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ABSTRACT: The study addresses the Jerusalem Municipality and the political conflict over Palestine during the British Mandate, 1918-1948. The Municipality has been established in 1863 during the Ottoman rule in order to provide services to the local residents. The first elections for the municipal council were held in 1908, which continued duties until the advent of the British occupation, 1917. The study mentions the shift from service provision objectives to political objectives, and how it became the scene of rivalry and conflict between the various Palestinian powers. This conflict led to split of the whole Palestinian nationalist movement, and diverted the Municipality from its original purposes, so it became a political platform for the opposition. Moreover, the British exploited this conflict to their favor and canceled the municipal elections, which have not been held until 1927. The British authorities inflamed the political dispute between parties of the Palestinian nationalist movement, thus making the Municipality the cause of the political conflict.
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INTRODUCTION

The Municipality during the Ottoman rule

The first municipal council in the Ottoman era –Istanbul Municipality- has been instated in 1858, followed by the first municipal council in Jerusalem (Al-Quds el-Shari’f)1, 1863, according to a special decree given by Sultan Abdul Aziz Ibn Mahmoud II, and during the ruling of Jerusalem acting governor Khourshid Basha. The Municipality was established following actions undertaken by the Egyptians while they were ruling Jerusalem during Ibrahim Basha era, 1831-1840, when the Wali formed an advisory board—a consultative council or the ‘Council’- as part of administrative reforms to help and advise him in terms of management of city affairs2. The Municipality included five appointed members; three Muslims, one Jew and one Christian, whereas the head was Abdul Rahman Afandi. European counsels stationed in Jerusalem were surprised with the council, and expressed opposition and preservation to the representation idea as this violated their interests as taxpayers. However, Jews living in Jerusalem were sympathetic with the Municipality since they were represented there, and supported it even more when they

were represented by two instead of one in the second municipal council, 1868 (Phalbro and Amiz Leich)³.

Mustafa Murad ed-Dabbagh described the first municipal council in his ‘Our Country Palestine’ as: ‘… it was a small entity, with limited authorities, minimum revenues that did not exceed 500 gold liras and without a bylaw⁴. The council did not actually commence actions until 1867, and some attribute this to the lack of a regulating law, but some actions were observed when districts administration law has been enacted, 1871. However, actions of the municipal council were more prominent following enactment of municipalities’ administration law, 1877⁵, but it featured an important status as part of the municipal council’s organizational structure since inception (government of Jerusalem district). It was seen as council representing different social and sectarian groups that regulates the local government’s relations with community, and manages daily affairs as part of modern systems⁶.

The Municipality had to undertake tasks in coordination with other bodies of the government. It took powers from the Porte’ in Istanbul and the Wali who represented Ottoman Sultan in Jerusalem, called ‘Mutasarraflek’ at the time instead of ‘Mutasallem’. Powers/missions of the Municipality, as well as mode of formation, became clearer following enactment of municipalities law, 1877, which stated that municipal councils had to include six to twelve members, elected for a term of four years. The right to vote was limited to male Turks, twenty five years and older, and pay certain tax for their property, but the right to nominate was limited to males speaking Turkish fluently, thirty and older and pay property tax no less than the amount specified in law and more than the amount paid by voters⁷.

The municipalities law stated duties and responsibilities of the Municipality, among which we mention the construction/maintenance of public buildings, roads and markets, supply residents with water, planning/supervising constructions, registering births/deaths, supervising restaurants/leisure places and provide security. Returns of the Municipality came from endowments sent by central government and from different municipal taxes. The aforementioned law stipulated that the mayor shall be chosen among members of the elected council, and shall be paid by the Municipality, while members were unpaid⁸.

This council was present in the Holy City in that late period of the ninetieth century, and mostly included leaders and educated members of grand clans of Jerusalem, and highly qualified persons who have been educated in high institutes of Istanbul and European universities who had the opportunity to be well-informed about evolution of western civilization. All of which had
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given the successive councils effective and influential roles to play regarding development of city’s infrastructure.

**DISCUSSION**

**Affairs in Jerusalem**

Affairs of Jerusalem have been administered by sixteen mayors from 1863-1913, among which was Omar Abdul Salam al-Husayni, Saleem al-Husayni, Hussein Saleem al-Husayni, Yusuf Zia’a al-Khalidi, Mohammed al-Alami, Ra’afat Abu as-So’ud and other clans of Jerusalem.

It should be mentioned that despite what the municipalities law of 1877 stated on electing the municipal council, the members have been appointed throughout the period of Ottoman ruling, except for once when residents of Jerusalem elected council members in 1908 for the first time, and without intervention of the local government. There were 1200 voters distributed by population percentage, where 700 Muslims, 300 Christians and 200 Jews elected ten Muslim members, two Christian members and two Jewish members. That sectarian representation had taken into account electing one person from each Christian sect (Orthodox and Catholic), eastern Jews and European Jews.

The most important thing about these elections is the rise of Nashashibi clan into the arena of conflict and rivalry with al-Husayni clan over positions and leadership in Jerusalem, which continued for the next stage and were well-exploited by the British for their own good.

Since inception of the Municipality to the end of Ottoman ruling in Palestine, 1917, this period was characterized by establishing precedents that Arab residents later referred to when talking about formation of municipalities in terms of representatives of each sect in the council, besides the one filling mayor position. The most important of these precedents is that the mayor shall be an Arab Muslim, and that the majority of council members are Arab Muslims, with certain representation of Arab Christians and Jews. The last council formed in the Ottoman era included 10 members; six Muslims, two Christians and two Jews. Saleem al-Husayni was the last mayor under ruling of the Ottomans, whose very last mission was handing the city to the British, December 9th 1917, on behalf of the Turkish governor Ezzat Bik.
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Jerusalem Municipality & British Military Ruling

The British military ruling arrived in Palestine on December 9th 1917, where all municipal councils continued service provision according to the previously applicable Ottoman municipalities law. The municipal councils of Jerusalem (six Muslims, two Christians, two Jews) continued actions either, and previous mayor Hussein Saleem al-Husayni remained in office for the same period until his death in January 1918\(^{17}\).

Trying to win Arabs to their side, with help from the accompanying advisor to Allenby crusade at the time Gabriel Haddad Basha, the British military authorities deemed it fit to appoint the deceased mayor’s brother, Musa Kazim Basha. The latter accepted the offer and took office in early 1918\(^{18}\), but Storrs, the military ruler of Jerusalem, reshuffled the municipal council to include six members instead of ten, all to reduce the number of Muslim members from six to only two, provided that one of them is the mayor. He kept Christian and Jewish representatives as previously (two for each sect, with a deputy mayor for each)\(^{19}\).

Musa Kazim al-Husayni started political action by leading the first Arab demonstration in Jerusalem, November 1918, marking the Belfour Declaration’s first anniversary. He presented a request to the military government and another one to the US government\(^{20}\). British authorities required municipalities and mayors to cooperate, but Musa Kazim al-Husayni did not only refused this, but also refused to approve Hebrew as an official language at Jerusalem Municipality, keeping in mind that one third of council members were Jewish, who hated him for that attitude\(^{21}\). A huge demonstration walked from Jerusalem on Nabi Musa Festival in 1920, when Musa Kazim led the crowds and gave a speech from the Municipality’s balcony. Things were gradually worsening between him and Jews\(^{22}\).

It seemed that the intensified situation made the British occupation fed up with him. After these demonstrations, people of Jerusalem presented a request signed by Jerusalem dignitaries, chief among which Jerusalem mayor Musa Kazim al-Husayni, asking the British government to dismiss Jerusalem ruler Mr. Storrs. One of these dignitaries, Raghib Nashashibi, disappeared from public sight until he was sure the request has been presented to the government, and it has been said that he was advised not to sign it\(^{23}\).

The British authorities accused Musa Kazim of orchestrating riots, as he became – in their perspective - the leader and spokesman of the opposition against mandate. Storrs tried to warn him by asking to choose between politics and mayor. However, the warning was in fact a deadline for Storrs to find al-Husayni’s replacement, who was Raghib Nashashibi. Once Storrs asked Nashashibi to take mayor post, he immediately accepted. Twenty minutes after the
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signature, Storrs –out of excitement- told Musa Kazim about the replacement and that time is up for a change. Musa Kazim replied: ‘Your Excellency has the free well to do that, but I recommend waiting as I am sure that no Arab would dare to take my place’. This is where the military ruler handed him Raghib Nashashibi’s acceptance. Musa Kazim had the right to be very confident as the government offered mayor post to many Jerusalem leaders, who declined it in turn.

The British authorities have been successful in breaking through the Palestinian nationalist movement, for which the Jerusalem Municipality was the most important post of action at that time. It was truly a national battle between the Zionist plans and Belfour Declaration on one hand and the nationalist movement on the other hand, which resisted judaizing the Municipality and national institutions. This incident marked a new turn in the nationalist movement and rivalry between al-Husayni and Nashashibi clans, where rivalry intensified between the two with instigation by the British, and the scope of rivalry included the whole Palestine. Since, Musa Kazim has been seen as the leader of nationalist Palestinian movement, especially after being chosen by the third nationalist Palestine Arab Congress as chairman, as well as chairman of emanating executive committee. On the other hand, Raghib Nashashibi was seen as Musa Kazim’s rival and close to British authorities, which was confirmed by the political escort Fakhri Nashashibi. That was a subject of severe controversy because he was a police officer associated with the High Commissioner Herbert Samuel, as he had close contact with Zionist personalities.

**Municipality Elections**

During the Ottoman ruling, people of Palestine, like all people in the Ottoman Empire, enjoyed civil rights and wide political freedoms in all aspects of life. They elected boards of directors, municipal councils and representatives at the parliament in Istanbul. When British occupation arrived in Palestine, they denied people all civil and democratic rights, and started appointing mayors and municipal council members who the government depended on and trusted their cooperation completely.

People demanded public municipal elections in Palestine when the civil administration was announced in 1921, but the British authorities did not agree, bringing false pretexts and weak causes to justify their attitude. It turned out that he government’s refusal to hold municipal elections was because of the fear that nationalists would win and take control of municipalities, so Arab supporters and collaborators of the British would be forced out, who were influential allies the British used to fight the Supreme Islamic Council and oppose the nationalist
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movement. On the other hand, the government refused to hold elections because Jews of Jerusalem were small minority among voters according to previously applicable municipalities law, so the government feared the results would reduce numbers of Jews appointed by the government in municipal council 30.

The British authorities unexpectedly decided to hold elections in 1927, where the basic motive that made the government changed its mind was realizing that number of Jewish residents (legitimate in view of the government) had increased a lot in major cities, so they became an important source of votes, with which the government could control election results. The government set new elections bylaws, which denied a great number of Arabs their right to vote, while it opened the door wide for Jewish and foreigner taxpayers to take part. The Palestinian leadership protested these bylaws, deemed it unfair and insisted they should be amended to protect Arabs’ rights and ensure they would not be denied 31. A campaign held by nationalist newspapers, supported by Islamic/Christian associations and chairman of Supreme Islamic Council Hajj Amin al-Husayni, failed to give municipal elections the sectarian feature, which meant that each sect would elect their own candidates to municipal councils, since Jewish candidates were winning by recommendation because their number was equal to their seats 32.

After that, Palestinians demanded to hold elections on constituent basis, but the government did not agree that too, where the major concern was enabling Jewish voters to control results of elections 33.

All of which made the ‘Orient Mirror’ Daily—an opposition newspaper—called upon Musa Kazim al-Husayni to unify the nation by means of a public congress, as the government wanted these elections to ‘increase the split between party leaders, and divert the nation from what is more important than municipalities; the conflict among the nation, where the government would pleasantly watch from distance’ 34. It was evident that Britain’s intention was inflaming internal conflict. Despite that, Jews opposed these elections, where a group belonged to the reformative Jabotinski party hanged many posters in markets stating boycott by Jews, not only in Jerusalem, but also in entire Palestine. The reason was that the new elections law has denied Jews many of their rights, where there was an opinion among all Jews, not just Jabotinski party, that Jews shall boycott elections if the government did not answer their demands 35.

The government appointed a supervisory committee for elections in Jerusalem, which was composed of Bader el-Khalidi, Ibrahim Kalbouba, Yusuf Wafa Dajani, Mohammad Salih al-Husayni, Joadat Nashashibi, Elyas Mushabbak, Elyas Haddad, George Siksik, Dr. Qalbian and Francis Batato 36. It has been decided that municipal council of Jerusalem would include twelve
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members (five Muslims, three Christians and four Jews). The government set that quota based on number of voters (two thirds Arabs, one third Jews). A unified Jewish list has been formed as well as some individual candidates, whereas two Arab lists appeared; the first represented nationalists (Aref Basha Dajani, Mitri Salameh, Jamal al-Husayni, Elyas Jalal, Dr. Husam Abu as-So’oud, Abdul Raheem Tubji, Hasan Oueidah, engineer George Shabar), and the second represented opposition which included Raghib Nashashibi, Yaqoub Farraj, Nakhleh Katan, Mohammed Yusuf el-‘Alami, Sa’ad Eddin el-Khalili, Zaki Nuseibebeh, Abdul Halim Tubji and Francis Batato. The government set two election centers; one for Arabs and the other for Jews, where it has been observed that both Arab lists included Muslim and Christian candidates, presented as Arab candidates.

The country was busy with municipal elections since October 1926 through mid 1927. Parties, blocs, clans and leaders went over the top with nationalist criticism, where the ‘Orient Mirror’ Daily—an opposition newspaper- accused the two councils of uniting with Aref Dajani in order to alienate Raghib Nashashibi, not out of respect for him. The Daily added: ‘Those people or leaders only work for some people, kill people and for personal interest. Is not it time for us to rebel against them and make them act for the public interest?’ Moreover, the Daily accused the executive board of selling away Palestine by saying: ‘If these elections are destined to reveal the true face of the executive board, they are auctioning Palestine off to the highest bidder; the Zionists. They want us to trade off Palestine with Jerusalem Municipality, as if this small post is more valuable than Palestine in the eyes of the executive board’. The ‘Orient Mirror’ Daily quoted ‘Davar Ha Yum’ Hebrew Newspaper that candidates of the executive board have pledged –in case Jews voted for their favor- that half Municipality staff would be Jewish, not only in terms of quantity but also posts and ranks, that the works would be equally divided between Jewish and Arab contractors, Hebrew would be approved as an official language (alongside Arabic) and the mayor would not take any political or administrative step without consulting the municipal council first. The executive board also promised to somehow change their negative attitude towards Zionist policies, provided that they would find ways to settle arguments in the near future. It seemed that Zionist press intended with exaggeration of these contacts to either mar reputation of the executive board and al-Husayni clan, or inflame the conflict between Nashashibi and al-Husayni clans even more. Ben Avi wrote in the same Newspaper an editorial stating: ‘I would support Raghib’. The Zionist movement could not turn down such tempting offer.

It seemed that Jamal al-Husayni met before the elections with the Jewish general Kirsch, trying to convince him vote for Jewish candidates only, not for Arabs. al-Husayni considered this movement as ‘good well, cooperation and mutual respect’, not aggression. Hajj Amin al-Husayni met the Jewish judge Jan Frankenstein in presence of Abdullah Dajani and Hajj Sa’ed Shawwa, where al-Husayni urged the Jewish judge to cooperate with him in order to thwart reelecting
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Raghib Nashashibi, in exchange for better treatment and special privileges for Jewish community in case al-Husayni clan took over Jerusalem Municipality.\(^43\)

The executive board has not done anything before elections but release a statement criticizing policy of the previous opposition-controlled municipal council. The statement accused the council of not publishing detailed budget or annual report of actions, not announcing decisions, not taking meeting minutes, imposing property fees, not cleaning streets well and reserving works for a certain number of contractors.\(^44\)

Elections were held in due day; the nationalist bloc candidates got %65 of Arab votes and opposition candidates got %35. Even though, six opposition members and two from the nationalist list found their way into the new council. The reason for that result is the Jews’ control over elections, as they cast most of their votes to the Jewish list, and the Zionist Association ordered Jewish voters to cast votes to six Arab candidates from opposition; Raghib Nashashibi, Yaqoub Farraj, Zaki Nuseibeh, Sa’ad Eddin el-Khalili, Nakhleh Katan and Francis Batato (three Christians and three Muslims). Apparently, Jews agreed to elect six opposition candidates, which left room for only two nationalist candidates, so Arabs would be divided inside the council. Jews did not vote for any nationalist bloc candidates, from which Jamal al-Husayni and Husam Abu es-So’oud won.\(^45\) Jewish winners include Ha’im Salamon, Isaac Bin Tsevi, Isaac Basha and Eliaho Shamma’a.\(^46\) The High Commissioner appointed Raghib Nashashibi the mayor as well as two deputies; a Christian (Yaqoub Farraj) and a Jewish.\(^47\)

The ‘Arab League’ Newspaper attributed that win to Jews’ support to opposition leader, and to an agreement made between opposition leaders and Zionist movement.\(^48\) The Newspaper accused the agreement of carelessness towards interests of the nation, compromising rights and treason.\(^49\) It accused the opposition-controlled municipal councils in the past of being dishonest.\(^50\)

It seemed that municipal elections became the central issue that led to split of the nationalist movement, where the battle was decisive in Jerusalem as the capital city of Palestine and the political center of al-Husayni and Nashashibi clans. Besides, the Municipality was the political platform for each, through which they address the government as well as the public.

**Municipal elections, 1934**

The British authorities refused to hold elections in 1931 despite the Arabs’ protest and persisting. The British feared that nationalists would win, besides that numbers of Jews were not enough to control results. The High Commissioner Wallhope unexpectedly decided in 1934 to hold
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elections, apparently relying on two things; the increased Jewish immigration into Jerusalem in particular, which would give Jews greater chances to control the municipal council, and the vulnerable, disturbed and divided nationalist movement, which furnished the opportunity to widen the gap and catapult the government allies in these elections51.

Numbers of Arab voters in Jerusalem increased %15 more than they were in 1927, where Muslim registered voters reached 2825, represented by 4. Christians were 1586 and represented by two, while Jews were 4392 and represented by 6. This meant that voters increased by %35 more than 1927, and this was because the government granted the right to vote to great numbers of Jews who arrived into the country less than a year ago. The government set number of council members based on percentage of voters (Arab and Jewish), so number of Jewish members increased from four to six, whereas Arab members dropped from eight to six52.

The British authorities amended municipal elections law of 1934, so the central government could control funds and local policies of municipalities, and elected councils would be denied many powers. All financial decisions required the central government approval, and municipal councils were elected by residents, whereas the council is appointed by the central government, provided that it includes elected members53. Jerusalem was divided into 12 constituents, half for Jews and the other half for Arabs, and there were three Arab constituents containing a great number of Jewish voters in time when there were constituents only for Jews. The battle was restricted to Arab constituents because Jewish candidates in their six constituents won by recommendation54.

People of the Mufti tried to find a candidate that would compete up against Raghib Nashashibi. Many names were discussed such as Jamal al-Husayni, Fakhri al-Husayni, Musa al-‘Alami and Dr. Hussein Fakhr al-Khalidi. Finally, it was decided that Dr. Hussein Fakhri al-Khalidi, head of Jerusalem physicians at the time, would be chosen, who resigned office and competed despite previous disagreement with Hajj Amin al-Husayni. The two settled the disagreement before elections, but the opposition never thought that al-Khalidi would compete against their leaders for mayor55. Thus, the nationalist bloc list was formed of Dr. Hussein Fakhri al-Khalidi, Sa’ad Eddin al-Khalili, Nakhla Katan, Ibrahim Darwish, Subhi Abdullah Dajani and Tawfiq Farah. The opposition list included Raghib Nashashibi, Yaqoub Farraj, Zaki Nuseibeh, Anstas Hanania, Husam Abu as-So’oud and Hasan Sudqi Dajani56.

Elections of 1934 were more political than any other elections, and ‘council members decided to overthrow Raghib Nashashibi no matter what’57, as this post was the source of power for him for 14 years. Jerusalem Municipality became an opposition stronghold in the middle of Palestine religious and political capital, so Hajj Amin wanted to take it over and score a political triumph
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for him and the political movement he led\textsuperscript{58}. Influence of Hajj Amin was focused in the Supreme Islamic Council, including Waqf, with broad religious powers, whereas influence of Raghib Nashashibi is mainly derived from mayor powers over Jerusalem and outskirts. The mayor was commonly regarded as senior of Palestine mayors since foreign communities and consulates are stationed in Jerusalem, and because he had contacts with British governors and heads of consular missions. Over the years, Jerusalem Municipality turned into a diplomatic establishment\textsuperscript{59}, and this is where the Mufti concentrated in his electoral propaganda that Raghib is unpatriotic, and accused him of being the reason behind failure of resistance programs against the British ruling. The nationalists were convinced that deposing Raghib Nashashibi and replacing him with a nationalist would eliminate the biggest impediment in the face of nationalist movement\textsuperscript{60}. The Mufti presented a proof of Nashashibi’s pro-Zionist/government, anti-Islam attitude, which was holding a conference in a Jewish hotel to oppose the Islamic conference, held 1931\textsuperscript{61}.

The elections were held within an extreme enthusiasm, which led to failure of Raghib Nashashibi and victory of the nationalist list candidates (Hussein Fakhri el-Khalidi ‘head’, Sa’ad Eddin el-Khalili, Hasan Sudqi Dajani and Ibrahim Darwish on behalf of Muslims, Yaqoub Farraj and Anstas Hanania on behalf of Christians, Daniel Ouster, Haiem Salamon, Shamuel Ednah, Ibrahim el-Malih, Yusuf Ha’Kham Shuieli and Isaac Bin Tzevi on behalf of Jews)\textsuperscript{62}. The High Commissioner decided to appoint el-Khalidi a mayor, with Daniel Ouster and Yaqoub Farraj as deputies. Moreover, the High Commissioner amended the municipal councils law in order to reduce powers and influence of the new mayor. The new amendment stated that the High Commissioner shall have the right to appoint deputy mayor from time to time, and that the High Commissioner shall have the right to authorize deputy mayor the tasks of mayor if it turned out the latter is inefficient\textsuperscript{63}.

One of the reasons why Dr. el-Khalidi was successful is the propaganda circulated in mosques, the campaign against his rival Raghib Nashashibi, link of many voters’ interests with Waqf department and the Islamic Council and engagement of a huge number of Waqf officers and mosque imams in that fray. Furthermore, the Mufti was personally engaged, where he visited voters at houses and visited Lifta Village several times. Al-Husayni clan made people morally pledged to vote for Dr. el-Khalidi’s favor; they influence people at Dome of the Rock Mosque and made them swear on the Holy Quran to vote\textsuperscript{64}. Raghib Nashashibi’s defeat was also exacerbated by turning him down by notable clans besides el-Khalidis, Dajanis, Ansaris and Sa’eeds, all of then supported Hussein el-Khalidi\textsuperscript{65}. A key factor that contributed to Raghib Nashashibi’s defeat is his failure to secure Jewish voters’ support as the latter deemed him untrustworthy ally, especially after his involvement in the Arab delegation that went to London in 1930 to defend the national issue. The ‘Rasivt’ Journal published: ‘Nashashibi’s engagement
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in the delegation travelling to London is the judgment for traditional Zionist policy against Arabs. We did not yet forget the Council of Palestine’s Jews calling upon boycott Jerusalem Municipality elections, and we still remember the political evidence that have been used to support Nashashibi party against Al-Husayni party. This Jewish attitude could be evidenced by the fact that Jewish members boycotted council sessions from 1931-1934, protesting political statements delivered by the mayor Raghib Nashashibi.

**Jerusalem Municipality outside political conflict**

The new mayor Dr. Hussein el-Khalidi embraced unbiased policy among the two rival camps, and focused most of his actions on municipal issues. El-Khalidi determined line of his policy in his memoir: ‘… government opinion and Arab public opinion divided into two parties; one says that the new mayor will be an opponent, but on new basis, and the other party accused me of being one of the Mufti supporters, but I remained impartial’. This neutral attitude that the mayor has chosen was a key reason for taking Jerusalem Municipality out of the political conflict.

As the opposition leader, Jerusalem mayor was the hub of political magnitude, which attracts other mayors who supported his policy. Therefore, his failure in the last elections has led to removal of this leadership feature from Jerusalem Municipality. In addition, the new mayor did not follow the Mufti Amin Al-Husayni’s line, where the Municipality could have secured an important status if the new mayor was one of the the Mufti’s men. The government itself stopped considering the political magnitude of Jerusalem mayor just for the defeat of Raghib Nashashibi. This is supported by Britain’s withdrawal of Palestine parliament proposal as a result of election results due to uncertain success, according to Britain’s vision.

The High Commissioner appointed the deputy mayor Daniel Ouster (Jewish), who enjoyed special status, to be a senior deputy according to an agreement between the High Commissioner, Moshi Shartul and Hussein el-Khalidi. This status was a source of sensitivity and many disagreements between the Arab mayor and his Jewish deputy, which was intensified in 1936 after el-Khalidi became a member to the High Arab Commission. El-Khalidi responded to Jewish members’ complaints against him, reiterating that he serves all city residents.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, in August 1936, Hussein el-Khalidi went on a vacation, and his powers were delegated to his Jewish deputy Ouster on orders of the High Commissioner. El-Khalidi was arrested by the British authorities upon his return and deported him to the Seychelles Island, the Indian Ocean, on November 1st, 1937 for his membership in the High Arab Commission. Ouster continued in office as acting mayor until end of August 1938. The High Commissioner appointed
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Mustafa el-Khalidi a member to the municipal council and a mayor on October 1st, 1938, in addition to appointment of Hasan Abu es-So’oud as a member, succeeding Ibrahim Darwish who has been arrested and exiled as well. Mustafa el-Khalidi remained in office until his death, August 1944, where the temporary successor was his Jewish deputy Ouster. Jews started to demand appointment of a mayor of their own, whereas Arabs stressed that the mayor must be an Arab Muslim, expressing Palestinians and Arabs’ viewpoint towards their capital. However, the British did not appoint a mayor from any of the two sides. When the Arabs refused the British government proposal to rotate mayor office (first mayor is Jewish, second is Arab, third is British) and boycotted the council sessions, the British dissolved the council on July 11th, 1945 and appointed a municipal committee of six British staff members, and so the Arabs lost the mayor office. This continued until end of the British mandate in Palestine, May 194872, where Arabs lost Jerusalem Municipality and Jerusalem itself too.
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