.

Haneen Naamneh is a final year PhD candidate in sociology at the London School of Economics and previously a research assistant at the LSE Middle East Center (2016–2018). This article is based on her research on the legal and social history of Jerusalem from the late Mandate period until shortly after the Israeli occupation in 1967, with a special focus on the Jerusalem Municipality. Her research was supported by the British Society for Middle Eastern Studies, Palestinian American Research Center, Funding for Graduate Women (UK), and the Open Society Foundation. The author thanks Rana Barakat, Lori Allen, and Alejandro DeCoss Corzo for comments on an earlier version of this essay.

Endnotes

- 1 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
- 2 Abdallah al-Tal, *Karithat Filistin [The Catastrophe of Palestine]* (Cairo: n.p., 1959), 367.
- 3 'Arif al-'Arif, *Al-Mufasssal fi-Tarikh al-Quds [A History of Jerusalem: Detailed Account of the Holy City]* (Jerusalem: al-Andalus Library, 1999), 478. Vincent Lemier argues that the "first documentary clues" indicated that the municipality was established in 1866-67." See *Jerusalem 1900: The Holy City in the Age of Possibilities*, trans. Catherine Tihanyi and Lys Ann Weiss (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2017), 105.
- 4 *Report of the Palestine Royal Commission [Peel Commission]* (Cmd. 5479. London: HMSO, 1937), 354.
- 5 *A Survey of Palestine*, Volume II, 933–938; Israel State Archive, P/15/201: Anton and Hanna Atallah – Meeting report of the Arab Municipal Council's members, 28 September 1944.
- 6 *A Survey of Palestine*, Volume II, 935–937.
- 7 Statement by Jerusalem District Commissioner to Jerusalem Municipal Councillors, 11 July 1945, in *Local Government in Palestine, Memorandum Submitted to the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine on behalf of the Vaad Leumi General Council of the Jewish Community of Palestine* (Jerusalem: Haoman Press, 1947), 28–29. *A Survey of Palestine*, Volume II, 937 stated that six British officials were appointed. See also *Report by William Fitzgerald on the local administration of Jerusalem (Palestine Gazette, no. 1541, 1946).*
- 8 Israel State Archive: Microfilm of Jerusalem municipal council protocols (1940–48), 6 April 1948, and Graves Richard Massie *Experiment in Anarchy* (London: Victor Gollancz, 1949), 170.
- 9 Israel State Archive, P/61/990: Evading paying municipal dues.
- 10 Israel State Archive, P/61/990: Evading paying municipal dues. Graves expected this rejection as he stated in his memoir: "the Jews will probably be prepared to co-operate, but I fear that the Arabs may think that co-operating with me and the Commission is equivalent to co-operating with the Jews." See Graves, *Experiment in Anarchy*, 154.
- 11 Israel State Archive: Microfilm of Jerusalem municipal council protocols (1940–48), 6 April 1948.
- 12 Graves, *Experiment in Anarchy*, 106.
- 13 Graves, *Experiment in Anarchy*, 115–116.
- 14 Municipal employee Salah al-Din Jarallah stated, however, that one of the Jewish staff

- refrained from attending the town hall starting March 1948. See Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/7: The Municipality case against Barclays bank.
- 15 Graves, *Experiment in Anarchy*, 124.
 - 16 Israel State Archive: Jerusalem municipal council protocols, 6 April 1948.
 - 17 Jarallah gave a detailed description of the events in his testimony on 11 January 1954 in the legal case 262/52 Jerusalem Municipality vs. Barclays Bank in Jerusalem Magistrate Court, Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/7.
 - 18 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
 - 19 Abdallah Schleifer, *The Fall of Jerusalem* (Nottingham: The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, 1972), 43.
 - 20 Schleifer, *The Fall of Jerusalem*; Salim Tamari, "The City and its Rural Hinterland," in *Jerusalem 1948 – The Arab neighbourhoods and their fate in the war*, ed. Salim Tamari (US: Institute of Palestine Studies, 1999), 77–80.
 - 21 Jarallah testimony, JMA 965/7 and *Al-Difa'*.
 - 22 The Jordanian military commander Ahmad Hilmi Pasha approved Safieh's appointment as a head of the Arab municipal council. JMA 965/8: The Municipality's negotiation to release its money from Barclays bank.
 - 23 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
 - 24 Krystal Nathan, "The Fall of the New City," in *Jerusalem 1948: The Arab neighbourhoods and their fate in the war*, ed. Salim Tamari (US: Institute of Palestine Studies, 1999), 84-141; Report of the UN Truce Commission in Jerusalem (16 August 1948), online at uniteapps.un.org/dpa/dpr/unispal.nsf/eed216406b50bf6485256ce10072f637/33b977861eec51f985256a5c0051bf6f?OpenDocument (accessed 3 November 2018).
 - 25 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 16 August 1948.
 - 26 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, meeting on 5 July 1948.
 - 27 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 944/24: Speeches, lectures and talks.
 - 28 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/7.
 - 29 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
 - 30 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950. Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 944/24.
 - 31 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/8: The municipality's negotiation to release its money from Barclays bank; British National Archives, FO 371/82216: Jerusalem Municipality Funds. Code EE file 1152 and *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
 - 32 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/8.
 - 33 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950. Other accounts suggest that the safe was destroyed and buried under rubble when the town hall was partially damaged, see Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/8.
 - 34 Bernadotte was the United Nations mediator in Palestine, appointed in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 186 of 14 May 1948.
 - 35 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 11 August 1948.
 - 36 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/8 and *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950. It is beyond the scope of this article to detail the unending efforts of Safieh and other Palestinian and Jordanian officials to release the money.
 - 37 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 12 August 1948.
 - 38 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 12 August 1948.
 - 39 British National Archives, FO 371/82216.
 - 40 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 965/7.
 - 41 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 5 July 1948.
 - 42 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 22 August 1948.
 - 43 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 5 July 1948. Before the termination of the Mandate, the government paid a group of workers advanced salaries until May 1948 and another group until June 1948 – JMA 936/8, municipal meeting on 7 August 1956.
 - 44 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 5 July 1948.
 - 45 JMA 936/1, municipal meeting on 12 August 1948.
 - 46 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
 - 47 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 21 August 1948.
 - 48 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 22 August 1948.
 - 49 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 22 August 1948.

- 50 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
- 51 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950.
- 52 *Al-Difa'*, 26 December 1950. Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 945/8: Jerusalem Municipality, general directions to the city's residents.
- 53 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 945/8.
- 54 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 945/8.
- 55 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 945/8.
- 56 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 2 July 1948.
- 57 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 945/8.
- 58 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 31 July 1948.
- 59 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 31 July 1948
- 60 Jerusalem Municipality Archive, 936/1, municipal meeting on 31 July 1948.
- 61 Schleifer, *The Fall of Jerusalem*, 43. *Filistin*, 4 February 1949.
- 62 Israel State Archive, P/61/990.