

# Jerusalem Interrupted



00

0

Jerusalem Interrupted:  
Modernity and Colonial Transformation  
1917–Present

edited by Lena Jayyusi



OLIVE  
BRANCH  
PRESS

An imprint of Interlink Publishing Group, Inc.  
[www.interlinkbooks.com](http://www.interlinkbooks.com)

First published in 2012 by

OLIVE BRANCH PRESS  
An imprint of Interlink Publishing Group, Inc.  
46 Crosby Street, Northampton, Massachusetts 01060  
www.interlinkbooks.com

Copyright © Lena Jarryusi, 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Jerusalem interrupted : modernity and colonial transformation 1917–present / edited by Lena Jarryusi. — 1st American ed.  
p. cm.  
Includes bibliographical references and index.  
ISBN 978-1-56656-787-9 (pbk.)  
1. Jerusalem—History—20th century. 2. Jerusalem—History—21st century. 3. Jerusalem—International status. 4. Arab–Israeli conflict—Jerusalem. I. Jarryusi, Lena.  
DS109.93.J48 2009  
956.94'4205—dc22  
2009036444

Printed and bound in the United States of America

Front cover image:

To request our catalog, please call us toll free at 1-800-238-LINK, visit our website at www.interlinkbooks.com, or write to Interlink Publishing  
46 Crosby Street, Northampton, MA 01060  
e-mail: info@interlinkbooks.com--

To the memory of my grandfather

Subhi al-Khadra

whose dedicated and unflinching struggle on behalf of his country, Palestine,  
has been a persistent inspiration  
and has passed on a burden of love that I can never unload  
—LJ

## Table of Contents

*Foreword by Salma Khadra Jayyusi ix*

*Preface and Acknowledgments x*

*Note on Transliteration xii*

Introduction: Arab Jerusalem and Colonial Transformation

*Lena Jayyusi xiii*

### PART I: ARAB JERUSALEM 1900–1948: PRACTICES, ACTIVITIES, AND INSTITUTIONS 1

1. The Emergence of Photography as a Locally Practiced Craft in Jerusalem  
*Issam Nassar 3*
2. The Pictorial Arts of Jerusalem, 1900–1948  
*Samia A. Halaby 21*
3. Music in Arab Jerusalem during the First Half of the Twentieth Century  
*Elias Sahhab 57*
4. Broadcasting a Nationalist Modernity: Arabic Programming on the Palestine Broadcasting Service under ‘Ajaj Nuwayhid 1940–1943  
*Andrea Stanton 73*
5. A Window on the Palestinian Press in Jerusalem Before 1948  
*Makram Khoury-Machool 87*
6. Healing Jerusalem: Colonial Medicine and Arab Health from World War I to 1948  
*Sandy Sufian 115*
7. Islamic Ritual and Palestinian Nationalism: al-Hajj Amin al-Husayni and the Nabi Musa Festival, 1921–1937  
*Awad Halabi 139*
8. Jerusalem Arab Women’s Politicization during the British Mandate  
*Ellen L. Fleischmann 153*
9. The Silk Threads of Jerusalem: Attire and Handicrafts during the British Mandate Period  
*Widad Kawar 169*
10. Growing up Palestinian in Jerusalem before 1948: Childhood Memories of Communal Life, Education, and Political Awareness  
*Rochelle Davis 187*
11. Growing Up in Shaykh Jarrah: A Short Memoir  
*Subhi Ghosheh 211*
12. The Shaykh Jarrah Quarter: A Brief Topographic–Historical Survey  
*Muhammad Ghosheh 227*

## PART II: 1948 AND AFTER: TRANSFORMATIONS OF SPACE AND PLACE 243

13. "Diverse Absences": Remembering and Forgetting Arab–Jewish Relations in the Jerusalem of the British Empire  
*Tom Abowd* 249
14. Translating Truths: Nationalism, the Practice of Archaeology, and the Remaking of Past and Present in Contemporary Jerusalem  
*Nadia Abu El-Haj* 269
15. Christianity, Jerusalem, and Zionist Exclusivity: The St. John's Hospice Incident Reconsidered  
*Michael Dumper* 287
16. In Search of Jerusalem Airport  
*Nahed Awwad* 301
17. The Israeli Redefinition of Jerusalem  
*Ahmad J. Azem* 307
18. Imagining a Just Jerusalem: Citizenship and the Right to the City  
*Nasser Abourahme* 355

*Notes on Contributors* 375

*Endnotes and Bibliography* 381

*Index*

## Foreword

I am very happy to welcome this new volume, *Jerusalem Interrupted: Modernity and Colonial Transformation 1917–Present*, to the Jerusalem Book Library. This volume has been produced under the East-West Nexus project for Jerusalem begun in 1997, which has generated a number of books to date on various aspects of the city's history and experience. Planned and edited by Lena Jayyusi, this book contains specialized contributions from a rich array of scholars and researchers who have dedicated themselves to the study of certain aspects of the modern history of Jerusalem or Palestine. The book has been designed to address a wide range of topics dealing with the various aspects of Jerusalem's life, mainly through the twentieth century, with a view to showing the steady process of modernization that described Arab Jerusalem before 1948, and its consistent and enforced transformation both after 1948 when West Jerusalem was seized by Jewish forces, and after 1967 when Israel occupied the rest of the city. The book shows how this historic city, which carries the memory of centuries of events and upheavals, of strife and peaceful multicultural living, and which belongs spiritually to Christians, Muslims, and Jews, has had many of its historical aspects, and its social fabric, aggressively transformed, with impunity, in full view of the world, and at the expense of its original Arab inhabitants, both Muslims and Christians.

This book was first subsidized by His Royal Highness, Prince Salman b. 'Abd al-'Aziz, the governor of the district of Riyadh. Then, when the ambition of the work superseded its original plan, the King 'Abd al-'Aziz Public Library in Riyadh, represented by its secretary general, Ustadh Faisal al-Mu'ammam, himself a genuine lover of Jerusalem and its Islamic heritage, came to our aid, helping us to produce a publisher-ready copy. I profoundly thank these benefactors for help graciously extended.

My great thanks go to Lena Jayyusi for her initial suggestion of the idea of this book and for her meticulous work on it. I would also like to thank all the contributors and all those who helped in the process of producing this timely volume.

Salma Khadra Jayyusi  
Director, East-West Nexus  
Boston–London

## Preface and Acknowledgments

This book has been a long journey: like many journeys it has meant negotiating an obstacle course, and has at the same time been an ongoing encounter with many who have enriched, helped, and inspired. It sprang from an idea, and a vision, for a book whose scope and details could tell the story of Arab Jerusalem in the twentieth century, a city that at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century now stands imperiled. No one book can tell a comprehensive story, nor is this book intended to do so. Rather, it is intended to provide the elements of a representational and panoramic narrative: significant and telling elements that together can communicate the texture, depth, and breadth of the life of the city, and of the policies of colonization that forcibly changed and are still changing the pathways and fortunes of its indigenous people. For this reason, it has involved a process that went beyond, and has taken longer than, the usual process of editing a volume.

It has been especially important, and time-consuming, to locate photographs that could contribute to the scope of the book, and give various facets of the text a bodied form. The photographs in this volume, when not the direct subject or example for a specific paper, are meant to provide a complementary track through which to view the history of Arab Jerusalem and to understand the depth and significance of the transformation wrought upon it. But the photographs themselves, like all artifacts produced in the ramifying and entangled networks of everyday activities and personal concerns, suffer the same fate as their owners and producers. It has been especially time-consuming to retrieve them and to retrieve from them particulars of persons, places, and situations, to make some of those tell more than just the image presented to the eye. That has been a pursuit of its own. It is of note here that it is difficult to get photographs of working or poorer families and experiences from the pre-1948 period, apart from the many photographs of “types” taken with an Orientalist eye. In the first half of the twentieth century, photography was still an elite practice and had not yet taken off as a mass medium. Most of the photographs available are therefore of more established and privileged families, as well as of professional and political leaders and practitioners, who either had the means and self-imagining that prompted the production of photographs, or who would have been subjects of interest to professional photographers and news coverage. The lived histories of working people in Palestine in the first half of the twentieth century have to be retrieved by alternative methods such as oral histories and artifacts as well as critical readings of features of the photographic archive, sometimes against the grain. If anything, this book project has demonstrated, once more, the need for a serious Palestinian archival project, one that is publicly accessible to researchers and scholars, educators, artists and writers, and other cultural practitioners, as well as to the questioning and interested public.

Special thanks are due to the wonderful contributors, whose careful work and consistent responsiveness to the project has sustained it. Special thanks are also due to the many people who offered further suggestions, information, resources, photographs, aid in identifying photographs, technical A/V assistance, and other forms of help, all of which took time and every one of which helped make this volume what it is and contributed to the richness of detail that was intended. Special mention in this respect goes to Tamara Sawaya and the Arab Image Foundation, BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights in Bethlehem, Turath organization, Michel Mirhej Baklouk, and Anne Paquier for permission to use photographs; to the Palestinian Academic Society for the

Study of International Affairs (PASSIA), the Foundation for Middle East Peace (FMPEP), and the Jerusalem Media and Communication Center (JMCC) for permission to reproduce maps; to Widad Kawar for untiring help in locating photographs and identifying persons in them; to Jakoub and Mary Joury and Riyadh Dajani for help in identifying persons in the photographs; to Layla Taji al-Nusayba, Jumana al-Husayni, Fatma Budayri and Mahdi Issam Hammad, Sadik Odeh, Salma ‘Abd al-Hadi, Subhi Ghosheh, Adam Shapiro, and Perla Issa for providing personal photographs for use; to Bayan Nuwayhid al-Hout for help with historical details on various aspects of the pre-1948 period; to Salim Tamari for giving generous time in early discussions when I was trying to locate possible contributors for specific topics; to Faisal Khadra for reading and commenting on the introduction; to Tawfiq Abourahmeh for sharing his knowledge of Jerusalem life, places, and family names, which helped resolve many questions during the editing; to Issam Nassar, Nasser Abourahmeh, and Jinan Coulter for various kinds of technical help with the photographic material; and to Wafa Mashaal for connecting me with various people in pursuit of visual resources. And of course, thanks are due to the director and general editor of East-West Nexus, Salma Khadra Jayyusi, who stood behind the project from the start and gave it every support over the time it took to accomplish.

It is very much hoped that this book will both provoke further and much-needed work in retrieving the silent or still invisible histories of Jerusalem and other Palestinian lives and places, and link up with work that has already been accomplished, or is currently being undertaken, in the effort to narrate and understand the past, transform the awareness of the present, and perhaps avert the ominous future that seems to hang over the city.

Lena Jayyusi

## Note on Transliteration

In a book that offers a set of studies, in English, about Arab social and cultural history, the question of rendering indigenous terms, especially person, place, and institutional names, becomes a key one, especially in a region marked by colonial mappings and namings. It is both a normative and epistemological issue, and may be a practical one. While producing a text that aims at making a serious contribution, but is not primarily intended for specialists, it is not always easy to maintain the balance between cultural verity and cross-cultural accessibility. For Arabic the differences between the classical form and the various localized (colloquial) dialects further complicates the matter.

This book is intended for a wide readership, not only a specialist one. For this reason, a simplified version of the *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (IJMES) transliteration system (to be found on the IJMES website) has been used. Diacritics are accordingly not used except for the ‘ayn (marked by a single open quotation mark) and the hamza (marked by a single closed quotation mark). For Arabic words now established in English usage, the English spelling is used without italics or diacritics, except where the English usage has acquired unnecessary resonances (so Shaykh is used, and not Sheikh). However, as with the IJMES convention, some of those terms still have the ‘ayn and hamza marked (as in ‘oud). This is to preserve the sense of the pronunciation and indigenous resonances of the word. Arabic terms that are not commonly known are italicized with the ‘ayn and hamza marked. Again, since we do not use full diacritics, we have used a form modified from the standard IJMES system for some words to provide for their appropriate pronunciation (e.g., ‘Eid instead of ‘Id).

Names that have an established English usage are spelled accordingly (e.g., King Hussein instead of Husayn). However, the names of authors and artists (as well as still living persons) are spelled the way they have chosen to spell them. In quoted text, or text referencing published documents or catalogs, they are spelled according to the form used in the source. For this reason, some names appear in different versions in the text, depending on their source and context. Thus we use “Nusayba” and “Budayri” in general in the text, to be consistent with the convention being used, but “Nusseibeh” and “Budeiri” if it is the form used by a particular individual author or source being drawn on. Similarly, where there is an established English form for a place name, it has been used instead of the Arabic form: Bethlehem and not Bay Lahm, Jerusalem instead of al-Quds, though some authors would have preferred to use the latter. All other names are spelled in accordance with the conventions used for names by Walid Khalidi et al., in the book *All That Remains* (Institute for Palestine Studies, 2002). This convention, like the IJMES system, privileges the classical Arabic form, rather than the colloquial form, which renders the name according to a particular dialect.

## Introduction: Arab Jerusalem and Colonial Transformation

Lena Jayyusi

On the eve of the British Mandate in 1917, Arab society in Jerusalem was rooted, diverse, and interconnected with other towns and rural areas in Palestine, as well as with other urban centers in the eastern Mediterranean basin and wider region, specifically Istanbul, Cairo, Damascus, and Beirut, through kinship networks, political office, educational endeavors and establishments, religious networks and pilgrimages, cultural practices, commerce, and tourism. Like most of the urban centers with which it was connected, Jerusalem had been modernizing throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, and its society had seen a continuous and dynamic intercourse with immigrants and travelers who had taken up residence in the city and made it their own, some becoming part of the Arab social fabric, others preserving distinct communities, even as their members interacted with Arab society and shared and managed space and place with, and sometimes within, it. Because of its spiritual significance, Jerusalem also had a sizable Jewish population, the majority of it inspired at the time by religious faith, rather than political motives, some of it Arab and indigenous, some composed of Ottoman citizens from the wider region who had settled in the city, and some recent immigrants from Europe or outside the Ottoman provinces, but a community with ongoing and various relationships with its Muslim and Christian Arab neighbors.

The Mandate, with its adoption of the Zionist project of setting up a “Jewish national home” in Palestine, ushered in an era of turbulence, and accelerated yet at the same time conditioned growth and urbanism. On the one hand, the British administration introduced new bureaucratic structures as well as various reforms in the areas of health, education, and municipal organization, among others, which provided Arab Jerusalem with an environment for continued development even as the British sought to contain that development within the grid of colonial control. On the other hand, the gathering momentum of the Zionist movement, and the heavy increase in Jewish immigration to the country, and to the city in particular, under the aegis of the British occupation and the political horizon of the Balfour Declaration, was to render the social and political fabric of the city, and its potential horizons, increasingly taut and fragile, even as areas of interaction and shared institutions and neighborhoods between Arabs and Jews persisted.<sup>1</sup> There emerged an increasingly fractured trajectory: while shared spaces, as in some schools and clinics or hospitals continued to exist, more and more spaces and institutions were developed that separated Arabs and Jews, resulting in direct conflict and/or competition during the Mandate years. What emerged was a divergence in constituency as well as radical differences in political purpose.

Over the thirty-one years of British rule, Arab society in Jerusalem continued to develop a vibrant and increasingly sophisticated and networked milieu that was part of a taken-for-granted world of “progress.” Already distinctly embarked on a process of modernization from the late Ottoman period,<sup>2</sup> a process that was unfolding throughout the region (perhaps at its most advanced in Egypt), Arab Jerusalem during the first half of the twentieth century witnessed the very real burgeoning of an indigenous modernity. This modernity could be described as indigenous because it sought to address indigenous developmental issues and needs (in trade and economy, education, health, and



political institutions among others), and because it was envisioned as being implemented by indigenous educators, politicians and practitioners, entrepreneurs and intellectuals, even though they would be unafraid to import ideas, new processes, and approaches from the West. There was not, at that time, either in Palestine or in the larger Arab region, an identification of “modernity” and “modernization” with Western (foreign) power per se, or even Western cultural dominance, as was to develop among some constituencies in various parts of the Muslim East during the later twentieth century, with the failure of independence and “development” projects. None within this society imagined, despite the brisk pace of Zionist colonization, the possibility of the radical rupture that was to come.<sup>3</sup> Yet at the end of those three decades, when in 1948 the Mandate came to a precipitous end and the war occurred during which the State of Israel was established, the western side of Arab Jerusalem (the “New City” as it used to be called), which had been a significant locus for this new modernity, was occupied by Jewish forces and emptied of its Arab inhabitants.<sup>4</sup> “West Jerusalem” was from then on to become an entirely Jewish city, as the Arab neighborhoods underwent property transfer, renaming, and re-creation as an essentially Jewish space. The process of disruption, rupture, and Judaization was to continue and expand to the remaining parts of Arab Jerusalem after “East Jerusalem” was occupied in 1967, and later annexed. Again, a process of reinscribing place and space as Jewish was launched, and accelerated increasingly during and after the Oslo years, extending into the Old City, Shu‘fat, Shaykh Jarrah, Ras al-‘Amud, Silwan, and other neighborhoods, a process that is further intensifying today, most recently in the Silwan and Shaykh Jarrah neighborhoods.<sup>5</sup>

The contributions in this volume together provide a window on the above history and the landscape it changed and produced. Section One details various dimensions of the lived fabric of Arab Jerusalem during the Mandate period, prior to the establishment of the State of Israel, using field work, archival sources, and oral histories to render facets of its social and cultural history, including photography, painting, music, broadcasting, the press, health, the Nabi Musa religious festival, women’s political activism, attire and crafts, education, celebrations, childhood experiences, and everyday life. Section Two delineates and reflects on the Israeli practices, and the processes thereby generated, that have engendered the Jerusalem we have today, and that aborted the project of an indigenously developing Arab modernity in the city and its environs. The contributions in Section Two address the intertwined symbolic and material practices of transforming Jerusalem into a Jewish city that took place after 1948 and also after 1967, including contributions on the neighborhood of Talbiyya in the western side of the city, which fell to Jewish forces in 1948, and the Jewish Quarter in the Old City, which was occupied in 1967. The contributions also narrate the way the Israeli position on the city hardened over time, highlighting the changes in communal relationships and in the provenance of religious spaces, as well the transformations in what one might call the instrumentalities of “normal modern” life in the eastern sector of the city and its environs, as evidenced in the fate of the Jerusalem airport, the checkpoints, section and the Wall. Together these papers capture the progressively amplified process of the political remaking of communal relationships in Jerusalem, and the ideological character of the policies directed towards reshaping the identity and organization of urban space implemented by Israel, the victor in the wars of 1948 and 1967, in a process that has left Jerusalem a deeply divided, tense, and problematic space with the potential for explosive conflict. As the two final papers in the volume indicate, this tension and division have an important intra-Jewish component as well.

Until relatively recently, most of what had been published in English about Jerusalem’s social and

cultural life during the Mandate years was about Jewish life and neighborhoods, many of which were effectively European in population and character. Not enough had been available concerning the fabric and details of Arab social life (indigenous society) prior to the critical year 1948. This has seen a change over the last decade, particularly with the establishment of the Institute for Jerusalem Studies, and a body of work has begun to accumulate.<sup>6</sup> On the whole, however, pre-1948 Jerusalem has not been very present in many of the discussions of the status and future of the city. In fact, a shift has been visible in the discourses and debates about Jerusalem over the last few decades: Arab West Jerusalem, so vibrant at the turn of the twentieth century and into the Mandate years, became all but enfolded in a discursive no-go zone, treated as given and nonnegotiable Israeli-Jewish space. The debates increasingly constructed only “East” Jerusalem as contested space and territory, naturalizing (at least implicitly) the violent occupation of Arab West Jerusalem in 1948, and the transformation worked on it subsequently. Conversely, in the naturalization of the takeover and Judaization of West Jerusalem, the Zionist discourse suggesting and presuming the *contestability* of East Jerusalem is, in turn, given life.<sup>7</sup> In other words, that the sheer presence of a Jewish population in particular areas—however it had come to be emplaced, and regardless of all other claims, rights, historical documents, and actually lived connections—should reconstitute the basis on which rights to possession as well as to social and political space (and sovereignty) are decided, gives momentum to the policy of “facts on the ground” that has historically been the Zionist strategy. The Zionist project of population control and spatial engineering implemented through practices of power and military force is made *productive* through such discursive practices in which even Arabs and Palestinians have been, at best, unwitting partners. In light of this, the processes, policies, and activities through which the transformation of Arab Jerusalem into a Jewish city is effected on *both* sides of the 1948 armistice line need to be seen as a whole and addressed together. This will allow a broad and cumulative view of a process of colonial reinscription and transformation of the city that is not easily accessible otherwise. It will enable a different narrative of the history of modern Jerusalem to emerge than the currently dominant one—a narrative that is vital to an adequate understanding of the claims and stakes involved in the conflict over the city, and therefore of the horizons of viable solutions.

The contributions in this volume are intended to enable the reader to put together just such a narrative. One must note here that Jerusalem is, in this respect, emblematic of the practices and processes which were generalized across Palestine as a whole, both after 1948 and then after 1967. These have witnessed a heightened pace after Oslo and constitute an increasingly visible rearticulation of the “foundational” Zionist project and discourse.

As one reads the various texts, locating the points of overlap and simultaneity, the continuities and threads, the interstitial spaces and embedded figures, a number of points emerge that speak to the denaturing dynamics of the colonial domination of indigenous habitats, and invite further reflection on the experience of coloniality in Jerusalem, on the troubled twentieth century history of the city, and on that of Palestine more broadly.

One point pertains to the fabric of Jerusalem as a mixed city as the twentieth century opened, where originally Arabs (both Christian and Muslim) and Jews, as well as various other communities (Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, and various European as well as American civilians, officials, and missionaries) interacted and enjoyed various kinds of economic, civic, cultural, and social relationships—a condition that continued in various ways even during the Mandate period. It was





exogenous political projects, specifically those of the Mandate authorities and the Zionist movement, that increasingly intervened in reshaping the space of the city and the relationships among communities, as well as in engendering the overriding salience of particular identities over others in the life of the city. As a result, the emerging Arab modernity in the city increasingly took shape as a local nationalist modernity, in conflict with the Jewish nationalist settler-colonial movement<sup>8</sup> and the British imperial-colonial system of the Mandate. The formation of this nationalist modernity was, of course, already underway, in tune with other locales in the Arab world such as Egypt and Greater Syria, and emerging from the Arab renaissance of the nineteenth century. Particularly after the 1908 constitutional revolution that brought the Young Turks to power, and in opposition to the ensuing Turkification campaign, this nationalism began to build momentum, although it was inflected as an “Arab” rather than a specifically Palestinian nationalism. It was thrown into even higher gear in the face of the greater challenge of the Zionist project with the onset of the British Mandate.

The second point that emerges clearly is the centrality of Jerusalem for and within Arab life in Palestine, and its importance in the Arab region within which it was embedded more generally.<sup>9</sup> This has been a recurrent motif in various Arab discourses on Jerusalem—whether academic, activist, or popular—and is to be read in juxtaposition with, and as a response to, the various Zionist discourses on Jerusalem as essentially and eternally Jewish. As many of the papers in the volume indicate, Jerusalem was both an emblematic site as well as a nodal site for various institutions and networks. This centrality was perhaps initially predicated on its symbolic, religious, and historical significance for both Muslim and Christian Palestinians, and for Christians and Muslims elsewhere (as indeed for Jews, Palestinian or otherwise), which meant that a variety of important religious, educational, and administrative institutions were historically established, and functions organized, in the city that had a direct connection to this historic/spiritual role (from libraries to missions to Sufi corners to schools, etc.). Starting in the nineteenth century, the city witnessed a succession of changes. Most relevant of these changes was the brief period of Egyptian rule (which opened up the city and the country to Western politico-missionary penetration), then the Ottoman reforms and the designation of the city as the capital of an independent *sanjak* (administrative district) in 1874. With the onset of the Mandate the city became the capital of Palestine.<sup>10</sup> But its significance, as exemplified by this choice, was already predicated not merely on its religious resonance for the new colonial rulers but also on its role as a seat of administrative control, authority (sacred and worldly), and institutional activity for its residents and the wider region. Its choice at that point can be said to have been already “overdetermined.”

Thus, Jerusalem increasingly became a central administrative and organizational site itself, as well as a representational (in the multiple senses of the term) site for Palestine and for the Arab region. Jerusalem attracted not only people from all over Palestine, but also from the other centers of the Arab world: educators, journalists, artists, and musicians were already making their way to the city in the second half of the nineteenth century, and continued to do so through the Mandate years. Jerusalem’s place as a central node in a web of connected cities, networks, and activities can be gleaned from an interrogation of any set of archives, whether they be photographic archives, press reports from the period, oral histories, or personal memoirs and biographies.<sup>11</sup> These reveal the radius of social life, encompassing Beirut/Lebanon, Syria, Egypt, Jordan, and the other parts of Palestine: Nablus, Jaffa, Haifa, Gaza, Ramla, Lydd, as well as Jerusalem’s rural hinterland. The papers in the first section

of this volume show as much. One must remember that despite the increasing cosmopolitanism of Jerusalem toward the end of the nineteenth century, and the intermeshing of the lives of people from various origins, faiths, and endeavors, Jerusalem was still an Arab city. The modern city in particular, unlike perhaps the old city-state (which would have had its own army, among other features), derives a critical component of its politico-lived identity, and its population and cultural profile, from the region within which it is embedded, with its linguistic, cultural, economic, and familial networks. In that context, despite the importance of various other communities that lived in Jerusalem, it was in a fundamental sense, until the workings of the British Mandate began to undo this, an Arab city (much as cosmopolitan Vienna under the Austro-Hungarian Empire was nevertheless an Austrian city). The disjoining of a “city” (or any locale) from its spatio-temporal regional setting is itself often a feature of colonial discourse and practice.

One might say that in the first half of the twentieth century Jerusalem saw an entire generation of Palestinians pass through it in one mode or another, and that indeed it became a catalytic space for a rising national sensibility and a national imaginary that was embodied in a national movement that had its center in the city. As a representational site, in that respect, it did not merely function as a symbolic locus for the imagined national community<sup>12</sup> but was a nodal point for a *lived* network, enacted and pursued (despite diverse differences and internal conflicts) both within and on behalf of the country at large, and within the wider region.<sup>13</sup>

Arab Jerusalem (together with Jaffa, Haifa, and also Gaza) was a significant urban “node” in the emergence of a modernizing national (and nationalist) elite and the developing nationalist modernity. This emergent but vibrant modernity, operating across multiple registers (whose features had germinated within the late Ottoman politico-social space) wove both Christians and Muslims within it, whether self-consciously (as in the women’s movement, various parties and political committees, and in the Muslim-Christian associations), or synergistically, as in the arts and music, health activism, or the press. What we call “modernity” was not seen as covalent with particular identities—as is sometimes projected in Eurocentric discourse—but was perhaps seen as a methodology and a set of prospective accomplishments and developmental objectives, which could be attained and oriented toward by anyone with a national and/or progressive social outlook. Leading figures in various fields may have had different institutional lineages (Waqf traditions, offices, or institutions on the one hand, or Christian orders and missionary schools on the other), but their intellectual, cultural, and relational resources converged, and were sometimes woven together, in a common national project without prejudice toward, or the dissolution of, the particular loyalties and engagements of different religious/spiritual and social affiliations. Both Christian and Muslim channels, institutions, networks, and resources were influential and were deployed or instrumental in both the national movement and the modernist thrust (as in the wider Arab region). Even the idioms and modes of emerging visual art, like the innovations and expression of musical art, drew in, and on, both Christian and Muslim lineages and traditions.

Yet what also emerges repeatedly from some of the papers in this volume is the simultaneously resistant and accommodationist stance on the part of many members of the elite national political leadership in relation to Britain, the imperial power. Many national leaders and figures pursued an accommodationist policy with the British Mandate even as they resisted its support of Zionism. The modernizing national elites in Palestine, as elsewhere, simultaneously resisted and accommodated,



often trying to work through the colonial system, or within its interstices. Here, perhaps, was a central fracture point for the national movement. The educated professional and nationalist leadership elite may have eventually been able (as in British-ruled India) to become agents of change and national independence. Since the colonial administration had a “glass ceiling,” the efforts of some of these elites would have been likely at some point to dovetail with, feed into, and in specific locations lead the more generalized grassroots anticolonial nationalist movement toward formal independence. Indeed, this seemed to be taking place with the establishment of the Istiqlal Party in 1932, whose political platform called for independence and for noncooperation with the British authorities, and identified British imperialism as the principal enemy. This was the direction Hajj Amin al-Husayni’s faction seemed to be moving in during the 1936–1939 revolt. Unlike India, however, the Palestinians faced a settler-colonial project *embedded* in the imperial colonizing project, a double colonial configuration that was to constitute a complete barrier not merely to sovereignty and development but to political being, and in the end, even existential presence in the country. Here the double figure of British colonialism in Palestine reveals the failure of the strategic thrust of the elites, who ultimately relied on the possibility of an adjustment in British policy and orientation.<sup>14</sup> It also points to the modular forms of colonialism, with similarities as well as distinct differences to that in North America, Australasia, and South Africa. Israeli settler colonialism was, by its logic as much as by its conscious policy, directed at excising the Palestinian presence altogether. The double figure of the colonial in Palestine was served by the British policy of communal compartmentalization and the autonomy provided to Jewish-Zionist institutions across many sectors (including health, education, and industry) with the result that the development of the Jewish community (largely immigrant Europeans) was consistently and substantially privileged at the expense of the Palestinians.

A further set of issues that emerge strikingly and that tie in directly to the above, as well as to the discourses over Jerusalem that arise in the contemporary contestations, is the significance of the politics of demography: particularly of the use of population counts and classification grids. As a number of the papers in this volume indicate, assessments of the population of Jerusalem at the beginning of the Mandate, as at its demise, have been critical moves in the games of claims talk and post hoc justifications of the status quo that emerged after the 1948 war. They have been critical in the discourses that justify the entire process of appropriation and colonization.<sup>15</sup> This issue is pertinent to an important problem in the history of settler-colonial societies: the dynamics of the relationship between indigeneity and colonization, and the metrics of colonial time and space. It is now clear that “demographics” form a core of both Israeli state and Zionist strategy and politics, and are engaged on those terms by Palestinian activists and intellectuals.

The issue of Jerusalem’s politico-juridical constitution and status has been cast repeatedly in terms of its ethnic-religious composition. The population counts of 1922 and 1947, carried out by the British, and referred to in a number of the papers in this volume, have been repeatedly used by Zionists as a way of demonstrating, at the very least post hoc, overriding (and eventually, at the political level, exclusive and exclusionary) Jewish claims to the city. Yet what the papers also indicate is the problematic nature of these figures. For example, the overestimation and/or underestimation of different segments of the population is not merely a matter of “error” or lack of clear indicators or available information, but often a move that inscribes into practice a specific political and epistemic figure.<sup>16</sup> Thus, the villages of Jerusalem, including those of the first ring around the city that were

closely tied to it economically, socially, and culturally, as well as through various practices (from work to further schooling to Boy Scout activities to wedding preparations and purchases etc.)—Dayr Yasin, Lifta, Malha, ‘Ayn Karim, Silwan and others—were kept out of the survey, whereas the Jewish communities that were further out were included in it.<sup>17</sup> The greater Jerusalem area, with the villages that were very much a part of its living perimeter, was predominantly Arab. The irony here can only be appreciated in a panoramic view of the colonial process in Palestine across more than a century. It is that after 1948, this process is first reversed and then, after the 1967 occupation of East Jerusalem and the rest of Palestine, it is reinstated, each time in favor of the colonizing state: thus the villages that were originally left out of the calculus of population counts that were to be used as evidence of the ethnic identity of the place did become part of the Jerusalem municipality once their population had been substituted, and eventually, again, other population centers in East Jerusalem such as Abu Dis, parts of ‘Ezariyya, Dahiyat al-Barid, and al-Ram, were excluded, while more outlying settlements, such as Male Adumim, were included in the Greater Jerusalem Master Plan.<sup>18</sup> This dynamic of alternating incorporation and excision, accompanied by population management and control—at times population substitution—that reshapes place and space and the rights embedded within them propels and reveals the intertwined politics of space and demography embodied in the colonial enterprise. The colonial calculus is ultimately borne through practices embedded in structures of power, but also, interestingly, always seems to reach for legitimacy in the forms these practices take: the appropriation must appear rational, legal, based on scientific or legal grounds. This, perhaps, is one of the most characteristic features of colonial modernity, which constitutes a shift from the practices of purely assertive exhibitionary power that characterized earlier periods of human history.<sup>19</sup>

It is not merely the “gerrymandering” of municipal boundaries that is productive in the politics of demography. The focal, yet often unspoken, text here is that a large proportion of the Jewish residents of Jerusalem were not indigenous to the city or to the country—they had arrived as precisely part of the movement to settle European Jews in the city and in Palestine, itself constitutive of the cumulative process of the “alienation” of the country from its indigenous inhabitants.<sup>20</sup> There is a political sleight of hand here: demography is used to justify a political project—the establishment of the Jewish state in what was an Arab country—when in the first place the demographic ratio was a *product* of that project. The larger number of Jews in Jerusalem toward the end of the Mandate was already the result of a policy of politically motivated migration, and not of indigenous natural growth: the resultant social structural map did not emerge from a natural history of social life, but from “imported population growth,” pursued under what were, from the point of view of the indigenous population, coercive colonial conditions. The census of 1947 (like, indeed, the 1922 census), which establishes Jewish population figures in Jerusalem as larger than Palestinian ones (combined Christian and Muslim), already inscribes the colonial objective into its classificatory system. It could have been alternatively organized: “Christian” and “Muslim” as classifications include a number of non-Palestinians, just as the category “Jews” includes large numbers of European immigrants from various countries. Lumping the latter together with local Arab and Palestinian Jews misshapes and distorts the social map projected. Thus *before* the enumeration or census even takes place, the social classificatory map is already a colonial one. The “map” is neither mechanically (and exhaustively) reflective of lived courses, nor does it merely artificially conjure them up on the page. It is a map whose origins are in the practices of classification already used and implemented, which involve the political



deployment and revaluing of particular classificatory criteria (here, religion as overriding—and marginalizing—nationality, ethnicity, language/culture, or indigeneity, for example) to reflect a colonial set of objectives and practical interests on the ground. Colonial classification here produces units of administrative planning that involve the privileging of particular indices and the fixation and rigidification of particular “differences,” turned thus into bureaucratic units, whose use eventually produces practical trajectories and *lived* divisions. Here we witness the transformation of the imagined geographies Edward Said interrogated into corporeal geographies.<sup>21</sup> Units of classification function as instruments of control and colonial reshaping that become the basis for juridico-political allocations and organization: the process of transformation of various forms of difference into actual and lived trajectories of difference and fatality.

Too many of the contemporary debates and discourses about Jerusalem, and the Palestine/Israel conflict in general, incorporate or occlude many of these colonial premises and elisions, which in the first place naturalize the fundamental colonial precept: the right to import and export populations, to classify and govern for unilateral ends, and thus to administer and control the fate of an indigenous society in its own land. Tracing the practices aimed at progressively transforming Jerusalem (on both sides of the 1948 line) into a Jewish city involves, and provokes, a deconstruction of such colonial discourses.

Indeed, as various of the contributions indicate or suggest, Arab-Jewish relationships prior to the Mandate were not essentially or universally conflicting or exclusionary. “Identity” at that time and within that context, as indeed in many places around the world today, was neither univocal nor wholly compartmentalized. During the late Ottoman period, various “identities” (Jewish, Muslim, Greek Orthodox, Arab, Palestinian, Jerusalemite) could function as overlapping and simultaneous elements of one’s life in various contexts and activities: they embodied horizons and trajectories of possible connections and situated engagements, not boxes that collected and cleanly sorted out unique and singular elements and resources within them. Certainly, each element may have been weighted differently by different people, or in differing contexts, but these identities did not function as nonporous, nonpermeable barriers.<sup>22</sup> What radically altered matters was the large waves of politically motivated immigration by European Jews, which became “official” (and too large to ignore) after the Balfour Declaration, and the entry of the British into Palestine.<sup>23</sup> Many of the oral histories of Palestinian lives before the Nakba tell of “good” relations between Arabs and Jews. There were visits and friendships, shared occasions and places, mutual help and services, forms of shared celebration, and even instances of marriage (men taking Jewish wives); indeed some of these relationships remained until the very end, even in the shadow of the Zionist project. Yacoub Joury, for example, who was the head of the Western music program at the Palestinian Broadcasting Service (PBS) for some time, talking of the Arab response to the Zionist Irgun attack on their offices, said, “You have no idea how many of us went to the funerals of Jews who were killed in the attack on the offices of the PBS.”<sup>24</sup> One does not have to adopt an idyllic narrative to recognize the potential mobility in identifications, whose eventual solidification then depends on juridico-organizational arrangements (and/or violent interventions) of one kind or another. What is important here are the ways that the politics of classification (tied to the politics of demography and specific practical objectives) *produce* new modes of being on the ground. We see this in sites of conflict everywhere. The British colonial system worked administratively through the use and production of systems of classification that

produced discrete categories/units of control and administration that ultimately produced particular trajectories of living. Subsequently, Zionist colonization deployed both such modes of classification *and* the violent transformational measures necessarily embedded in the Zionist objective of establishing a Jewish state in Arab Palestine.<sup>25</sup>

This objective could only consist in, and be accomplished through, the alienation of lived/politico-territorial space from the indigenous population: its de-Arabization. This de-Arabization worked primarily on the level of space and place (expulsion and colonization). At the same time, however, and given the number of Palestinians who were able to remain on their land inside the territories within the boundaries of the Israeli state of 1948, it also attempted to do its work on the level of the constitution of subjectivity. The first tool for this was the classification—and consequently differential management—of the remaining Palestinian population, now politically dispossessed, into “Christians,” “Muslims,” “Druze,” and “Bedouin.”<sup>26</sup> This project, as evident in the recent few years, has ultimately failed, and we can now witness a shift to more explicit and radical forms of spatial-ethnic transformation by the Israeli state.

That the practices of classification, and the projects of enumeration embedded in them, are materially productive in reshaping lived trajectories highlights the centrality of the material/symbolic nexus in the constitution of the colonial as well as the national. The production of “knowledge,” as well as narrative, in and through the deployments of bodied (corporeal) objects, places, and selves is made visible in the ways that the neighborhoods of Talbiyya and the Jewish Quarter were refashioned and reconfigured, the first after 1948 and the second after 1967. In contrast, and at the same time by extension, the disappearance of the Jerusalem airport near Qalandia from the social landscape, from “sight,” after 1967, is evidence of the converse: that the abjection of place, its flattening, its removal as a bodied sphere of imaginable activity, its evisceration, is also a step in the reshaping of knowledge, memory, and the possibilities of being and doing.

The history of colonization is always the history of the suppression of various texts and voices, as well as ways of being, and the reinscription into discourse and narrative of an alternate set of histories that are predicated on that suppression. “Absence” is not merely docile, it is a produced deficit in knowledge, a kind of negative symbolic capital, a weight and value accruing to that which colonizes the emptied space. The silenced past needs to speak, as it does so eloquently in the contributions in the first section of this volume; the names, activities, pursuits, concerns, and relational ways of being that are traced out in the pages can only come from drawing on oral histories and personal testimonies and memories as a substantial source conjointly with various forms of records and archives. The silenced past needs also to be reconnected with the vocal present, in order to speak fully and to play a critical role in subverting the silences planned in the present and the further transformations these silences would enable.

This volume then is intended to contribute to an understanding of the doubly and *simultaneously* ruptural and cumulative history of Jerusalem through the twentieth century. In the cumulative register of Jewish-Israeli expansion into and over the spaces and places of Jerusalem, after 1948 and then again post-1967, and the appropriation of these spaces and places, there were repeated ruptural and dislocative turns in the fates, experiences, and lives of Arab Jerusalemites, which today appear as a starkly cumulative record of containment and excision. Understanding this history in both its cumulative as well as panoramic modes, its diachronic and synchronic modes across various registers,



offers a perspective that becomes vital in the face of the present acceleration of colonial dispossession in the city.

There is, however, an irony in this process that bears reflecting on: as the twentieth century opened, the city of Jerusalem was expanding beyond its walls, and beginning to be fashioned as a modern and cosmopolitan space where the mixing of populations, and their overlapping and multiple identities, roots, and routes of becoming, was beginning to produce a modernity that was both open-textured and yet self-conscious as a communal remaking of life and place. As the twenty-first century began, the city, for all its expansion and modernizing designs and modern architecture (as in the reconstruction of the neighborhood of Mamilla), has been drawn back behind a Wall and into a social organization that is ethnically and religiously stratified and ever more rigidly compartmentalized. Apart from the practices directly targeting the Arab history, character, and population of the city, the Judaization of Jerusalem, as the process of inscribing and enforcing a categorical identity on it that is defined as simultaneously ethno-religious, has meant a radical exclusionary practice in which the old fabric of religious coexistence has been openly discarded. This is reflected not only in the Israeli state's policies toward the Muslim holy sites and Waqf properties but also in its relationship to the Churches, revealed most markedly in the St. John's Hospice incident. What we now seem to be witnessing is a militarized, technologically inflected, re-medievalization of the city. That there should be projects to explore an alternative future for the city than the one being pursued by the Israeli state is of some urgency. The final paper of this book draws on contemporary work on "rights to the city," and suggests one framework for a reenvisioned Jerusalem that can offer an alternative future, for both Palestinians and Israelis, to that being shaped by current policies. In this respect, the present volume is intended to enable a different assessment of contemporary claims to the city and suggest an alternative horizon of solutions and future possibilities, which would have to include both Palestinians and Israelis in an equilibrium of rights and obligations as equal citizens of the city.