PUBLIC SECURITY IN JERUSALEM UNDER OTTOMAN (19TH-20TH CENTURY) AND BRITISH RULE (1917-1948)

Eser GEMİCİ*

Abstract

This study examines public security practices under Ottoman and British rule in the multicultural context of Jerusalem using a comparative historical analysis method. Ottoman rule maintained social harmony and emphasized religious and cultural diversity through the millet system, sharia courts, local leaders, and foundations. The Tanzimat reforms combined local participation with centralization and supported the preservation of heritage to promote peace. Security policies were shaped by the structure of the walled city, including night watchmen and city gates. In contrast, policies supporting Jewish immigration during the British Mandate triggered tensions with Arab communities. Despite efforts to maintain order through new police forces and infrastructure projects, British strategies often intensified unrest. Their centralizing approaches disrupted demographic and social balances, weakening cohesion. Consequently, while the Ottomans prioritized tolerance and social harmony, the British focused on colonial interests, resulting in different public security approaches and outcomes for Jerusalem's social fabric.
Key Words: *Jerusalem, Ottoman Rule, British Mandate, Public Security, Security*

Öz

Osmanlı (19-20. Yüzyıllar) ve İngiliz Yönetiminde (1917-1948) Kudüs'te Kamu Güvenliği

Bu çalışma, Kudüs'ün çok kültürlü bağlamında Osmanlı ve İngiliz yönetimi altında kamu güvenliği uygulamalarını tarihsel analiz yöntemi kullanılarak karşılaştırmalı biçimde incelemektedir. Osmanlı yönetimi, millet sistemi, şeriat mahkemeleri, yerel liderler ve vakıflar aracılığıyla sosyal uyumu korumuş ve dini ve kültürel çeşitliliği vurgulamıştır. Tanzimat reformları, yerel katılımı merkezileştirmeyle birleştirmiş ve barışı teşvik etmek için mirasın korunmasını desteklemiştir. Güvenlik politikaları, gece bekçileri ve şehir kapıları da dahil olmak üzere surlarla çevrili şehrin yapısı tarafından şekillendirilmiştir. Buna karşılık, İngiliz Mandası döneminde Yahudi göçünü destekleyen politikalar, Arap topluluklarla gerilimleri tetikledi. Yeni polis güçleri ve altyapı

---
* Assoc. Prof. Dr., Anadolu University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Eskişehir.
 E-mail: esergemici@anadolu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-8969-3151.
 (Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 12.05.2025 - Makale Kabul Tarihi: 8.12.2025).

projeleriyle düzeni korumaya yönelik çabalara rağmen, İngiliz stratejileri genellikle huzursuzluğu yoğunlaştırdı. Merkeziyetçi yaklaşımları, demografik ve sosyal dengeleri bozarak uyumu zayıflattı. Sonuç olarak, Osmanlılar hoşgörü ve sosyal uyumu önceliklendirirken, İngilizler sömürge çıkarlarına odaklandı ve bu da Kudüs'ün sosyal dokusu için farklı kamu güvenliği yaklaşımları ve sonuçları doğurdu.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Kudüs, Osmanlı İmparatorluğu, İngiliz Mandası, Kamu Güvenliği, Güvenlik*

Introduction

Jerusalem, with its history dating back nearly 4,000 years, is among the world's oldest cities. Its historical control has been attributed to various groups, including the Canaanites, Jebusites, Israelites, Assyrians, Egyptians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Arabs, Seljuks, Crusaders, Mamluks, Ottomans, British, Jordanians and Israelis.[1] Throughout its history, Jerusalem has been not only a geographical and strategic centre, but also one of the most important cultural and religious cities in the world with its multi-religious and ethnically diverse structure. Notable sites such as the Dome of the Rock, held in high esteem by Muslims as the site where the Prophet Muhammad Mustafa (s.a.v.) ascended to heaven; the Western Wall (kotel), regarded by Jews globally as the most significant holy site of Judaism; and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, where Christians generally believe that Jesus Christ was crucified and buried, serve to underscore Jerusalem's profound significance as a centre for multiple religions.[2] On the other hand, every change in the governance of the city has witnessed transformations reflecting this unique diversity. In this sense, Jerusalem, as one of the most important religious, political and cultural cities in world history, has undergone profound transformations under different administrations. From antiquity to the Ottoman Empire and from the British Mandate to the current Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Jerusalem has experienced changes in its governance, with each period bearing its own indelible traces. Each period of governance has had an impact on the city's political structure, demographic balance and socio-economic conditions.

The earliest known administration of Jerusalem dates back to the reigns of King David and King Solomon, as described in biblical sources. King David gathered the center of worship and administration in Jerusalem, making the city both a religious and political center.[3] During this period, the strategic moves of the Davidic dynasty to consolidate power reflect their efforts to unite the tribes of Israel under a single religious and political identity.[4] Archaeological evidence also supports these centralist policies. The conquest of the city by various empires, such as the Babylonians and Persians, further altered the administrative structure of Jerusalem. The Babylonian exile led to a permanent political change in the city with the displacement of the Jewish population. The Persian period brought the return of the exiled Jews and a period of autonomy for the city as a religious

---

[1] Sharkansky 1995, p.74.
[2] Abowd 2018, p.136.
[3] Davies 2005, pp. 324-327.
[4] Maeir 2021, pp. 130-131.

center.[5] During the Crusades (1099-1187), Jerusalem was shaped by a feudal model of governance and entered a period of political instability and external threats from the Crusader Kingdom.[6] Religious diversity and administrative chaos in the city were the hallmarks of this period.

With Saladin Ayyubi's reconquest of Jerusalem in 1187, an administrative model was adopted that strengthened Islamic authority and emphasized religious tolerance.[7] This administrative structure laid the foundation for subsequent Islamic administrations such as the Mamluks and the Ottomans. The Ottoman Empire ruled Jerusalem between 1517 and 1917, bringing considerable stability and development to the city. The millet system allowed for self-government for different religious communities, but it also reinforced ethnic and religious divisions.

Jerusalem. While the British attempted to balance the conflicting demands of the Jewish and Arab populations, these efforts often exacerbated existing tensions. Waves of Jewish immigration and institutional changes The British Mandate period (1917-1948) brought a new dimension to the administration of transformed the demographics of the city. After the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, Jerusalem was divided into East and West, with East Jerusalem falling under Jordanian control. While the Jordanian administration emphasized the protection of holy sites, the division and demographic changes increased the difficulties in governance. Finally, after the 1967 Six-Day War, a new era in the governance of the city began with Israel's capture of East Jerusalem. The Israeli government attempted to reintegrate the demographic structure of the city through illegal infrastructure works and Jewish settlement policies.[8] However, these policies were met with resistance from the Palestinian population and led to increased tensions.[9]

Today, although the governance of Jerusalem is a right for Palestinians, it has been occupied and seized by Israel, which does not recognize international law, signed agreements or United Nations (UN) resolutions, and in this sense, Jerusalem remains a point of contention. Issues such as the status of the city, access to holy sites, territorial claims and Israel's stance complicate the search for a peaceful solution.[10] In conclusion, the changes in the governance of Jerusalem show that the city has undergone a profound political, religious and cultural transformation throughout history. These transformations in the historical process are also vital for understanding the dynamics of Jerusalem's governance today.

In light of all this information, this study aims to examine, in a comparative manner, how public security practices were shaped in Jerusalem during the Ottoman (19th–20th centuries) and British Mandate (1917–1948) periods. The research is based on primary and secondary sources such as modern historical literature, population data and legal and administrative regulations of the period, using historical analysis methods.

---

[5] Davies 2005, pp. 321-322.
[6] Jotischky 2015, p.589.
[7] Silberman 2001, p.491.
[8] Jabareen 2010, p.41.
[9] Brenner et al. 2023, pp. 61-63.
[10] Ma'oz 2014, pp. 61-65.

In particular, the millet system under Ottoman administration, the functioning of local structures, and post-Tanzimat reforms, as well as the demographic transformation, police force, and security strategies that emerged under British administration are evaluated in detail. Sources used in the article include works by Ottoman-period Jerusalem experts such as Büssow, Ben-Arieh, Abu-Manneh, and Kark, as well as Mandate-period literature by Jacobson, Abowd, Knight, and Anderson; contemporary analyses on public order, social security, city management, and the waqf system are also utilized. By placing the security policies of the two periods in their historical context, the study highlights the differences between the Ottoman approach based on social harmony and cooperation with local actors and the British Mandate administration's demographic interventions, centralizing security policies, and colonial administration logic; thus, it contributes to a better understanding of the historical origins of Jerusalem's current socio-political fragilities. In this context, the article fills gaps in the literature on both the Ottoman and Mandate periods by offering a perspective of historical continuity and change to the public security debates in Jerusalem, thereby providing a scientific basis for interdisciplinary studies on the relationship between security and politics.

1. Importance of the Ottoman and British Administrations

The history of Jerusalem under both the Ottoman and British empires has had a profound impact on the city's identity, which is characterised by a multifaceted structure that has influenced its cultural, social, and political dimensions. This identity is of significant importance within the broader context of the Middle East. From the conquest of Jerusalem by the Ottoman Empire in 1517 to the city's capture by the British in 1917, the period of rule was characterised by a period of stability with regard to the preservation of Jerusalem's historical and cultural heritage. During the Ottoman period, the city was recognised as one of the most significant Muslim holy sites, along with Mecca, Medina and Hebron, and was endowed with numerous charitable foundations, from the famous soup kitchen (imâret) of Hasseki Sultan, wife of Suleiman the Magnificent (Suleiman al-Qanûnî, 1494-1566), to the numerous fountains that provided the city with fresh drinking water. The Ottomans' direct donations to the holy cities also contributed to their status as "guardians of the two holy shrines" (hâdimü'l-harameynü'sh-sharîfeyn).[11] In addition to such contributions, the Ottomans made various arrangements to preserve the city not only militarily but also culturally, and created conditions that allowed the preservation of Jerusalem's architectural heritage. Recognizing the religious significance of the city, the Ottomans spearheaded efforts to preserve and develop its architectural heritage. Shehada (2020) notes that the Ottoman Sultans played a pivotal role in the revitalization and preservation of the city's historic buildings, ensuring that Jerusalem's architectural identity was preserved amidst the changing political landscape of the region. This commitment to preservation was manifested in various projects, including the restoration of the Dome of the Rock and the construction of new mosques that served religious purposes and reinforced the Ottoman presence in the city. During this period, the various conservation methods applied to the preservation of Jerusalem's historic buildings

---

[11] Naïli 2022, pp. 109-110.

ensured the creation of a safe environment for the city's different religious communities to survive and supported the multicultural nature of the city.[12] The Ottomans not only preserved the physical structures, but also created an administrative framework that kept the different religious communities in Jerusalem together, ensured social cohesion in the city, and promoted cultural diversity that lasted for many years. Moreover, Ottoman administrative policies facilitated the integration of different communities in Jerusalem. The millet system, one of the hallmarks of Ottoman rule, allowed the various religious communities to retain a degree of autonomy in managing their own affairs, including education and legal matters. This system fostered a sense of coexistence among the city's Muslim, Christian and Jewish populations, as Balcı and Kardaş (2023) note, emphasizing the importance of soft power in the Ottoman international system.[13] The millet system provided a framework for religious tolerance and contributed to the social cohesion and public security that characterized Jerusalem during this period. The economic policies implemented by the Ottoman administration also played an important role in shaping the urban landscape of Jerusalem. The Ottomans enacted a land law regulating land ownership and use, which had lasting effects on the city's development. Thawaba argues that the land law created by the Ottomans, which facilitated the expansion of the city and the establishment of new neighborhoods, was later modified by the British Mandate. However, the new land-use planning organized by the British administration was seen as a tool to exclude and manage different colonial ethnic groups and led to the deprivation of Palestinian land use rights in Palestine.[14] On the other hand, Ottoman rule in Jerusalem also had an impact on the city's religious institutions. The Ottomans invested in the maintenance and construction of religious sites that served as places of worship and symbols of Ottoman authority. The administration's support for religious institutions helped to solidify its legitimacy in the eyes of the empire's diverse subjects. This is particularly evident in the case of the Islamic waqf system, which provided funding for the maintenance of mosques and educational institutions, ensuring that these vital components of society remained functional.[15] Nevertheless, the socio-political dynamics of Jerusalem during the Ottoman period were also shaped by external factors, including the empire's relations with European powers. The geopolitical landscape of the region was shaped by the rivalry between European nations seeking influence over Jerusalem due to its religious significance. Balcı and Kardaş argue that military power and public security were shaped by diplomatic efforts, and the Ottomans had to navigate the complexities of international relations to protect their interests in the city.[16]

The year 1917 marked a turning point that profoundly affected the city and its region, with the end of Ottoman rule and the beginning of British rule in Jerusalem. The entry of the British army into Jerusalem under the leadership of General Allenby was not only a military victory, but also the beginning of a much deeper political change aimed at

---

[12] Shehada 2020, pp. 148-149.
[13] Balcı and Kardaş 2023, p.880.
[14] Thawaba 2009, pp. 30-36.
[15] Hathaway and Barbir 2013, pp. 144-147.
[16] Balcı and Kardaş 2023, p.878.

reshaping the governance of Jerusalem and dominance in the region. This event, together with the British administration that followed the long Ottoman rule, led to the introduction of new administrative practices that transformed the social structure, infrastructure and cultural heritage of Jerusalem. As Mazza notes, the establishment of the Pro-Jerusalem Society in 1918 was met with skepticism by locals as to how effectively the British would manage Jerusalem's cultural heritage, but it was seen as an indication of the British intention to govern Jerusalem not only on cultural and religious grounds.[17] Under British rule, Jerusalem also underwent significant changes in urban planning and public health, and as Davidovitch and Greenberg note, the implementation of colonial medicine and health policies led to significant improvements in the city's infrastructure.[18] However, the British Mandate period also made tensions between ethnic and religious groups in Jerusalem more pronounced. In particular, the rivalry between the Jewish and Arab communities intensified in parallel with the British policies, and this rivalry deepened with the growing strength of the Zionist movement. Shlay and Rosen argue that British policy generally encouraged Jewish immigration and settlement, which led to serious tensions over the management and control of Jerusalem. The British administration's approaches to urban planning and management were based on Ottoman practices but shaped by a more differentiated framework, further complicating the socio-political dynamics in Jerusalem.[19] At the same time, British rule also marked a significant transformation in the management of Jerusalem's cultural heritage. Pullan and Sternberg argue that the introduction of Western preservation practices led to significant changes in both the physical and ideological landscape of Jerusalem, altering perceptions of and management of the city's sacred sites. During this period, the British aimed to emphasize the historical significance of Jerusalem while balancing the interests of different religious communities in the city. However, this aim often clashed with the efforts of different religious groups to assert their own cultural and religious rights, creating a constant tension over how to represent Jerusalem's cultural heritage.[20]

Under Ottoman rule, Jerusalem was considered an integral part of the empire. Arabs living there were granted equal status with Turks throughout the empire and were largely allowed to govern themselves. They were also given the opportunity to be appointed to the most responsible state positions, such as prime minister, minister, governor, judge, and representative in parliament. This period also represented a form of governance in which the rights of the three monotheistic religions were protected with understanding and respect, based on custom and even written law, as established by the 1757 Edict. However, the British Mandate administration, which began after 1917, initiated a process described as "what a great change, what a great contradiction, and what a great regression" in terms of Arab rights and law. This "Mandate" system, established after World War I, was implemented in the context of colonialism and imperialism, which were part of the international relations system. It was established by the decision of an

---

[17] Mazza 2018, pp. 407-409.
[18] Davidovitch and Greenberg 2007, pp. 404-406.
[19] Shlay and Rosen 2010, p.361.
[20] Pullan and Sternberg 2012, pp. 234-237.

international organization without consulting the local population, contrary to the principle of "self-determination" of the Palestinian people, and this situation was considered a violation of the law. Therefore, the transition from a long-term, inclusive imperial rule to a mandate regime based on external control and disregarding the will of the people signifies a fundamental break in the legal and political status of Jerusalem.[21]

In conclusion, the importance of Jerusalem under Ottoman and British rule was not only limited to the cultural and architectural contributions of these two administrations to the city, but also the social structures and governance approaches during this period profoundly shaped the identity and future of Jerusalem. The Ottoman period laid a solid foundation for Jerusalem's architectural and cultural heritage, while the British Mandate reshaped Jerusalem's identity through radical changes in the city's governance and social structure. Understanding this historical process is crucial to accurately assess the complex struggles over the status of Jerusalem and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

2. Ottoman Period (19th and 20th Century)

"The story of Ottoman Jerusalem is one in which Jewish communities elsewhere in Palestine lived alongside their Christian and Muslim neighbors for hundreds of years before the rise of Zionism in the late 1800s."[22]

2.1. Security in Jerusalem (Administrative and Legal Mechanisms) under Ottoman Administration (19th and 20th Century)

In the 1870s, Jerusalem's population was between 14,000 and 22,000, with a significant religious presence from all three Abrahamic faiths (Islam, Christianity and Judaism). This was further evidenced by the increasing presence of European religious activity throughout the nineteenth century. The Ottoman land reforms of 1839 and 1856, which permitted non-Ottoman citizens to possess land, in conjunction with the political aspirations of European powers for "religious-cultural influence," transformed Jerusalem and the broader Holy Land into a site of significant European competition, as asserted by Scholch.[23] This mobility, in conjunction with Ottoman reforms throughout the Empire, resulted in significant changes to Jerusalem at the conclusion of the Ottoman period. The city underwent substantial transformations in terms of its population, physical settlement, public security, buildings, and infrastructure in comparison to its state a century prior.[24] In addition to these reforms, the Ottoman administration used a wide range of administrative, legal and social mechanisms to ensure social security in Jerusalem, especially in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These mechanisms demonstrate that, taking into account the complexity and multicultural nature of Jerusalem's social

---

[21] Ataöv 1981, pp. 34-38.
[22] Abowd 2018, p.135.
[23] Scholch 1990, p.230.
[24] Davis 2002, p.11.

structure, the Ottoman administration of the city took a comprehensive approach to ensure social welfare, public health, individual rights, and community tranquility. Since Jerusalem was a city where different ethnic and religious groups lived together, the Ottoman administration took this social diversity into account and developed a series of policies to maintain social order in the city. These policies aimed both to meet the needs of the people in the city and to promote social cohesion.

The fundamental process that laid the groundwork for the chronic nature of the Palestinian issue was the Jewish immigration to the region beginning in the 1880s and the subsequent colonization movements. This wave of immigration began under the influence of religious beliefs and anti-Semitism in Europe. It took on a systematic character with the founding of the World Zionist Organization by Theodor Herzl in 1897, aiming to create a "living space" for Jews in Palestine. Despite the Ottoman Empire's legal regulations, particularly during the reign of Sultan Abdulhamid, aimed at preventing land acquisition and population transfer, the migration movements continued through the protection of foreign consuls and large-scale land purchases by foreign Jews, completely altering not only Palestine's political geography but also its demographic structure. The seriousness of this demographic shift was raised by Jerusalem deputies at the Meclis-i Mebusan (Parliament) sessions on May 16, 1911. Sait el-Hüseynî Bey claimed that the Jewish population in 1880, claimed that the Jewish population of around 8-10,000 in 1880 had reached approximately 100,000 due to ongoing immigration and that they had acquired more than 100,000 acres of land. Ruhi el-Halidî Bey described this situation as an illegitimate process resulting from the corruption of civil servants' morals and drew attention to the goal of establishing a Jewish state centered in Jerusalem. Official Ottoman statistics show that the registered Jewish population in the central district of Jerusalem, along with Jaffa and Hebron, rose from 8,110 in 1882-1893 to 21,259 in 1914, confirming that immigration had resulted in a demographic structure where Jews constituted the majority in certain areas. This demographic transformation clearly demonstrates that the issue had become a "major problem" for the Ottoman Empire even before World War I.[25]

One of the important administrative mechanisms implemented by the Ottoman administration in the social security system in Jerusalem was the establishment of local councils and committees that operated in the fields of public health and community welfare. These councils served an important function in implementing public health reforms, improving hygiene and sanitary conditions in the community, preventing disease outbreaks, and raising public awareness on these issues. As Gray wrote in 1908, by educating the local population in Jerusalem on hygiene and sanitation, public health committees contributed to the spread of public health measures and increased public awareness.[26] Such an approach was not only aimed at solving urgent health problems, but also helped to strengthen social cohesion by fostering a sense of communal responsibility and participation among the people of the city. In addition, the Ottoman state recognized the importance of education in ensuring social welfare. The Ottoman education system encompassed not only basic literacy but also vocational training to ensure economic self-

---

[25] Yiğit 2019, pp. 391-395.
[26] Gray 1908, p.313.

sufficiency. The education policies of the Ottoman administration aimed to provide citizens with a basis for understanding the complex structure of the city and society and for participating in the social and legal systems. This approach promoted social cohesion and social stability in Jerusalem and strengthened the population's ties to the state.

Schools	Girls	Men	Total
Christian Schools	926	861	1,787
Christian Schools for Jewish Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
Jewish Schools	160	1,547	1,707
Muslim Schools	0	360	360
Total Number of Students	1,086	2,768	3,854

Table 1: Number of Students in Jerusalem Schools in 1882 by School Type and Gender.[27]

As demonstrated in Table 1, there was an increase in the number of schools and diversified educational opportunities. This resulted in a significant increase in the number of educated people in Jerusalem (and parts of the Levant) for the conditions of the time. Secondly, most of the students studied in Arabic or Turkish as well as other languages (Greek, Russian, French, English and German). It has also been documented that this training enabled many of the students to secure employment in foreign diplomatic and religious institutions. Conversely, a significant number of students embarked on educational pursuits abroad, predominantly attending institutions in Lebanon, Egypt, and Istanbul. Notably, Al-Azhar University in Cairo played a pivotal role in the dissemination of religious education, nurturing a substantial number of individuals who subsequently returned to assume pivotal roles as imams and religious scholars in Jerusalem and the broader region of Palestine.[28]

In addition, the Ottoman administration alleviated the immediate economic hardships faced by local relief societies in Jerusalem by providing economic support, especially to low-income groups, tax policies were structured to ensure that all segments of society contributed to the state's social programs to the extent of their means, and various charities and religious organizations contributed greatly to social welfare and public security by providing resources and support to those in need.[29] Ultimately, the Ottoman administration utilized various administrative, legal and financial mechanisms

[27] Davis 2002, p.14.
[28] Davis 2002, p.14.
[29] Köse 2015, pp. 167-175.

to ensure public security in Jerusalem, which helped to create a stable and secure environment among the city's diverse communities. With the contribution of local councils, legal regulations, educational programs, tax policies, and especially philanthropic organizations, the Ottoman administration took important steps towards ensuring social cohesion in Jerusalem and improving the welfare of its citizens.

2.2. Jerusalem's multi-religious and ethnic structure and social peace under Ottoman rule

The Ottoman approach to governance in Jerusalem was shaped by a series of strategic policies and practices aimed at ensuring social peace and stability, especially in the context of the multi-religious and multi-ethnic nature of the city. Given the religious significance of Jerusalem for Jews, Christians and Muslims, this approach was crucial for ensuring social cohesion and social peace. The Ottoman administration recognized its responsibility to maintain this delicate balance in its administrative strategies, urban planning and legal frameworks governing the city. In order to maintain harmony and peace among different religious communities, the Ottoman Empire adopted an administrative approach that took into account the multicultural nature of the city and granted them autonomy. However, especially in the nineteenth century, the inter-church rivalries and disputes in Jerusalem grew to a level that could not be ignored. Since the early nineteenth century, there have been great developments in the mission efforts of Christians of different denominations in Jerusalem. These efforts later led to an increase in the number of churches, hospitals, monasteries, etc. of Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox Christians, depending on the power of the states behind them. During this period, the Ottoman Empire not only tried to understand the rights and claims of foreign states on Christians who were its citizens, but also sought to find a middle way and preserve the culture of peace.[30]

One of the main mechanisms used by the Ottoman Empire to promote social peace in Jerusalem was the so-called "millet system".[31] This system allowed different religious communities, especially Jews, Christians and Muslims, to self-govern themselves through their religious leaders in personal legal matters such as marriage, divorce and inheritance, while at the same time remaining under the general authority of the Ottoman state. This approach not only helped the communities to solve their internal problems, but also contributed to the reduction of social tensions and the preservation of peace between religious groups.[32] During the Ottoman Empire (1517–1917), Jerusalem preserved its multi-religious and multi-ethnic structure as a center for Judaism, Christianity, and Islam through legal and administrative mechanisms. As mentioned above, the Ottoman administration, within the framework of a structure known as the "millet system" and which can be considered an advanced form of "federalism," showed understanding and respect to the followers of the "People of the Book," including Jews and Christians. The rights of followers of these three religions were protected based on centuries-old customs

---

[30] Türkan, and Uğurlu 2016, pp. 103-104.
[31] Adıyeke 2014, p.3.
[32] Köksal 2008, p.1501.

and codified in the 1757 Edict. In the administrative sphere, the Arabs of Jerusalem were treated as equals to the Turks within the empire, were largely able to govern themselves, and even participated effectively in the imperial administration by being appointed to the most responsible positions in the state machinery, such as prime minister, minister, governor, and district administrator. Furthermore, Sultan Suleiman the Magnificent (1537-41) and subsequent sultans upheld the sanctity of the city and its holy structures through fundamental repairs and additions, such as the renovation of the walls and the tiling of mosque domes. This form of governance, which began in 638 AD when Caliph Omar entered the city without bloodshed and chose not to pray in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and in 1187 when Saladin, despite his victory, left the Holy Places under Christian control, thus continuing the tradition of respect for established rights and justice established by previous Muslim rulers.[33] This approach allowed each community to freely maintain its own identity and religious practices in a multi-religious city like Jerusalem. The millet system was particularly effective in Jerusalem because the city was a place where different religious and ethnic groups lived together and deeply influenced each other's cultures. In order to accommodate this diversity, the administration developed a structure in which religious groups could retain their freedoms, while ensuring the harmony required for coexistence.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Ottoman administration instigated a series of reforms, which included the establishment of new state institutions such as the municipality (baladiyye) and local and provincial councils (majlis-i umumi and majlis-i idari). The purpose of these institutions was to strengthen not only religious structures but also the entire social structure.[34] In addition, local leaders were given an active and institutionalised role in local governance. These reforms regularized Muslim, Christian and Jewish urban residents to serve together in municipal and provincial assemblies across the empire.[35] On the other hand, the Ottomans also included local leaders and religious leaders in this process, ensuring that the different communities in Jerusalem were represented in the administration. The appointment of local leaders to administrative positions not only strengthened communication between the state and the communities, but also ensured that city-specific problems were addressed more effectively. This strategy of the Ottomans ensured the representation of each community while at the same time helping to ensure public security. This approach also enabled the formation of an administrative model that represented the demographic diversity in Jerusalem and governed the city.[36] On the other hand, the Ottoman administration preferred to resolve occasional disputes between religious groups in Jerusalem over holy sites through negotiations and compromise rather than the use of force.[37] This solution-oriented attitude of the Ottoman administration not only reduced potential tensions but also reinforced the legitimacy of the Ottoman administration in the eyes of the people of Jerusalem.

---

[33] Ataöv 1981, pp. 32-34.
[34] Najjar 2023, pp. 199-201.
[35] Campos 2022, p.54.
[36] Köse 2015, pp. 172-173.
[37] Clements 2019, pp. 423-426.

The socio-political structure of the Ottoman Empire in Jerusalem was also shaped as a reflection of the empire's modernization efforts. With the Tanzimat reforms carried out in the mid-nineteenth century, steps were taken to ensure equal rights among citizens regardless of religion or ethnic origin. For example, before the Tanzimat, non-Muslims were subjects of the Ottoman Empire just like Muslims. However, non-Muslims could only hold official positions in special circumstances. With the Tanzimat reforms, non-Muslims were also able to become civil servants, administrators, etc., just like Muslims. These reforms also contributed to Jerusalem becoming a more harmonious multicultural structure.[38] Such modern legal frameworks and administrative practices brought social cohesion and social peace among the city's diverse populations and religious identities. However, the Ottoman Empire's approach to governance in Jerusalem was not without its challenges. The rise of nationalist sentiments and ethnic tensions in the late 19th and early 20th centuries posed significant threats to the city's public security. The Ottoman administration's historical legacy of tolerance and coexistence provided a framework for overcoming these challenges. The concept of "Ottomanism", which emphasized loyalty to the empire rather than ethnic or religious identities, was an important element in maintaining social cohesion in times of unrest.[39] However, Campos (2022), quoting historian Nora Lafi (2013), argues that Ottoman urban governance was a "negotiated urban equilibrium based on the coexistence of communities",[40] which she calls the "Ottoman pax urbana".[41] This legacy of coexistence, on the other hand, continues to influence contemporary debates about identity and community in Jerusalem.

In addition to the aforementioned points, it is also posited that Jerusalem experienced tangible security concerns. It is asserted that the city walls could readily accommodate a limited population, thereby explaining the relatively unregulated expansion of Jerusalem beyond these boundaries in the initial stages, primarily due to concerns regarding public safety. This state of affairs persisted until the 1870s, when the city gates were customarily closed during nocturnal hours and during Muslim Friday prayers. The issue of public security in Jerusalem is, therefore, at the heart of a complex interaction between the Ottoman military presence, 'bandits' who attacked or robbed unprotected people, and local leaders. When Jerusalem became a province (mutasarrıflık) in 1858, the increased Ottoman administrative presence, including the army, is reported to have made the city appear safer and better protected.[42]

In conclusion, the Ottoman Empire's strategies to ensure public security in Jerusalem included an approach to governance that recognized the multicultural nature of the city and addressed the needs of each community. Through various mechanisms such as the millet system, the participation of local leaders, urban planning, conflict resolution methods, and Ottoman military presence, the Ottomans managed to create an environment conducive to coexistence among Jerusalem's diverse religious and ethnic groups.

---

[38] Kawtharani 2018, p.52.
[39] Maritan 2022, pp. 5-7.
[40] Campos 2022, p.54.
[41] Lafi 2013, p.329.
[42] Davis 2002, p.20.

2.3. The Role of Local Structures (Foundation System, Community Structure and Sharia Courts) in Providing Public Security in Ottoman Administration

For more than six centuries, the Ottoman Empire developed a multifaceted system for ensuring public security through a wide range of local structures, notably the waqf system, community structures and sharia courts. These structures played a critical role in ensuring social welfare and social stability by ensuring that the needs of the population were consistently met, while also making significant contributions to the sustainability of Ottoman society. Each element of this social and social security system fulfilled a distinct function to meet the needs of society and ensure the security of individuals.

The waqf system, a charitable endowment in Islamic law, is particularly important in the Ottoman context. This system served not only as a religious and cultural practice, but also as a powerful tool for social welfare. The waqf was an important social institution that provided basic services such as education, health, infrastructure development, and often had more financial resources than regular charitable organizations. In fact, in the Ottoman period, waqf ownership became the third largest financial sector after the public and private sectors. It is reported that in the Ottoman period, waqfs sometimes amounted to between 12 and 50 percent of the total financial system.[43] According to Rusydiana and Mi'raj, by providing both economic and social services in the society, the waqf aimed to raise the living standards of the people and especially supported individuals in difficult situations.[44] An important aspect of the waqf system was its flexibility to adapt to the changing economic conditions of the empire. Iskandar emphasizes that money foundations were used not only for social services but also as a source of state financing. The dual role of these foundations in both social welfare and state financing made the social and social security system of the Ottoman administration more sustainable and effective.[45] The economic impact of the waqf left deep traces on the welfare of the society. For example, Altay and Bulut's (2024) analysis shows that foundations in Rumelia provided higher daily wages than unskilled workers in Istanbul. This reveals how the foundation system contributed to economic prosperity and its role in ensuring public security.[46] In addition to economic support, as Iskender (2023) notes, the waqf system also played an important role in financing public health facilities. The fact that even the most vulnerable members of society had access to basic health services is an indicator of the safety net that the waqf system created in the long run.[47] The return on foundation investments ensured the continuity of these services and created a safety net for society. The Tanzimat reforms in the mid-nineteenth century aimed to regulate the local administration and the foundation system in the Ottoman Empire and aimed to centralize administrative structures by modernizing them.[48] While aiming to increase state control, these reforms also addressed social and economic development in the provinces. The

---

[43] Muna and Stebia 2023, p.108.
[44] Rusydiana and Mi'raj 2022, p.1.
[45] Iskandar 2022, p.38.
[46] Altay and Bulut 2024, pp. 87-89.
[47] Iskandar et al. 2023, pp. 283-287.
[48] Köksal 2002, pp. 107-110.

Tanzimat reforms introduced a more organized approach to the management of waqf assets and ensured that these assets were used effectively for the benefit of society. This centralization ensured that the waqf system maintained its integrity and continued to serve the purpose of social welfare.

Community structures in the Ottoman Empire also played a vital role in ensuring public security. The Empire had a diverse population of different ethnic and religious groups, which often operated independently through their own community organizations, providing social services and support networks for their members. These local community structures made it possible for different communities to freely express and maintain their cultural identities and religious beliefs. At the same time, local governance structures, such as sharia courts, have helped to resolve disputes within the community and have ensured security by maintaining social order. As Cayli notes, phenomena such as banditry and public panic led to the need for a robust system of social control, often managed at the community level.[49] Sharia courts not only resolved legal issues, but also contributed greatly to the stability of society by reinforcing social norms and values. For example, in 1614, the Venetian ambassador to Istanbul complained that some Muslim groups had attempted to forcibly seize the keys to the Church of the Nativity from the Franciscan priests who held them. The Ottoman administration immediately took action, ordering the Qadi of Jerusalem to arrest these Muslims and thwart their plans, as their actions were contrary to the Sultan's will and the rules of Sharia, law, and established tradition. This situation can also be seen as an important indicator of the contribution made by the Qadi and the Sharia courts to social stability. Another example is the incident involving the Church of the Nativity, which turned into a struggle between Muslims and Christians. The Muslim plaintiffs, who took the case to the Qadi, claimed that the Christians had seized the basilica and operated it as a church without the Sultan's permission and in violation of the laws of the Quran. Unable to convince the Qadi, the Muslim plaintiffs took the matter to the central government in Istanbul. In an urgent decree issued in late 1675, the Ottoman administration clearly stated that the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem was exclusively a Christian temple and that true Muslims should stay away from it because of those who wanted to cause chaos.[50] In this sense, public services in Jerusalem were maintained and administered by a variety of overlapping institutions, including the local sharia court, artisan guilds, and foundations. The administrative philosophy of the Ottoman Empire's rule over Jerusalem was based on the "millet system," which has been described as a "federalism" concept ahead of its time. Under this system, Jews and Christians were accepted as "People of the Book," and the rights of the followers of these three religions were protected based on centuries-old customs and were even guaranteed in writing by the 1757 Edict. In terms of administrative participation, the Arab subjects, including the Christians of Jerusalem, were considered equal to the Turks throughout the empire and had the opportunity to govern their own cities to a large extent. These Arabs were appointed to the most responsible positions in the state machinery, such as prime minister, minister, governor, judge, and representative

---

[49] Cayli 2020, pp. 368-369.
[50] Peri 1999, pp.104-106.

in the assemblies, thus ensuring their effective participation in Ottoman administration.[51] The main officials involved in the administration of the city were the chief Islamic qadi (qadi), the chief Islamic jurist (mufti), the market inspector (muhtasib) and the naqib al-ashraf (local representative of the Prophet's descendants). Another administrator in Jerusalem appears to have been the naqib, the equivalent of the modern mayor.[52] The majority of these offices were held by the local notables, who were members of prominent Muslim families. At this point, it is reported that the people in charge of the administration of the city were referred to as 'a'yan or efendiyye.[53] One of the main reasons why most of these positions were filled by local notables who were members of prominent Muslim families was the increase in taxes by Muhammad Pasha, who was appointed governor of Jerusalem in 1702, and the resulting uprising led by Nakîbüleşraf Muhammad Hüseynî. This is because the Nakîbüleşraf effectively took control of the administration for two years, and the governor of the Damascus province was only able to suppress the uprising in 1705 by using military force. This weakness in central administration and the marked increase in the prestige and power of certain families in Jerusalem led to the appointment of sanjak beys from among the powerful local families. In this century, most of the sanjak beys of Jerusalem were chosen from the Tukan and Nimr families. During the same period, families such as the Husayni, Khalidi, and Abu al-Lutf also gained power and were influential in the administration of Jerusalem throughout the Ottoman period. Muftis were mostly selected from the Abu al-Lutf family, the Naqib al-Ashraf from the Husayni family, and senior officials of the Sharia court and mayors from the Khalidi family.[54]

In conclusion, it is understood that under the Ottoman Empire's rule, especially artisan guilds, the waqf system, community organizations and sharia courts played a crucial role in ensuring public security in Jerusalem. These institutions functioned effectively in providing basic services, maintaining social order and adapting to the changing needs of the population.

2.4. Public Security in Jerusalem during the Ottoman Period

Jerusalem, which was neither a significant hub of global trade nor perceived as militarily advantageous, was regarded by the Ottomans as the third most sacred site in Islam, surpassed only by Mecca and Medina.[55] The Ottomans exercised dominion over this city from 1516 until 1917. Following the successful campaign led by Sultan Selim I against the Mamlukes in Syria and Palestine, which culminated in the capture of Cairo in 1517, the Ottomans entered into a peaceful period in which they ruled over the city without encountering any significant opposition. This period of relative tranquillity came to an end with the British campaign of 1917, which led to the city's capture by General Allenby.[56] Jerusalem, a modest pilgrimage town and provincial centre conquered by the

---

[51] Ataöv 1981, pp. 34-35.
[52] Büssow 2014, p.99.
[53] Ben-Bassat and Buessow 2018, p.115.
[54] Aseli 2002, p. 335.
[55] Ben-Arieh 1984, p.104.
[56] Ben-Bassat and Buessow 2018, p.115.

Ottomans in the sixteenth century, was not a rapidly developing and modernising city when it was transferred to British rule. However, the most significant achievement of the Ottoman administration in 19th-century Palestine was the marked improvement of public security, which is argued to have been the most important reason for Jerusalem's failure to develop and modernise. The geographical landscape of Palestine is characterised by a coastal plain and a mountainous terrain. While the coastal zone exhibited a greater potential for settlement, it remained uninhabited. The mountainous area of Ottoman Palestine, on the other hand, was densely populated. This clearly points to a situation where lack of public security was a natural feature.[57] The deterioration of security within the nation can be attributed to the activities of the nomads. As the ruling state of the arid nation experienced periods of weakening both militarily and politically, there was a corresponding increase in encroachments by nomads. These encroachments had the potential to jeopardise the nation's security.[58] From the 17th and 18th centuries onwards, attacks by nomads led to the desolation of vast territories. Although nomads were unable to penetrate the mountainous region, there were various conflicts that could undermine the authority of the Ottoman administration. There was a strong local elite of opposing village or neighborhood sheikhs, among whom often violent conflicts were almost constant. The prevailing state of anarchy in these areas also hindered potential economic and political development. The conclusion of this period occurred in the mid-19th century, coinciding with the initiation by the Ottoman government of the inaugural Tanzimat reforms within the geographical context of Palestine. Initially, the main effort of the Ottoman administration was to consolidate its control over its dominions. In a series of clashes with the Ottoman army in the 1830s and 1860s, most of these local rebel forces were eliminated or minimized. The supremacy of Ottoman authority in Palestine was never questioned again. The formation of village sheikhs disappeared and was replaced by the "mukhtar", an Ottoman civil servant who was completely subordinate to the "mudir" or nahiyeh director. All of this is said to have ameliorated the chronic lack of security in Palestine in general and Jerusalem in particular, which was ensured by the Ottoman administration.[59]

The Ottoman administration had a significant indirect role to play in the development of these cities, primarily through the assurance of security for life and property, stability, religious tolerance, and the improvement of the status of foreign residents. The expansion in privileges granted to foreigners as per the provisions of the Capitulations, and the subsequent elevation of the status of foreign consuls, was a consequence of pressure exerted by European powers. This led to the extension of privileges and trading rights to European companies in various domains such as communications, industry, and finance. In addition, the establishment and operation of religious, educational and medical institutions by charitable, missionary, and other organisations remained unimpeded. Furthermore, the Ottomans indirectly contributed to the urban population's growth by not interfering with immigrants' settlement (with the

---

[57] Hütteroth 1975, p.3-6.
[58] Sharon 1975, pp. 12-15.
[59] Gerber 1985, pp. 31-33.

exception of restricting Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe in certain years).[60] For example, reliable maps from the 1840s and onwards, as well as early aerial photographs of Jerusalem, measured settlements inside and outside the city walls. Accordingly, as shown in Table 2, Jerusalem's area grew from 699 dunums in 1841 - again mostly within the city walls - to 4,130 dunums in 1917, more than three-quarters of which were located outside the Old City.[61]

Years	Location	Area of Jerusalem in acres (dunums)	% of total area
1841	Inside the Walls	681	97.4
	Outside the Walls	18	2.6
	Total	699	100.0
1917	Inside the Walls	749	18.1
	Outside the Walls	3,381	81.9
	Total	4,130	100.0

Table 2: Built-up Area in Jerusalem between 1841-1918.[62]

The 1860s witnessed the initial settling of Jews in the newly established neighbourhoods extending beyond the confines of Jerusalem's Old City walls. This was in response to the increasing influx of the Jewish population, which was already operating at full capacity and could not find adequate accommodation in the walled Jewish Quarter, which included the city. The decision to vacate the city walls was further influenced by the enhancement of security conditions within and around the city, a development that can be attributed to the implementation of measures by the Ottomans during this period. This decision ultimately led to the establishment of the 'New City' of Jerusalem, a development that was facilitated by the improved security conditions.[63]

In the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Ottomans made significant investments in the city and the region of Jerusalem in order to keep pace with European activities in the area. This was in addition to the growth of the city and its expansion beyond the city walls. Following the recapture of the Holy Land and Jerusalem after the invasion of Egypt, the Ottomans suppressed the local warlords in the region and improved security in the countryside. Subsequent to this, and as a component of the broader Tanzimat reforms within the Empire, a series of reforms were initiated that profoundly

---

[60] Kark 1986, p.51.
[61] Kark 1986, p.46.
[62] Kark 1986, p.46.
[63] Ben-Bassat and Buessow 2018, pp. 116-117.

impacted life in Jerusalem and the region. The most significant innovation of these reforms was the establishment of an Administrative Council within the region, which, in addition to the Ottoman governor, comprised the city's notables and representatives of religious communities.[64] The council, dominated by several prominent Muslim families, was responsible for tax collection, land registration, sanitation, population registration, issuance of various documents, education, health and security.[65]

Following the establishment of the municipality in 1863, Jerusalem became a pioneering city in the field of modern urban governance, as it was the first to adopt the new system of municipal administration introduced by the Ottoman administration. The mayor was elected by the city's population, while the administrative council was presided over by the Ottoman governor. Despite operating under stringent financial constraints, the Jerusalem Municipality successfully enhanced living conditions within the city through its policies in the areas of infrastructure, health, security and culture. It has been documented that the activities of the Jerusalem Municipality began to extend to other areas in the Jerusalem District.Conversely, the success of numerous municipal projects was attributable to their implementation in collaboration with religious foundations or other partners.[66]

By decision of the Ottoman Empire, the city of Jerusalem gained the status of an independent mutasarrifate operating under the direct supervision of the Ministry of the Interior in Istanbul. The jurisdiction of this new entity encompassed the entirety of central and southern Palestine. This development can be attributed to the city's growing importance in the eyes of the Ottoman authorities, particularly its emergence as a focal point for international attention and activity. Prior to this, and throughout the historical period of the Ottoman Empire, Jerusalem had been part of the Vilayet of Damascus. The Ottomans' decision to make Jerusalem the capital of an independent mutasarrifate in 1872 can be seen as a strategic move to prevent the Europeans from gaining dominance in the region.[67] As the provincial capital of the autonomous Jerusalem sanjak, the city was home to three councils: the municipal council, the administrative council and the Majlis-i Umumi. As previously mentioned, the municipal council in Jerusalem had been in existence since 1863, though it was not until 1875 and 1877 that its functions came to be formally regulated by law. The municipal administration of Jerusalem was overseen by twenty-three Muslim mayors and a single Greek Ottoman mayor from 1863 until the British occupation.[68]

Along with all these, it is reported that the Ottoman urban administration had a 'corporatist' character based on self-organization and collective responsibility. The field of public safety can be cited as one of the best examples to explain this. In corporatist urban governance, all residents of a neighborhood were held responsible for any action that could endanger public safety within a certain period of time, and the resulting fines

---

[64] Gerber 1985, pp. 130-135.
[65] Abu-Manneh 1990, pp. 10-13.
[66] Büssow 2014, pp. 127-128.
[67] Büssow 2011, p.398.
[68] Jacobson 2011, p.5.

were shared. Given this, Ottoman court records are reported to contain ample evidence that residents of certain neighborhoods exercised strict social control and were suspicious of outsiders coming into their neighborhoods. In similar Ottoman cities, such as Jerusalem, in order to ensure public safety, especially after dark, residents placed guards at strategic points to limit traffic between neighborhoods. City gates were locked at night so that criminals could not flee the city in the dark. In addition, the main streets of many cities could be closed with wooden gates. Since there were very few streetlights, those who had to walk through the city after dark had to carry a lantern. In many places, night watchmen were allowed to arrest people wandering the streets without a lantern and detain them until the next morning.[69] Given that in 1877 the Ottoman administration granted municipalities broad powers, including in the areas of infrastructure and urban planning, public health, image management, cultural life, and security, the Jerusalem municipality is reported to have increasingly exercised these powers. For example, the most important contribution of the Municipality in the field of public security was the establishment of a city police department in 1887. The first seven municipal policemen (municipal sergeants) demonstrated their effectiveness in 1888 by arresting a group of thieves operating in the new Jewish neighborhoods outside the city walls. The small police force was gradually enlarged and increased to 35 in 1910.[70] In this sense, the activities of the municipality in terms of public safety are also shown in table 3.

Policy Area	Year	Measures Taken
Security	1887	City police force (municipal sergeants)
	1907	87 Night guards (60 in the city, 27 in the new city)
	1915	119 Integration of special guards into city police

Table 3: Jerusalem Municipality's Security Policies Source.[71]

Despite the generally accepted view that the Ottoman administration contributed little to the development of Jerusalem between 1840 and 1917, various levels of the regime helped both directly and indirectly to accelerate the urban development of these cities. The Ottoman administration directly contributed to the construction and development of urban and inter-urban infrastructure, the prevention of bribery and corruption, especially in the provision of public security and the implementation of an orderly administration. Ultimately, the Ottoman administration is reported to have shown greater awareness of the need for development and improvement of living conditions in

---

[69] Hanssen 2005, pp. 198-199.
[70] Büssow 2014, p.131.
[71] Büssow, 2014, p.125.

the city in addition to security policies.[72] In the context of this historical analysis, the advent of the First World War is of particular pertinence, marking the conclusion of Ottoman dominion over Jerusalem. Despite the absence of significant confrontations between Ottoman and British military forces within the city, the repercussions of the First World War were profoundly felt by the Jerusalem populace. The city experienced a period of profound hardship, characterised by scarcities of essential commodities and medical resources. The expulsion of the majority of the foreign population during the war, comprising diplomats, missionaries and religious officials, further compounded the city's already dire circumstances. The city was captured by the British without significant opposition, with only minor skirmishes. Consequently, the four centuries of Ottoman rule in Jerusalem came to an end, marking the advent of a new era in the city's history.[73]

3. British Mandate Period (1917-1948)

"The story of British Jerusalem is one in which the rights and aspirations of Palestinian Arabs to govern and determine the fate of their principal city of Jerusalem and its holy sites were routinely denied or ignored."[74]

3.1. From Empire to Mandate

The British considered it imperative to ensure that the Muslim subjects of the Ottoman Empire did not perceive the war as a Christian-Muslim conflict. British officials asserted that utilising Jerusalem as a symbolic and ideological instrument posed a considerable risk and would only be effective if executed in an appropriate manner.[75] In anticipation of the Palestine campaign and the deployment of British forces into Jerusalem, a comprehensive discourse on the matter was held well in advance of the city's actual occupation. Beyond considerations pertaining to military preparedness, the British exhibited a profound concern regarding the response of the native populace to a British invasion, or more accurately, to an invasion by a Christian power that would mark the conclusion of four centuries of Muslim dominance over the region. As early as September 1914, as Jacobson (2011) reports in his study, the War Office in Cairo received an intelligence report with an estimate of the situation in Palestine. According to the report:

"There is a growing feeling among all classes in Palestine that the country should be occupied by foreigners, especially by Great Britain... This desire was at first confined to the Christian elements, but in these last days of oppression and plunder it has spread rapidly among the Muslims, a large number of whom are more enthusiastic than the Christians... It must, however, be remembered that there are a large number of Muslims who are strongly opposed to any foreign occupation of their country and who would join forces with Turkish troops to resist such an attack".

---

[72] Kark 1986, pp. 54-56.
[73] Jacobson 2011, pp. 130-135.
[74] Abowd 2018, p.135.
[75] Mazza 2009, p.124.

The report described the hardships of conscription into the Ottoman army, the seizure of homes, crops and livestock, and the flight of young people to Egypt and America. It was reported that Christians and Jews in Palestine were "eagerly awaiting liberation" and that even prominent families in Jerusalem, such as the Husseinis and Khalidis, welcomed the occupation.[76]

The British were acutely aware of Jerusalem's symbolic importance and value, particularly from a religious perspective, as well as the heightened sensitivities of the situation. The city's occupation by Christian forces, following four centuries of Muslim rule, was a matter of considerable concern for the British, who were especially wary of any potential Muslim reaction. However, the British were also cognisant of the potential for a more complex dynamic, namely the reaction of the major global powers, particularly France and Italy, and to a lesser extent Russia, to the British occupation of the city. The extensive correspondence between various British officials and the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, Rennie MacInnes, provides insight into the intricate web of tensions and interests involved, and the manner in which the British navigated these complexities. A particularly noteworthy instance in this context was the correspondence dated 2nd May 1917, which was addressed by Bishop MacInnes, who was then residing in Cairo, to Major General Clayton, who had been appointed as the first political chief of the Egyptian Expeditionary Force. An excerpt from the aforementioned correspondence is as follows:

"That it is desirable to take official ownership of every building that was originally built as a Christian church and is now being used as a Muslim mosque... I therefore respectfully request that every building that was originally built as a Christian church and is now being used as a mosque or is in the hands of Muslims, in all the lands we possess, be officially returned to Christian ownership..."

In his letter, MacInnes positions the occupation of Palestine as a Christian conquest waged against the Muslims, and as a triumph of the West over the East. A number of letters were written in response to MacInnes, from both clergy and military personnel, offering insight into the prejudices, intentions and beliefs of British administrators and politicians. One such response, from Colonel Deedes, was addressed to High Commissioner in Egypt, General Reginald Wingate, and was published in full in the letters that follow. In his letter, Deedes stated that the issue should be examined more carefully, that the Bishop's arguments were based on insufficient premises, and that this would be a step that would be attacked by the anti-British tendency and would bring protests from Muslim heads of state.[77] As can be understood from all these developments, it is understood that the religious, political and ethnic differences of the city were significantly evaluated before the capture of the city by the British, and the reaction of the Muslim population along with the states such as France, Italy and Russia was also thoroughly considered.

The transition between the Ottomans and the British, when Jerusalem "changed hands", has also been described as the moment that reshaped the city once again.[78] The

---

[76] Jacobson 2011, pp. 118-119.
[77] Jacobson 2011, pp. 123–124.
[78] Jacobson 2011, p.130.

conquest of Jerusalem and Palestine was not easy. The British made two attempts to take Gaza under the command of General Archibald Murray, but Murray failed to achieve his goal. At the end of April 1917, Lloyd George offered the command to General Edmund Allenby, nicknamed "the bull", and the Palestine campaign entered a new phase that would culminate in the capture of Jerusalem.[79] The British advanced on Jerusalem on the night of 7 December 1917, marking the culmination of 40 days of intense combat in Beer-Sheva, Gaza and Jaffa. The primary offensive on the city was initiated on the morning of 8 December amidst challenging weather conditions. Unexpectedly, the Turkish defences were found to be less robust than anticipated, leading to the withdrawal of Ottoman military forces and civilians from the city beginning on the evening of 8 December. The Turkish governor, Izzat Pasha, was the last official to depart from the city, doing so in the early hours of December 9.At 11:00 a.m. on that same day, the surrender of Jerusalem was announced by its mayor, Hussein Selim al-Husseini, to the British forces. The keys to the city were formally presented to Major General Allenby by the mayor in the name of the British forces. Two days after the official surrender, General Allenby entered Jerusalem in a ceremony that also represented the end of 400 years of Ottoman rule over the city.[80] In this sense, the capture of the Holy City helped the Allies gain momentum and played an important role in boosting the morale of troops on other fronts of the war. In the longer term, however, instead of resolving existing conflicts, the occupation of the city created more complex ones. When the British took over the city, the inconsistency of wartime agreements, promises made to Arabs and Jews, and the over-romanticization of the city are reported to have come to the fore.[81] On the other hand, it is also reported that Jerusalemites generally welcomed the British army, regardless of their background, but that both the Muslim and Christian Arab populations sought their own justifications for supporting a new foreign occupation. Although images of the Crusades were almost forgotten in Muslim memory[82], Muslims were forced to confront the 'crusader-mania' spread through the press in Britain and local Christian churches. With all this, great expectations were created among the local population in 1917. In particular, Christians hoped that they would be freer under the protection of a Christian power, Arabs hoped that they would be part of an Arab state, Jews hoped that they would be able to establish a National Jewish Home, and Catholic clergy hoped that a Catholic power would take over the administration of the city. Perhaps the British rule of Jerusalem is best described by Wasif Jawhariyyeh. As Tamari (2000) quotes from Wasif Jawhariyyeh's diaries, Wasif Jawhariyyeh: "I remember that today [the British occupation] was a very happy day for the people. You could see them dancing in the streets with joy, congratulating each other on this happy event". However, according to Wasif, the "honeymoon" did not last long. In the same diary, Wasif summarized the British occupation in the following words: "We

---

[79] Wavell 1946, p.14.
[80] Jacobson 2011, p.125.
[81] Mazza 2009, p.124.
[82] Holt 2013, p.37.

did not realize then that this damned occupation would be a curse, not a blessing, for our beloved homeland".[83]

The discussion herein underscores the pivotal function of religion and its schisms in the context of Palestine prior to, during, and in the wake of Jerusalem's occupation. The British authorities endeavoured to minimise the religious dimensions of the occupation, portraying it as a purely military undertaking, devoid of any civil or religious undertones. However, the local populace, comprising both Jews and Arabs, articulated their discontent and disillusionment with British policy, each community exhibiting their own distinct reasons for this sentiment. The establishment of a religiously divided Palestinian population – into Jews, Muslims, and Christians – along with the creation of distinct categories for each of these groups, had considerable repercussions for the intercommunal tensions present in Jerusalem.[84] In the end, Jerusalem, a city inhabited by communities of different religions, languages and races, was now a city under the British mandate. From this point of view, the activities and management style of the British administration, especially in terms of public security, which constitutes the essence of the study, are tried to be evaluated in the next section.

3.2. British Mandate and Security in Jerusalem

In December 1917, following a period of Ottoman rule that had lasted for four centuries, Great Britain seized control of the city of Jerusalem and, in the months that followed, the entire territory of Palestine. Britain's rule over the "Holy Land" was to last only thirty years. However, as has been documented, throughout the turbulent period in question, profound and significant transformations in terms of politics, demographics and spatial structure were undergone by the Muslim, Christian and Jewish communities of Palestine, and to a greater extent than in any other location, in Jerusalem. From 1917 until the conclusion of the British Mandate in May 1948, the city witnessed an unprecedented series of political, demographic and spatial changes, the like of which it had never previously experienced. Jerusalem has been ruled by many dynasties and monarchs throughout its remarkable 5,000-year history. However, the city had not been ruled by Christians since the European Crusaders captured Jerusalem in 1244, until British General Allenby surrendered the city.[85] This chapter will attempt to reveal the British military rule in Jerusalem and the internal security structure in ensuring public safety.

Upon entering Jerusalem, General Allenby delivered a proclamation that declared the city to be subject to martial law and that the status quo of Ottoman rule would remain unaltered. The rationale underlying this decision was that the prevailing military government did not have the mandate to implement urgent reforms, as its mandate did not extend to the regulation of civilian matters. Nevertheless, it has been observed that the Military Administration took actions that were contradictory to the status quo, particularly in view of the fact that, by 1918, the majority of the population of the

---

[83] Tamari 2000, pp. 7-9.
[84] Jacobson 2011, pp. 131-132.
[85] Abowd 2018, p.133.

Palestinian territory was of Arab descent.[86] Allenby's perspective on the matter was that the Ottoman administrative system, which was based on decentralisation under strong central control, appeared to be the most Palestine. Consequently, the British military administration, influenced by the Ottoman effective method of organising administration in accordance with local conditions in administrative division, divided the territory under its control into four regions: Jerusalem, Jaffa, Mejdal and Beer-Sheva. Each of these districts was administered by a military governor. Jerusalem was distinguished as a distinct administrative entity, initially under the administration of Colonel Burton, who was subsequently succeeded by Colonel Storrs, who received his directives directly from General Allenby.

On 2 March 1918, General Allenby submitted a comprehensive report to the War Office in London, providing detailed insights on the operational framework of the OETA (Occupied Enemy Territory Administration). This report highlights the profound impact of Ottoman influence on the administration of the military in Palestine. The report dealt with a variety of issues, including the organization and functioning of the administration, as well as revenue and currency matters. British forces had initially occupied most of the territory that had constituted the Ottoman sanjak of Jerusalem. Allenby proposed to retain the Ottoman administrative division of the sanjak in order to disrupt as little as possible the methods of administration to which the population had become accustomed and to enable the British administration to take advantage of the Ottoman machinery of government.[87]

In regard to the administrative undertakings undertaken by the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration (OETA), it is notable that the Ottomans exerted a profound influence in this domain as well. During the period of Ottoman dominion, the organisational structure of the government was meticulously divided into various administrative entities, encompassing domains such as public worship, administration of justice, police, gendarmerie, prisons, public health, hospitals, public education, public works, land registry, agriculture, forests, trade, postal services and financial services.It is noteworthy that the OETA adopted a congruent organisational model to facilitate the effective functioning of the administration. Despite criticisms from British authorities regarding Ottoman oversight of Jerusalem and its inhabitants, alongside disparaging remarks on the administration in Palestine, there was eventual overt respect for the Ottoman administration, bureaucratic organisation, and this model of administration persisted under martial law. This approach also served to demonstrate to the foreign Allies that no political or colonial ambitions were held by Britain regarding the Palestine region. In terms of administrative structure, the senior bureaucrats were predominantly British civil servants, many of whom lacked experience in the Middle East and were not versed in Hebrew or Arabic. Local bureaucrats comprised Muslims, Christians and Jews who were employed in various capacities, with some officials retaining their positions from before the occupation. For instance, the mayor of Jerusalem, Hussein al-Husseini, remained in office until his death in early 1918 and was succeeded by his brother, Musa

---

[86] Storrs 1937, p.353.
[87] Jacobson 2011, pp. 135-137.

Kazim al-Husseini.Furthermore, Ronald Storrs appointed Mufti Kamal al-Husseini as the acting president of the Muslim Court of Appeal, thus ensuring the uninterrupted continuation of religious activities.[88] At this stage, along with this approach of the British administration in terms of administrative affairs, the activities carried out to ensure public order will be evaluated in accordance with the framework of the study.

Following the capture of Palestine by the British in 1917, it is mentioned that there were two separate institutions in charge of ensuring public security and public order in Palestine and Jerusalem in particular. These are the police and the British gendarmerie.[89] At this juncture, an analysis of the police, the law enforcement agency entrusted with the responsibility of ensuring public security, provides a valuable opportunity to assess the interaction between Arabs, Jews and the British in Mandate Palestine. In a manner similar to other police forces within the British Empire, the Palestine Police could not maintain an aloof stance in relation to the prevailing political environment. Consequently, its activities were subject to both the influence and the shaping of external events. It is reported that policemen who held rank as Palestinians walked a fine line between professional loyalties on the one hand and social and national loyalties on the other.[90] In contrast, the British established local police forces throughout their vast empire. These forces comprised local rank-and-file personnel and were commanded by British officers. This practice is attributed to the necessity of maintaining an empire in a cost-effective manner, as well as the prevailing philosophy of indirect rule that informed British colonial thinking between the two world wars. Consequently, the colonial state's primary interface with the majority of the population was the police, who were responsible for enforcing the laws that upheld colonial authority.[91]

The Palestine Police during the Mandate period is described as a quasi-military force. Its main duties were to maintain law and order, suppress disturbances and patrol the borders. It also carried out day-to-day police work such as crime prevention, detection and traffic regulation. Established in 1920 as a small force of mostly Arabs and some Jews under British command, the police force underwent various reforms in the following years. Following their failure to control intercommunal violence in 1920 and 1921, and due to the involvement of some Arab policemen in the riots, the British reportedly created a local gendarmerie of 500 men, and then in 1922 brought in some 700 former policemen from Ireland to form a separate British section within the gendarmerie. In 1926, it is understood that the gendarmerie was disbanded and some of the soldiers were transferred to a new section of the police force, the "British section", which operated alongside the larger "Palestinian section".[92] Following the outbreak of violence, such as the "Wailing Wall incidents"[93], the British police component gradually expanded again with reforms. For example, each police station was usually under the command of a Bedouin sergeant

---

[88] Storrs 1937, pp. 343-344.
[89] Knight 2011, p.524.
[90] Alon 2018, p.64.
[91] Anderson and Killingray 2017, pp. 1-3.
[92] Smith 2017, p.63.
[93] Freas 2017, p.75.

or corporal (shawish) from a sheikh's family, and he had about ten men patrolling the area under his command. In 1934, the police force consisted of 140 people. Of these, 18 were infantry, 72 were Bedouins under the British Mandate who used 35 camels and 24 horses.[94] In 1939, at the end of the Arab Revolt[95], the police force was 55 percent British, 35 percent Arab and 10 percent Jewish. However, it is stated that the number of Jews and Arabs was much higher when various auxiliary police units such as the Temporary Additional Police and the Reserve Police were included. In the last years of the mandate, it was the Jewish riots that occupied the police and led to the establishment of special anti-riot units and more reinforcements from Britain.[96] With these events, it is reported that in 1947, the police force in Palestine reached nine thousand, 62 percent of whom were British.[97] The Palestinian Police was similar to other police forces in the empire, but evolved over time, becoming a cadre of mostly British police officers with the end of British rule in 1948. In the context of British Mandate Jerusalem, the police force is described as a colonial institution, bringing together British, Arab and Jewish soldiers.[98] In addition, it should be noted that British authorities constructed fifty-four police stations in Palestine between 1936 and 1939 as part of a construction program aimed at establishing concrete realities in both the political and security spheres. The establishment of these stations, located on main transportation arteries or high ground and enabling control of the surrounding area, is considered one of the largest construction projects in the Palestine Mandate during the 1930s.[99] All efforts to establish a police force reflected not only the duty to ensure public safety, but also the desire to secure the colonial state's sovereignty.

It is evident that the British colonial administration in Palestine demonstrated a clear reluctance to substantively augment the democratic freedoms and rights of its colonised subjects. This can be attributed to the prevalence of military repression, which was at times notably severe, in addition to Britain's unilateral alterations in cities like Jerusalem. This authoritarianism exerted a profound influence on the Jewish and, to a greater extent, Arab communities within the country. From 1917 to 1948, there was an escalation in the intensity of conflicts between Zionist settlers and the Muslim and Christian communities in Palestine. The quest for spiritual connection to the Holy Land, alongside assertions of territorial claims, served as catalysts for this intensified discord. The Arab populace exhibited an escalating degree of hostility towards British governance, and it merits attention that these conflicts transcended the confines of British-administered Jerusalem, manifesting instead as a recurrent consequence of British colonial policies.[100] The British sought to maintain stability and control in their newly acquired territories in accordance with their colonial objectives by adapting or modifying

---

[94] Rabia 2001, pp.35-36.
[95] Norris 2008, p.25.
[96] Hayen 2014, pp. 150-151.
[97] Smith 2017, p.63.
[98] Alon 2018, p.62.
[99] Rabia 2001, p.36.
[100] Abowd 2018, pp. 135-140.

the existing Ottoman security organizational structure, collaborating with local elites, and implementing new military and policing strategies. This complex interplay of adaptation and continuity not only shaped the nature of British colonial rule, but also had lasting effects on the political and social dynamics of the region. The legacy of these adaptations continues to influence the entire order in the Middle East, underscoring the enduring impact of colonial rule on the region's historical trajectory.

The fundamental dynamics that led to the chronic nature of the Palestinian issue, along with all the practices implemented by the British Mandate administration with its colonial approach, gained momentum from the 1880s onwards and began with the Jewish colonies established in Palestine by Jewish immigrants, which deepened systematically during the British Mandate period with the "Jewish national homeland" commitment brought about by the Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1917, which is also considered the beginning of the Arab-Israeli conflict.[101] This process was reinforced by Britain's division of the mandated territories into two parts: Palestine, the western region where Jewish colonies were concentrated, and the State of Jordan east of the Jordan River, which completely changed the region's political geography and demographic structure. Indeed, the Jewish population in the Jerusalem region, which was around 8,000-10,000 at the end of the Ottoman period in 1880, rose to 386,084 by 1937 during the British Mandate period, reaching approximately one-third of the total population. By 1948, when the British Mandate ended, while the official estimated figures for the Arab population were over 1,300,000, the Jewish population had risen to just over 600,000, becoming half of the total population. This situation clearly demonstrated the demographic change.[102] Along with immigration, Jewish land ownership reached 1,543,000 dunams by 1939, paving the way for Jews to establish the necessary institutions for statehood, from education to security, while causing the Arab community to become economically and socially marginalized. The inability of the British administration to maintain law and order despite martial law, and the chronic conflict caused by terrorist acts by Jewish organizations (Haganah, Irgun, Lohmei) against British facilities, security forces, and even civil servants, led to the rejection of proposed solutions such as the Peel Report (1937) and the MacDonald Report (1939). The Arabs' unwillingness to accept a Jewish state and the Jews' desire to dominate all of Palestine made a solution impossible. As a result, Britain's contradictory Palestine policy became unsustainable, and Palestine, which could not be partitioned and on which a joint state could not be established, thus entered a process beyond Britain's control. Successfully assessing the changing conditions during World War II and the circumstances in which Britain found itself, the Jews completed the process of statehood.[103]

Conclusion

Jerusalem is a city that has been under many different regimes and administrations throughout history, and has experienced unique political, social and administrative

---

[101] Ediz 2019, p. 118.
[102] Rabia 2001, p. 66.
[103] Yiğit 2019, pp. 405-413.

experiences in each period. The periods under Ottoman and British rule have had a profound impact on the city's social fabric, public security approaches and administrative structure. The effects of these two different approaches to governance on the public security of the city present both similarities and differences.

Under Ottoman rule, a security approach based on religious and cultural tolerance was adopted. The millet system empowered diverse communities to manage their internal affairs, while local leaders were integrated into administration, fostering social cohesion. Institutions like Sharia courts and local councils effectively mitigated conflicts. The Tanzimat reforms furthered modernization and local participation while reinforcing central authority. These practices helped preserve the city's cultural heritage and maintain public order through methods like gate controls and night patrols.

During the British Mandate, public security took a different course. Although the British modernized infrastructure and administrative systems, policies such as encouraging Jewish immigration disrupted the city's social balance, fueling tensions. New police forces and urban planning efforts improved physical infrastructure but weakened social cohesion, especially amid growing Arab-Jewish conflict.

A comparison of the Ottoman and British periods clearly reveals the different effects of these two administrative approaches on the city. While Ottoman administration promoted social harmony by preserving the city's multicultural and religious structure, British administration disrupted the city's social balance with its colonial approach. The Ottomans' policies of self-governance and local participation encouraged greater harmony among religious and ethnic groups in the city, while the British approach, which was centralized and guided by international circumstances, intensified the dynamics of conflict in the city. The millet system implemented during the Ottoman period strengthened the trust between different segments of society and provided long-term stability. In contrast, the policies of the British led to demographic changes, increasing tensions in the city and disrupting social cohesion.

As a result, the Ottoman and British approaches to public security in Jerusalem reflected different social and political priorities, and these differences underpinned the complex identity and dynamics of the city today. This contrast between the Ottoman policies of tolerance and social balance and the British approach focused on modernization and strategic priorities represents one of the most important turning points in Jerusalem's history. While the Ottoman harmonious relationship with local communities preserved the historical fabric of the city, under British rule this fabric was fragmented. An in-depth study of both periods is vital for understanding how Jerusalem has evolved historically and culturally. These studies not only help to understand the dynamics of Jerusalem in the past, but also to better grasp the roots of the problems the city faces today. Future research could examine the evolution of public security in Jerusalem under different administrations from a broader perspective, focusing on the interactions between social cohesion, religious conflicts, and modernization processes. Furthermore, examining the economic policies of these periods and their impact on the city's infrastructure can provide a more comprehensive understanding of Jerusalem's historical development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abowd 2018   Thomas Abowd, "British Jerusalem", *Routledge Handbook on Jerusalem*, Ed. Suleiman A. Mourad et al., Routledge: New York, pp.133-145.

Abu-Manneh 2014   Butrus Abu-Manneh, "Jerusalem in the Tanzimat Period: The New Ottoman Administration and the Notables", *Die Welt des Islams,* 30(1), pp.1-44.

Adıyeke 2014   Nuri Adıyeke, "Osmanlı Millet Sistemine Dair Tartışmalar ve Siyasal Bir Uzlaşma Modeli Olarak Osmanlı Millet Sistemi", *Yeni Türkiye,* (60), pp.1-13.

Alon 2018   Alon Yoav, "Bridging Imperial, National, and Local Historiographies: Britons, Arabs, and Jews in the Mandate Palestine Police", *Jerusalem Quarterly,* (75), pp.62-77.

Altay and Bulut 2024 Bora Altay and Mehmet Bulut, "Analysis of Cash Waqfs and Real Wages in Ottoman Rumelia, 1500-1914", *Isra International Journal of Islamic Finance,* 16(S1), pp. 71-93.

Anderson and Killingray 2017
                      David M. Anderson and David Killingray, "Consent, Coercion and Colonial Control: Policing the Empire, 1830–1940", *Policing the Empire*, Ed. David M. Anderson and David Killingray, Manchester University Press: Manchester, pp.1-16.

Aseli 2002   Kâmîl Cemîl El-Aselî, "Kudüs–Osmanlı Dönemi ve Sonrası", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, Cilt. 26, İslam Araştırmaları Merkezi: İstanbul, pp. 334-338.

Ataöv 1981   Türkkaya Ataöv, "Kudüs ve Devletler Hukuku", *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 35(01), pp. 29-54.

Balcı and Kardaş 2023 Ali Balcı, and Tuncay Kardaş, "The Ottoman International System: Power Projection, Interconnectedness, and the Autonomy of Frontier Polities", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies,* 51(3), pp.866-891.

Ben-Arieh 1984   Yehoshua Ben-Arieh, *Jerusalem in the 19th Century. The Old City,* St Martin's Press, New York.

Ben-Bassat and Buessow 2018
                      Yuval Ben-Bassat and Johann Buessow, "Ottoman Jerusalem, 1517–1918", *Routledge Handbook on Jerusalem*, Ed. Suleiman A. Mourad et al., Routledge: London, pp.113-121.

Brenner et al. 2023   Noam Brenner, Dan Miodownik, and Shaul R. Shenhav, "Leadership Repertoire and Political Engagement in a Divided City: The Case of East Jerusalem", *Urban Studies* 61(1), pp.58-77.

Büssow 2014	Johann Büssow, "Ottoman Reform and Urban Government in Jerusalem, 1867–1917", *Urban Governance Under The Ottomans: Between Cosmopolitanism and Conflict*, Ed. Ulrike Freitag and Nora Lafi, Routledge: London, pp.97-141.
Büssow 2011	Johann Büssow, *Hamidian Palestine: Politics and Society in The District of Jerusalem 1872-1908*, Brill, Leiden
Campos 2022	Michelle U. Campos, "The Jerusalem Light Rail in Historical Perspective: Urban Transportation and Urban Citizenship between Ottomanism and Apartheid", *Jerusalem Quarterly*, (92), pp.52-68.
Caylı 2020	Barış Caylı, "Crime, Bandits, and Community: How Public Panic Shaped the Social Control of Territory in the Ottoman Empire", *Territory Politics Governance*, 8(3), pp.356-371.
Clements 2019	Henry Clements, "Documenting Community in the Late Ottoman Empire", *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 51(3) pp.423-443.
Davidovitch and Greenberg 2007	Nadav Davidovitch and Zalman Greenberg, "Public Health, Culture, and Colonial Medicine: Smallpox and Variolation in Palestine during the British Mandate", *Public Health Reports*, 122(3), pp.398-406.
Davies 2005	Philip R. Davies, "The Origin of Biblical Israel", *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*, (5), 2005, pp.317-330.
Davis 2002	Rochelle Davis, "Ottoman Jerusalem: The Growth of the City Outside the Walls", *Jerusalem 1948: The Arab Neighbourhoods and Their Fate in the War*, Ed. Salim Tamari, Institute of Jerusalem Studies, Jerusalem, pp.10-29.
Ediz 2019	İsmail Ediz, "A Neoclassical Realist Explanation of The Balfour Declaration and The Origins of The British Foreign Policy In Palestine", *Tarih İncelemeleri Dergisi*, *34*(1), pp.99-122.
Freas 2017	Erik Freas, *Nationalism and the Haram al-Sharif/Temple Mount: The Exclusivity of Holiness*, Springer, New York.
Gerber 1985	Haim Gerber, *Ottoman Rule in Jerusalem, 1890–1914*, Klaus Schwarz, Berlin.
Gray 1908	B. Kirkman Gray, *Philanthropy and the State, or Social Politics*, P. S. King & Son Orchard House, London.
Hanssen 2005	Jens Hanssen, *Fin de siècle Beirut: The Making of An Ottoman Provincial Capital*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Hathaway and Barbir 2013	Jane Hathaway and Karl K. Barbir, *The Arab Lands under Ottoman Rule*, Routledge, London.

Hayen 2014	Nicholas Hayen, "Combating Insurgency in British Palestine", *Utah Historical Review*, (4), pp.145-170.
Holt 2013	Peter Malcolm Holt, *The Age Of The Crusades: The Near East From The Eleventh Century to 1517*, Routledge, London.
Hütteroth 1975	Wolf Dieter Hütteroth, "The Pattern of Settlement in Palestine in the Sixteenth Century", *Studies on Palestine During the Ottoman Period*, Ed. Mosheh Maʿoz, Magnes Press, Jerusalem, pp.3-10.
Iskandar et al. 2023	Iskandar Iskandar, Dadang Irsyamuddin, Esa Dwiyan and Hidayatul Ihsanet, "Waqf Substantial Contribution Toward the Public Healthcare Sector in the Ottoman Empire", *Journal of Critical Realism in Socio-Economics (JOCRISE)*, 1(3), pp.275-294.
Iskandar 2022	Iskandar Iskandar, "Waqf Institution and Management Cash Waqf During the Ottoman Period", *International Journal of Islamic Business and Economics (IJIBEC)*, 6(1), pp.37-51.
Jabareen 2010	Yosef Rafeq Jabareen, "The Politics of State Planning in Achieving Geopolitical Ends: The Case of the Recent Master Plan for Jerusalem", *International Development Planning Review*, 32(1), pp.27-43.
Jacobson 2011	Abigail Jacobson, *From Empire to Empire: Jerusalem Between Ottoman and British Rule*, Syracuse University Press, New York.
Jotischky 2015	Andrew Jotischky, "Politics and the Crown in the Kingdom of Jerusalem 1099–1187", *History Compass*, 13(11), pp.589-598.
Kark 1986	Ruth Kark, "The Contribution of the Ottoman Regime to the Development of Jerusalem and Jaffa, 1840–1917", *Palestine in the Late Ottoman Period: Political, Social, and Economic Transformation*, Ed. David Kushner, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, Jerusalem, pp.46-58.
Kawtharani 2018	Wajih Kawtharani, "The Ottoman Tanzimat and the Constitution", *AlMuntaqa*, 1(1), pp.51-65.
Knight 2011	John Knight, "Securing Zion? Policing in British Palestine, 1917–39", *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*, 18(4), pp.523-543.
Köksal 2002	Yonca Köksal, "Imperial Center and Local Groups: Tanzimat Reforms in the Provinces of Edirne and Ankara", *New Perspectives on Turkey*, (27), pp.107-138.
Köksal 2008	Yonca Köksal, "Rethinking Nationalism", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 51(10), pp.1498-1515.
Köse 2015	Feyza Betül Köse, "Osmanlı Dönemi Kudüs'ünde İdari ve Sosyal Yapı", *Ardahan Üniversitesi İnsani Bilimler ve Edebiyat Fakültesi Belgü Dergisi*, (1), pp.161-199.

Lafi 2013	Nora Lafi, "Mediterranean Cosmopolitanism and Its Contemporary Revivals: A Critical Approach", *New Geographies 5: The Mediterranean*, Ed. Antonio Petrov, Harvard University Graduate School of Design, Cambridge, pp.325-333.
Ma'oz 2014	Moshe Ma'oz, "The Role of the Temple Mount / Al-Haram Al-Sharif in the Deterioration of Muslim–Jewish Relations", *Approaching Religion*, 4(2), pp.60-70.
Maeir 2021	Aren M. Maeir, "On Defining Israel: Or, Let's Do the Kulturkreislehre Again!", *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel*, 10(2), pp.106-148.
Maritan 2022	Mario Maritan, "National Indifference and Dynastic Loyalty in Comparative Perspective: The Demise of the Habsburg and Ottoman Empires Revisited", *History Compass*, 20(12), pp.1-11.
Mazza 2009	Roberto Mazza, *Jerusalem: From The Ottomans to The British*, IB Tauris Publisers, London.
Mazza 2018	Roberto Mazza, "The Preservation and Safeguarding of the Amenities of the Holy City without Favour or Prejudice to Race or Creed: The Pro-Jerusalem Society and Ronald Storrs, 1917–1926", *Ordinary Jerusalem, 1840-1940: Opening New Archives, Revisiting a Global City*, Ed. Angelos Dalachanis, Vincent Lemire, Brill, Leiden, pp.403-422.
Muna and Stebia 2023	Izzatul Muna and Yasdi Stebia, "Ottoman Cash Waqf System: An Alternative to the Western Capitalist System", *Islamic Economics Journal*, 9(1), pp.101-116.
Naïli 2022	Falestin Naïli, "Jerusalem's Ottoman Municipality: An Actor in the Slow Transition from Communal Charity to Social Welfare?", *Endowment Studies*, 6(1-2), pp.109-129.
Najjar 2023	Raed Najjar, "Urban Planning and Land-Use Management in Jerusalem – Chronological Analysis: Urban Perspectives in Contested Cities", *Land-Use Management - Recent Advances, New Perspectives, and Applications*, Ed. Sérgio António, Neves Lousada, IntechOpen, London, pp.195-218.
Norris 2008	Jacob Norris, "Repression and Rebellion: Britain's Response to the Arab Revolt in Palestine of 1936–39", *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 36(1), pp.25-45.
Peri 1999	Oded Peri, "Islamic Law and Christian Holy Sites: Jerusalem and Its Vicinity in Early Ottoman Times", *Islamic Law and Society*, 6(1), pp.97-111.
Pullan and Sternberg 2012	

	Wendy Pullan and Maximilian Sternberg, "The Making of Jerusalem's 'Holy Basin'", *Planning Perspectives*, 27(2), pp.225-248.
Rabia 2001	Aref Abu Rabia, *A Bedouin Century: Education and Development Among the Negev Tribes in the 20th Century*, Berghahn Books, New York.
Rusydiana and Mi'raj 2022	
	Aam Slamet Rusydiana and Denizar Abdurrahman Mi'raj, "A Study of the Various Waqf Model in the Ottoman History", *Islamic Economics and History*, 1(1), pp.1-10.
Scholch 1990	Alexander Scholch, "Jerusalem in the 19th Century (1831–1917)", *Jerusalem in History*, Ed. Kamil Jamil Asali, Olive Branch Press, New York, pp.228–249.
Sharkansky 1995	Ira D. Sharkansky, "Policy Strategies of Accommodation or Domination in Jerusalem: An Historical Perspective", *Journal of Conflict Studies*, 15(1), pp.74-91.
Sharon 1975	Moshe Sharon, "The Political Role of the Bedouins in Palestine in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", *Studies on Palestine During the Ottoman Period*, Ed. Moshe Maʿoz, The Magnes Press, Jerusalem, pp.1-30.
Shehada 2020	Ziad M. Shehada, "The Influence of Ottoman Empire on the Conservation of the Architectural Heritage in Jerusalem", *Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, 10(1), pp.127-151.
Shlay and Rosen 2010	Anne B. Shlay ve Gillad Rosen, "Making Place: The Shifting Green Line and the Development of 'Greater' Metropolitan Jerusalem", *City & Community*, 9(4), pp.358–389.
Silberman 2001	Neil Asher Silberman, "If I Forget Thee, O Jerusalem: Archaeology, Religious Commemoration and Nationalism in a Disputed City, 1801–2001", *Nations and Nationalism*, 7(4), pp.487-504.
Smith 2017	Charles Smith, "Communal Conflict and Insurrection in Palestine, 1936–48", *Policing and Decolonisation: Politics, Nationalism and the Police*, Ed. David M. Anderson, David Killingray, Manchester University Press, Manchester, pp.62-83.
Storrs 1937	Ronald Storrs, *Orientations*, Ivor Nicholson and Watson Limited, London.
Tamari 2000	Salim Tamari, "Jerusalem's Ottoman Modernity: The Times and Lives of Wasif Jawhariyyeh", *Jerusalem Quarterly* (9), pp.5-27.
Thawaba 2009	Salem A. Thawaba, "Urban Growth of a City under Siege: Tulkarm, Palestine over the Past Century", *Journal of Planning History*, 8(1), pp.27-46.
Türkan and Uğurlu 2016	

Ahmet Türkan and Tuğberk Uğurlu, "XIX. Yüzyılda Kilise Rekabetlerinin Yaşandığı Kudüs'te Osmanlı'nın Uyguladığı Birlikte Yaşama ve Barış Kültürü Politikaları", *İslam Medeniyeti Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(1), pp.103-138.

Yiğit 2019   Ali Ata Yiğit, "Filistin Meselesinin Kronikleşmesi (1918-1948)", *Türk Dünyası Araştırmaları*, *123*(243), pp. 391-414.

Wavell 1946   Archibald Percival Wavell, *Allenby: Soldier and Statesman*, George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd., London.