

Chapter 1 : Prime Minister's Office - Overview

*CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE "His Majesty's Government Does Not Insist" GILLIARD could not have known it, but, from the earliest days of the revolution, an overriding preoccupation of the Provisional Government had been to get the Tsar and his family to safety.*

Chaim Weizmann resigned as president of the Jewish Agency, stating that the British had betrayed their promises. Endless letters of protest from all over the world barraged British officials. Many British government representatives distanced themselves from the White Paper, causing an uncomfortable atmosphere of dissent for Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald. To clear the air, MacDonald wrote a letter to Weizmann, in which he clarified the meaning of the White Paper. Jewish immigration would continue as it should, according to the letter: The obligation to facilitate Jewish immigration and make possible dense settlement of Jews on the land is still a positive obligation of the Mandate, and it can be fulfilled without jeopardizing the rights and conditions of the other part of the Palestine population. The letter also pointed out that Hope-Simpson had overestimated the effects of Jewish immigration on the Arab population. Jews who could find work would be allowed to immigrate. In a letter to MacDonald, the president of the Arab executive wrote that the letter had ruined any hope of cooperation between Arabs and Jews. That position has been reaffirmed and again made plain by my speech in the House of Commons on the 17th of November. In my speech on the 3rd of April, I used the following language: This is an international obligation from which there can be no question of receding. That is the duty from which they will not shrink and to discharge of which they will apply all the resources at their command. That declaration is in conformity not only with the articles but also with the preamble of the mandate, which is hereby explicitly reaffirmed. In carrying out the policy of the mandate the mandatory cannot ignore the existence of the differing interests and viewpoints. These, indeed, are not in themselves irreconcilable, but they can only be reconciled if there is a proper realization that the full solution of the problem depends upon an understanding between the Jews and the Arabs. Until that is reached, considerations of balance must inevitably enter into the definition of policy. A good deal of criticism has been directed to the White Paper upon the assertion that it contains injurious allegations against the Jewish people and Jewish labor organizations. It is recognized that the Jewish Agency have all along given willing cooperation in carrying out the policy of the mandate and that the constructive work done by the Jewish people in Palestine has had beneficial effects on the development and well-being of the country as a whole. These rights and position are not TO BE prejudiced; that is, are not to be impaired or made worse. The effect of the policy of immigration and settlement on the economic position of the non-Jewish community cannot be excluded from consideration. But the words are not to be read as implying that existing economic conditions in Palestine should be crystallized. On the contrary, the obligation to facilitate Jewish immigration and to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land remains a positive obligation of the mandate and it can be fulfilled without prejudice to the rights and position of other sections of the population of Palestine. We may proceed to the contention that the mandate has been interpreted in a manner highly prejudicial to Jewish interests in the vital matters of land settlement and immigration. It has been said that the policy of the White Paper would place an embargo on immigration and would suspend, if not indeed terminate, the close settlement of the Jews on the land, which is a primary purpose of the mandate. It is desirable to make it clear that the landless Arabs, to whom it was intended to refer in the passage quoted, were such Arabs as can be shown to have been displaced from the lands which they occupied in consequence of the land passing into Jewish hands, and who have not obtained other holdings on which they establish themselves, or other equally satisfactory occupation. The number of such displaced Arabs must be a matter for careful inquiry. It contains no such prohibition, nor is any such intended. What it does contemplate is such temporary control of land disposition and transfers as may be necessary not to impair the harmony and effectiveness of the scheme of land settlement to be undertaken. Cognate to this question is the control of immigration. It must first of all be pointed out that such control is not in any sense a departure from previous policy. From onward, when the original immigration ordinance came into force, regulations for the control of immigration have been issued

from time to time, directed to prevent illicit entry and to define and facilitate authorized entry. The right of regulation has at no time been challenged. They were concerned to state that, in the regulation of Jewish immigration, the following principles should apply: That principle is vital to any scheme of development, the primary purpose of which must be the settlement both of Jews and of displaced Arabs on the land. The considerations relevant to the limits of absorptive capacity are purely economic considerations. The practice of sanctioning a labor schedule of wage-earning immigrants will continue. In each case consideration will be given to anticipated labor requirements for works which, being dependent upon Jewish or mainly Jewish capital, would not be or would not have been undertaken unless Jewish labor was available. With regard to public and municipal works failing to be financed out of public funds, the claim of Jewish labor to a due share of the employment available, taking into account Jewish contributions to public revenue, shall be taken into consideration. As regards others kinds of employment, it will be necessary in each case to take into account the factors bearing upon the demand for labor, including the factor of unemployment among both the Jews and the Arabs. Immigrants with prospects of employment other than employment of a purely ephemeral character will not be excluded on the sole ground that the employment cannot be guaranteed to be of unlimited duration. The principle of preferential, and indeed exclusive, employment of Jewish labor by Jewish organizations is a principle which the Jewish Agency are entitled to affirm. But it must be pointed out that if in consequence of this policy Arab labor is displaced or existing unemployment becomes aggravated, that is a factor in the situation to which the mandatory is bound to have regard. But if their efforts are to be successful, there is need for cooperation, confidence, readiness on all sides to appreciate the difficulties and complexities of the problem, and, above all, there must be a full and unqualified recognition that no solution can be satisfactory or permanent which is not based upon justice, both to the Jewish people and to the non-Jewish communities of Palestine.

Chapter 2 : 1 Corinthians - ESV - or rude. It does not insist on

*The Government of the United Kingdom, formally referred to as Her Majesty's Government, is the central government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. It is also commonly referred to as simply the UK Government or the British Government.*

This is called responsible government. The United Kingdom is a constitutional monarchy in which the reigning monarch that is, the King or Queen who is the Head of State at any given time does not make any open political decisions. All political decisions are taken by the government and Parliament. This constitutional state of affairs is the result of a long history of constraining and reducing the political power of the monarch, beginning with the Magna Carta in Parliament is split into two houses: The House of Commons is the lower house and is the more powerful. The House of Lords is the upper house and although it can vote to amend proposed laws, the House of Commons can usually vote to overrule its amendments. Although the House of Lords can introduce bills, most important laws are introduced in the House of Commons " and most of those are introduced by the government, which schedules the vast majority of parliamentary time in the Commons. Parliamentary time is essential for bills to be passed into law, because they must pass through a number of readings before becoming law. Ministers of the Crown are responsible to the House in which they sit; they make statements in that House and take questions from members of that House. For most senior ministers this is usually the elected House of Commons rather than the House of Lords. There have been some recent exceptions to this: A similar convention applies to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It would likely be politically unacceptable for the budget speech to be given in the Lords, with MPs unable to directly question the Chancellor, especially now that the Lords have very limited powers in relation to money bills. The last Chancellor of the Exchequer to be a member of the House of Lords was Lord Denman , who served as interim Chancellor of the Exchequer for one month in By convention, if a government loses the confidence of the House of Commons it must either resign or a General Election is held. The support of the Lords, while useful to the government in getting its legislation passed without delay, is not vital. A government is not required to resign even if it loses the confidence of the Lords and is defeated in key votes in that House. The House of Commons is thus the Responsible house. There are also departmental questions when ministers answer questions relating to their specific departmental brief. Unlike PMQs both the cabinet ministers for the department and junior ministers within the department may answer on behalf of the government, depending on the topic of the question. During debates on legislation proposed by the government, ministers" usually with departmental responsibility for the bill " will lead the debate for the government and respond to points made by MPs or Lords. Committees [9] of both the House of Commons and House of Lords hold the government to account, scrutinise its work and examine in detail proposals for legislation. Ministers appear before committees to give evidence and answer questions. Government ministers are also required by convention and the Ministerial Code , [10] when Parliament is sitting, to make major statements regarding government policy or issues of national importance to Parliament. This allows MPs or Lords to question the government on the statement. When the government instead chooses to make announcements first outside Parliament, it is often the subject of significant criticism from MPs and the Speaker of the House of Commons. The monarch takes little direct part in governing the country, and remains neutral in political affairs. However, the legal authority of the state that is vested in the sovereign, known as The Crown , remains the source of the executive power exercised by the government. In addition to explicit statutory authority , in many areas the Crown also possesses a body of powers known as the Royal Prerogative , which can be used for many purposes, from the issue or withdrawal of passports to declaration of war. By long-standing custom, most of these powers are delegated from the sovereign to various ministers or other officers of the Crown, who may use them without having to obtain the consent of Parliament. The head of the government, the prime minister , also has weekly meetings with the monarch, when she "has a right and a duty to express her views on Government matters These meetings, as with all communications between The Queen and her Government, remain strictly confidential. Having expressed her views, The Queen abides by the advice of her ministers. Domestic powers[

edit ] The power to appoint and also, in theory, dismiss a prime minister. This power is exercised by the monarch herself. By convention she appoints and is expected to appoint the individual most likely to be capable of commanding the confidence of a majority in the House of Commons. The power to dismiss and appoint other ministers. This power is exercised by the monarch on the advice of the prime minister. The power to assent to and enact laws by giving [Royal] Assent to Bills passed by both Houses of Parliament, which is required in order for a law to from a passed Bill make it into the Statute Books i. This is exercised by the monarch, who also theoretically has the power to refuse assent, although no monarch has refused assent to a bill passed by Parliament since Queen Anne in The power to give and to issue commissions to commissioned officers in the Armed Forces. The power to issue and also to suspend, cancel, recall, impound, withdraw or revoke British passports and the general power to provide or deny British passport facilities to British citizens and British nationals. The Royal Prerogative of mercy although capital punishment has been abolished thereby removing the need to use this power to issue pardons to commute a death penalty imposed, usually substituted into life imprisonment in lieu , this power is still used under rare circumstances e. The power to grant and also to cancel and annul honours. The power to create corporations including the status of being a city, with its own corporation by Royal Charter , and also to amend, replace and revoke existing charters.

**Chapter 3 : Her Majesty's Government (term) - Wikipedia**

*The phrase Her Majesty's Government (His Majesty's Government during the reign of a male monarch) is a formal term referring to the government of a Commonwealth realm or one of constituent provinces, states or territories.*

By using either unbecoming words, or doing indecent actions; for a man unprincipled with this grace will be careful that no filthy and corrupt communication proceed out of his mouth, which may offend pious ears; and that he uses no ridiculous and ludicrous gestures, which may expose himself and grieve the saints; accordingly the Syriac version renders it, "neither does it commit that which is shameful": Some understand it in this sense, that one endued with this grace thinks nothing unseemly and unbecoming him, however mean it may appear, in which he can be serviceable to men, and promote the honour of religion and interest of Christ; though it be by making coats and garments for the poor, as Dorcas did; or by washing the feet of the saints, in imitation of his Lord and master: This word occurs in 1 Corinthians 7: See the note on that verse. It means to conduct improperly, or disgracefully, or in a manner to deserve reproach. Love seeks that which is proper or becoming in the circumstances and relations of life in which we are placed. The proper idea of the phrase is, that it prompts to all that is fit and becoming in life; and would save from all that is unfit and unbecoming. There may be included in the word also the idea that it would prevent anything that would be a violation of decency or delicacy. It is well known that the Cynics were in the habit of setting at defiance all the usual ideas of decency; and indeed this was, and is, commonly done in the temples of idolatry and pollution everywhere. In the same way it prompts to the fit discharge of all the relative duties, because it leads to the desire to promote the happiness of all. And in the same manner it would lead a man to avoid profane and indecent language, improper allusions, double meanings and inuendoes, coarse and vulgar expressions, because such things pain the ear, and offend the heart of purity and delicacy. There is much that is indecent and unseemly still in society that would be corrected by Christian love. Seeketh not her own - There is, perhaps, not a more striking or important expression in the New Testament than this; or one that more beautifully sets forth the nature and power of that love which is produced by true religion. Its evident meaning is, that it is not selfish; it does not seek its own happiness exclusively or mainly; it does not seek its own happiness to the injury of others. This expression is not, however, to be pressed as if Paul meant to teach that a man should not regard his own welfare at all; or have no respect to his health, his property, his happiness, or his salvation. Every man is bound to pursue such a course of life as will ultimately secure his own salvation. But it is not simply or mainly that he may be happy that he is to seek it. It is, that he may thus glorify God his Saviour; and accomplish the great design which his Maker has had in view in his creation and redemption. If his happiness is the main or leading thing, it proves that he is supremely selfish; and selfishness is not religion. True religion, or love to others, will prompt us to seek their welfare with self-denial, and personal sacrifice and toil. Similar expressions, to denote comparison, occur frequently in the sacred Scriptures. Thus, where it is said Hosea 7: Love to others will prompt to that, and that alone. There is not a particle of selfishness in true love. It seeks the welfare of others, and of all others. It follows from this statement: Long since the whole world would have been converted, had all Christians been under its influence. Then there will be no lack of funds to spread Bibles and tracts; to sustain missionaries, or to establish colleges and schools; then there will be no lack of people who shall be willing to go to any part of the earth to preach the gospel; and then there will be no lack of prayer to implore the divine mercy on a ruined and perishing world. O may the time soon come when all the selfishness in the human heart shall be dissolved, and when the whole world shall be embraced in the benevolence of Christians, and the time, and talent, and wealth of the whole church shall be regarded as consecrated to God, and employed and expended under the influence of Christian love! Compare the note at 1 Corinthians This word occurs in the New Testament only in one other place. Here it means evidently to rouse to anger; to excite to indignation or wrath. The translators have inserted it to convey the idea that he who is under the influence of love, though he may be provoked, that is, injured, or though there might be incitements to anger, yet that he would not be roused, or readily give way to it. He is calm, serious, patient. He looks soberly at things; and though he may be injured, yet he governs his passions, restrains his temper, subdues his

feelings. This, Paul says, would be produced by love. And this is apparent. If we are under the influence of benevolence, or love to anyone, we shall not give way to sudden bursts of feeling. We shall look kindly on his actions; put the best construction on his motives; deem it possible that we have mistaken the nature or the reasons of his conduct; seek or desire explanation Matthew 5: That true religion is designed to produce this, is apparent everywhere in the New Testament, and especially from the example of the Lord Jesus; that it actually does produce it, is apparent from all who come under its influence in any proper manner. The effect of religion is no where else more striking and apparent than in changing a temper naturally quick, excitable, and irritable, to one that is calm, and gentle, and subdued. A consciousness of the presence of God will do much to produce this state of mind; and if we truly loved all people, we should be soon angry with none. Thinketh no evil - That is, puts the best possible construction on the motives and the conduct of others. It is not disposed to think that there was any evil in the case; or that what was done was with any improper intention or design; that is, it puts the best possible construction on the conduct of others, and supposes, as far as can be done, that it was in consistency with honesty, truth, friendship, and love. We desire to think well of the man whom we love; nor will we think ill of his motives, opinions, or conduct until we are compelled to do so by the most unbreakable evidence. True religion, therefore, will prompt to charitable judging; nor is there a more striking evidence of the destitution of true religion than a disposition to impute the worst motives and opinions to a man. No ill-bred man, or what is termed rude or unmannerly, is a Christian. A man may have a natural bluntness, or be a clown, and yet there be nothing boorish or hoggish in his manner. I must apologize for using such words; they best express the evil against which I wish both powerfully and successfully to declaim. I never wish to meet with those who affect to be called "blunt, honest men;" who feel themselves above all the forms of respect and civility, and care not how many they put to pain, or how many they displease. But let me not be misunderstood; I do not contend for ridiculous ceremonies, and hollow compliments; there is surely a medium: Even that people who profess to be above all worldly forms, and are generally stiff enough, yet are rarely found to be rude, uncivil, or ill-bred. See Bishop Pearce, and see the notes on 1 Corinthians 1: Love is never satisfied but in the welfare, comfort, and salvation of all. That man is no Christian who is solicitous for his own happiness alone; and cares not how the world goes, so that himself be comfortable. How the word easily got into our translation it is hard to say; but, however it got in, it is utterly improper, and has nothing in the original to countenance it. By the transcript from my old MS. The New Testament, printed in , 4to. The edition published in English in the following year, , has the same rendering, but the orthography better: The Bible in folio, with notes, published the next year, , by Edmund Becke, preserves nearly the same reading, is not provoketh to anger. The large folio printed by Richard Cardmarden, at Rouen, , has the same reading. The translation made and printed by the command of King James I. Bible printed at London four years after, , not only retains this original and correct reading, it is not provoked to anger, but has the word love every where in this chapter instead of charity, in which all the preceding versions and editions agree. In short, this is the reading of Coverdale, Matthews, Cranmer, the Geneva, and others; and our own authorized version is the only one which I have seen where this false reading appears. It is of importance to make these observations, because the common version of this place destroys the meaning of the apostle, and makes him speak very improperly. If love is provoked at all; it then ceases to be love; and if it be not easily provoked, this grants, as almost all the commentators say, that in special cases it may be provoked; and this they instance in the case of Paul and Barnabas, Acts When the man who possesses this love gives way to provocation, he loses the balance of his soul, and grieves the Spirit of God. In that instant he ceases from loving God with all his soul, mind, and strength; and surely if he get embittered against his neighbor, he does not love him as himself. It is generally said that, though a man may feel himself highly irritated against the sin, he may feel tender concern for the sinner. Irritation of any kind is inconsistent with self-government, and consequently with internal peace and communion with God. However favourably we may think of our own state, and however industrious we may be to find out excuses for sallies of passion, etc. His heart is so governed and influenced by the love of God, that he cannot think of evil but where it appears. The original implies that he does not invent or devise any evil; or, does not reason on any particular act or word so as to infer evil from it; for this would destroy his love to his brother; it would be ruinous to charity and benevolence.

**Chapter 4 : His Majesty appoints interim government – KuenselOnline**

*His Majesty The King granted a Kasho appointing the Interim Government yesterday at the Tashichhodzong. In accordance with the Constitution, His Majesty The King appointed the Chief Justice Tshering Wangchuk, as the Chief Advisor of the Interim Government.*

The last Tsar of Russia, Nicholas II, came to the throne in October , before the widespread production of postcards. Thus the postcards that we have are only of him and his family, as none were produced before his reign. Nicholas abdicated in under pressure from the revolutionaries in Russia, and in he, his wife Alexandra, their son Alexei and their four daughters Olga, Maria, Tatiana and Anastasia, were executed near Ekaterinburg. Their bodies were buried in a pit and burned. Some of the postcards which appear here were produced by Russian emigres in France to commemorate their ruler. Others were printed whilst the Tsar was still in power. This poor lad suffered from haemophilia, a disease which in those days could not be treated, and as a result spent much of his life in intense pain. Doctors could not help and only the monk Rasputin seemed to be able to bring about any relief. This enabled Rasputin to have an ever increasing influence over first Alexandra and then Nicholas - so much influence that finally a group of Russian noblemen, led by Felix Yusupov, decided to kill him. The story of the assassination is fascinating - see our book illness was kept secret from the Russian people. No date for this postcard, but at the time of their execution, Olga was 23 and Tatiana Several women claimed to be her, the most notorious being Anna Anderson, and whilst remaining members of the Romanovs did not believe she was Anastasia, many people did, even though police investigations showed otherwise. On her death in , DNA tests showed that she was not a Romanov, and subsequent investigations and DNA tests by the Russian Government have proved conclusively that Anastasia perished with her family. Note the physical resemblance between the Czar and the Prince of Wales - they were first cousins. However, the revolutionaries in Russia did not want the Romanovs to leave the country and perhaps organise a counter revolution, and for a while there was a stand-off between the two sides. Meanwhile, although The British Government at first agreed, many in the UK were opposed to offering the Tsar asylum, and King George, realising that to receive the Tsar might cause him serious unpopularity, reluctantly suggested to the Prime Minister, David Lloyd George, that Britain should not welcome the Russian royals. The postcard on the left shows Livadia Palace which is situated in Livadia , near Yalta. The Imperial family used to spend their summers there. The Yalta Conference was held here in Since then the building has housed a museum, and is sometimes used for international conferences. Postcards of the Past Custom Search In conjunction with Zazzle, we have produced an extensive range of gifts, using images from these old postcards. The items available include many reproduction postcards, coffee mugs, greetings cards, key chains, fridge magnets, watches etc. Many images on these pages have a direct link to a reproduction postcard - just click on the image to see and buy it! Or, to view more gifts based on our old postcards, follow this link.

Chapter 5 : Government of the United Kingdom - Wikipedia

*romanov family: their british cousins' offer of asylum The Romanov family with their British cousins: King Edward VII and future King George V and family. Most of us heard the story of King George V of England rescinding on his offer of asylum to the Romanov family in , but here is the first hand account of the Head of the Provisional.*

In , the Meiji Constitution was adopted in a move to strengthen Japan to the level of western nations, resulting in the first parliamentary system in Asia. Members of the House of Peers were made up of the Imperial Family , the Kazoku, and those nominated by the Emperor, [16] while members of the House of Representatives were elected by direct male suffrage. He is defined by the Constitution to be "the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people". He has no real powers related to the Government as stated clearly in article 4 of the Constitution. Appointment of the Prime Minister as designated by the Diet. While the Cabinet is the source of executive power and most of its power is exercised directly by the Prime Minister , several of its powers are exercised by the Emperor. The powers exercised via the Emperor, as stipulated by Article 7 of the Constitution, are: Promulgation of amendments of the constitution, laws, cabinet orders and treaties. Convocation of the Diet. Dissolution of the House of Representatives. Proclamation of general election of members of the Diet. Attestation of the appointment and dismissal of Ministers of State and other officials as provided for by law, and of full powers and credentials of Ambassadors and Ministers. Attestation of general and special amnesty, commutation of punishment, reprieve, and restoration of rights. Attestation of instruments of ratification and other diplomatic documents as provided for by law. Receiving foreign ambassadors and ministers. Performance of ceremonial functions. The Emperor is known to hold the nominal ceremonial authority. For example, the Emperor is the only person that has the authority to appoint the Prime Minister , even though the Diet has the power to designate the person fitted for the position. One such example can be prominently seen in the Dissolution of the House of Representatives. The House was expected to be dissolved on the advice of the Prime Minister, but was temporarily unable to do so for the next general election, as both the Emperor and Empress were visiting Canada. Instead, the Emperor represents the State and appoints other high officials in the name of the State, in which the Japanese people hold sovereignty. He was officially enthroned on November 12, The Prime Minister is the head of the Cabinet , and is designated by the legislative organ, the National Diet. The practice of its powers is responsible to the Diet, and as a whole, should the Cabinet lose confidence and support to be in office by the Diet, the Diet may dismiss the Cabinet en masse with a motion of no confidence. The Prime Minister heads the Cabinet and exercises "control and supervision" of the executive branch, and is the head of government and commander-in-chief of the Japan Self-Defense Forces. Under the Constitution, should both houses not agree on a common candidate, then a joint committee is allowed to be established to agree on the matter; specifically within a period of ten days, exclusive of the period of recess.

Chapter 6 : His Majesty's Theatre | Perth Theatre Trust

*The South East Governors' Forum has condemned last Tuesday's reported 'attempted assassination' of the Deputy Senate President, Ike Ekweremadu, and some members of his family, insisting.*

The Royal Decree directs the interim government to ensure uninterrupted continuance of the routine functions of the government until the new Prime Minister enters office after the new National Assembly has been constituted. The former chief justice and chairman of the drafting committee of the Constitution, Sonam Tobgye said that the 15 days period has significant meaning. If this provision was not kept and that the interim government was to be appointed the very next day after the government leaves, then it might appear in our culture as if we have waited for the term of the government to end and get rid of them. Bhutan, through the adoption of the Constitution, chose to have an interim government over a caretaker government. While the system had its flaws, it was the better option. Then numerous measures were put in place to remedy those flaws that existed in this kind of governance in other parts of the world, he said. The Constitution states that the Interim Government shall cease to exist from the date on which the new Prime Minister enters office when the new National Assembly is constituted. The former chief justice said that in other countries, some governments refused to leave their office. On other occasions, the caretaker governments refuse to hand over the reign of the government and leave office. Throughout the world, the electoral reforms suggest that long period campaign is expensive, great harassment for the people, and not good for the country. Some countries have unlimited campaign period. What if the elections cannot be conducted in three months? Calling the NA elections in a short period also had its disadvantages, therefore, it was suggested for three to six months term. Thinking back, three months was bit too long as there is harassment. Certainly, in two months they can do primary and general rounds but three months is all right and it can be conducted. Under the parliamentary form of government, it works with aid and advice to the King who is the head of the state. In the UK Parliament, the Queen is the first to know of any decision the government takes. Handing over the reins of governance, the out-going prime minister, at a press conference Dasho Tshering Tobgay said that his Cabinet resigned from office formally yesterday morning. The last thing he did before leaving office, was clearing the table in his office and meeting the officials from the Gross National Happiness Commission. He said, he then offered a prayer as he left the room.

**Chapter 7 : Balfour Declaration letter written - HISTORY**

*The British offer was withdrawn - "His Majesty's Government does not insist on its The items available include many reproduction postcards, coffee mugs, greetings.*

The figures taken from official returns for the export of copper from the United States for Italy for the months during which the war has been in progress up to the end of the first three weeks of December are as follows: The corresponding figures under this heading are as follows: We believe that this rule has been adhered to in practice hitherto, but if the United States Government have instances to the contrary, we are prepared to examine them, and it is our present intention to adhere to the rule, though we can not give an unlimited and unconditional undertaking in view of the departure by those against whom we are fighting from hitherto accepted rules of civilization and humanity and the uncertainty as to the extent to which such rules may be violated by them in future. From the 4th of August last to the 3d of January the number of steamships proceeding from the United States for Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Italy has been Of these there are 45 which have had consignments or cargoes placed in the prize court while of the ships themselves only 8 have been placed in the prize court and 1 of these has since been released. It is, however, essential under modern conditions that where there is real ground for suspecting the presence of contraband, the vessels should be brought into port for examination: Information was received by us that special instructions had been given to ship rubber from the United States under another designation to escape notice, and such cases have occurred in several instances. Only by search in a port can such cases, when suspected, be discovered and proved. The necessity for examination in a port may also be illustrated by a hypothetical instance, connected with cotton, which has not yet occurred. There has never been any foundation for this allegation. But information has reached us that, precisely because we have declared our intention of not interfering with cotton, ships carrying cotton will be specially selected to carry concealed contraband; and we have been warned that copper will be concealed in bales of cotton. Whatever suspicions we have entertained, we have not so far made these a ground for detaining any ship carrying cotton, but should we have information giving us real reason to believe in the case of a particular ship that the bales of cotton concealed copper or other contraband, the only way to prove our case would be to examine and weigh the bales; a process that could be carried out only by bringing the vessel into a port. We are confronted with the growing danger that neutral countries contiguous to the enemy will become on a scale hitherto unprecedented a base of supplies for the armed forces of our enemies and for materials for manufacturing armament. The trade figures of imports show how strong this tendency is, but we have no complaint to make of the attitude of the governments of those countries, which so far as we are aware have not departed from proper rules of neutrality. We endeavour in the interest of our own national safety to prevent this danger by intercepting goods really destined for the enemy without interfering with those which are bona fide neutral Grey Order in Council of March, 11, Whereas the German Government has issued certain orders which, in violation of the usages of war, purport to declare the waters surrounding the United Kingdom a military area, in which all British and allied merchant vessels will be destroyed irrespective of the safety of the lives of passengers and crew, and in which neutral shipping will be exposed to similar danger in view of the uncertainties of naval warfare; and. Whereas such attempts on the part of the enemy give to His Majesty an unquestionable right of retaliation; and Whereas His Majesty has therefore decided to adopt further measures in order to prevent commodities of any kind from reaching or leaving Germany, though such measures will be enforced without risk to neutral ships or to neutral or non-combatant life and in strict observance of the dictates of humanity; and Whereas the Allies of His Majesty are associated with him in the steps now to be announced for restricting further the commerce of Germany; His Majesty is therefore pleased, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to order and it is hereby ordered as follows: No merchant vessel which sailed from her port of departure after the 1st March shall be allowed to proceed on her voyage to any German port. Unless the vessel receives a pass enabling her to proceed to some neutral or allied port to be named in the pass, goods on board any such vessel must be discharged in a British port and placed in the custody of the Marshal of the Prize Court. Goods so discharged, not being contraband of

war, shall, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, be restored by order of the Court, upon such terms as the Court may in the circumstances deem to be just, to the person entitled thereto. No merchant vessel which sailed from any German port after the 1st March shall be allowed to proceed on her voyage with any goods on board laden at such port. All goods laden at such port must be discharged in a British or allied port. Goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the Prize Court, and, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, shall be detained or sold under the direction of the Prize Court. The proceeds of goods so sold shall be paid into Court and dealt with in such manner as the Court may in the circumstances deem to be just. Provided, that no proceeds of the sale of such goods shall be paid out of Court until the conclusion of peace, except on the application of the proper officer of the Crown, unless it be shown that the goods had become neutral property before the issue of this Order. Provided also, that nothing herein shall prevent the release of neutral property laden at such enemy port on the application of the proper officer of the Crown. Every merchant vessel which sailed from her port of departure after the 1st March on her way to a port other than a German port, carrying goods with an enemy destination, or which are enemy property, may be required to discharge such goods in a British or allied port. Any goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the Prize Court, and, unless they are contraband of war, shall, if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, be restored by order of the Court, upon such terms as the Court may in the circumstances deem to be just to the person entitled thereto. Provided, that this Article shall not apply in any case falling within Articles 2 or 4 of this Order. Every merchant vessel which sailed from a port other than a German port after the 1st March having on board goods which are of enemy origin or are enemy property may be required to discharge such goods in a British or allied port. Goods so discharged in a British port shall be placed in the custody of the marshal of the Prize Court, and if not requisitioned for the use of His Majesty, shall be detained or sold under the direction of the Prize Court. The proceeds of goods so sold shall be paid into Court and dealt with in such manner as the Court may in the circumstances deem to be just. Provided, that no proceeds of sale of such goods shall be paid out of Court until the conclusion of peace except on the application of the proper officer of the Crown, unless it be shown that the goods had become neutral property before the issue of this order. Provided also, that nothing herein shall prevent the release of neutral property of enemy origin on the application of the proper officer of the Crown. Any person claiming to be interested in, or to have any claim in respect of, any goods not being contraband of war placed in the custody of the marshal of the Prize Court under this order, or in the proceeds of such goods, may forthwith issue a writ in the Prize Court against the proper officer of the Crown and apply for an order that the goods should be restored to him, or that their proceeds should be paid to him, or for such other order as the circumstances of the case may require. The practice and procedure of the Prize Court shall, so far as applicable, be followed *mutatis mutandi* in any proceedings consequential upon this Order. A merchant vessel which has cleared for a neutral port from a British or allied port, or which has been allowed to pass having an ostensible destination to a neutral port, and proceeds to an enemy port, shall, if captured on any subsequent voyage, be liable to condemnation. Nothing in this Order shall be deemed to affect the liability of any vessel or goods to capture or condemnation independently of this Order. Nothing in this Order shall prevent the relaxation of the provisions of this Order in respect of the merchant vessels of any country which declares that no commerce intended for or originating in Germany or belonging to German subjects shall enjoy the protection of its flag. Secretary of State Bryan to Ambassador Page: The Government of the United States has given careful consideration to the subjects treated in the British notes of March 13 and March 15, and to the British order in council of the latter date. These communications contain matters of grave importance to neutral nations. They appear to menace their rights of trade and intercourse not only with belligerents but also with one another. They call for frank comment in order that misunderstandings may be avoided. The Government of the United States deems it its duty, therefore, speaking in the sincerest spirit of friendship, to make its own view and position with regard to them unmistakably clear. The order in council of the 15th of March would constitute, were its provisions to be actually carried into effect as they stand, a practical assertion of unlimited belligerent rights over neutral commerce within the whole European area, and an almost unqualified denial of the sovereign rights of the nations now at peace. This Government takes it for granted that there can be no question what those rights are.

It is even conceded the right to detain and take to its own ports for judicial examination all vessels which it suspects for substantial reasons to be engaged in unneutral or contraband service and to condemn them if the suspicion is sustained. But such rights, long clearly defined both in doctrine and practice, have hitherto been held to be the only permissible exceptions to the principle of universal equality of sovereignty on the high seas as between belligerents and nations not engaged in war. And no claim on the part of Great Britain of any justification for interfering with these clear rights of the United States and its citizens as neutrals could be admitted. To admit it would be to assume an attitude of unneutrality toward the present enemies of Great Britain which would be obviously inconsistent with the solemn obligations of this Government in the present circumstances; and for Great Britain to make such a claim would be for her to abandon and set at naught the principles for which she has consistently and earnestly contended in other times and circumstances. But the novel and quite unprecedented feature of that blockade, if we are to assume it to be properly so defined, is that it embraces many neutral ports and coasts, bars access to them, and subjects all neutral ships seeking to approach them to the same suspicion that would attach to them were they bound for the ports of the enemies of Great Britain, and to unusual risks and penalties. It is manifest that such limitations, risks, and liabilities placed upon the ships of a neutral power on the high seas, beyond the right of visit and search and the right to prevent the shipment of contraband already referred to, are a distinct invasion of the sovereign rights of the nation whose ships, trade, or commerce are interfered with. The Government of the United States is, of course, not oblivious to the great changes which have occurred in the conditions and means of naval warfare since the rules hitherto governing legal blockade were formulated. It might be ready to admit that the old form of close blockade with its cordon of ships in the immediate offing of the blockaded ports is no longer practicable in face of an enemy possessing the means and opportunity to make an effective defense by the use of submarines, mines, and aircraft; but it can hardly be maintained that, whatever form of effective blockade may be made use of, it is impossible to conform at least to the spirit and principles of the established rules of war. If the necessities of the case should seem to render it imperative that the cordon of blockading vessels be extended across the approaches to any neighboring neutral port or country, it would seem clear that it would still be easily practicable to comply with the well-recognized and reasonable prohibition of international law against the blockading of neutral ports by according free admission and exit to all lawful traffic with neutral ports through the blockading cordon. This traffic would of course include all outward-bound traffic from the neutral country and all inward-bound traffic to the neutral country except contraband in transit to the enemy. Such procedure need not conflict in any respect with the rights of the belligerent maintaining the blockade since the right would remain with the blockading vessels to visit and search all ships either entering or leaving the neutral territory which they were in fact, but not of right, investing. As stated in its communication of October 22., "This Government will insist that the rights and duties of the United States and its citizens in the present war be defined by the existing rules of international law and the treaties of the United States, irrespective of the provisions of the Declaration of London, and that this Government reserves to itself the right to enter a protest or demand in each case in which those rights and duties so defined are violated, or their free exercise interfered with, by the authorities of the British Government.

**Chapter 8 : Postcards of the Past - Old Postcards of the Russian Royal Family**

*It does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; 6 it does not rejoice at wrongdoing, but rejoices with the truth. 7 Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.*

Your Majesty, I am honoured to convey the greetings of our Government and my own, as well as some of our views concerning the issue of Western Sahara. As you are aware your Majesty, a number of years ago our then President, Nelson Mandela, announced a decision of our Government to recognise and establish diplomatic relations with the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic SADR consistent with earlier decisions of the OAU which our country joined in. The same view was communicated to us when we took over the Presidency of our country. The argument advanced was that we should give negotiations being carried out under the auspices of the UN Security Council and the UN Secretary General a chance to succeed. It was said that our recognition of SADR would seriously undermine these ongoing negotiations. We respected and valued the views expressed by the King and Government of Morocco, leaders of other countries with which we maintain friendly relations and the United Nations. Consistently, we have informed the leadership of the Front of our determination to pay heed to the advice and requests of leaders whose views we valued. We did not hide the fact that these had advised against the recognition of SADR. We indicated to the Front our belief that our respect of this advice was the best contribution we could make to the successful implementation of the peace plan and other proposals that would lead to the holding of a referendum that would give the people of Western Sahara the possibility to exercise their right to self-determination. Kofi Annan, in which he said: The issue of the sovereignty is, of course, the fundamental issue which has divided the parties for all these years. Morocco does not accept the settlement plan to which it has agreed for many years. As Your Majesty knows, this reply makes the categorical statements that: We are fully in agreement with the Security Council that the question of Western Sahara must be resolved on the basis of this commitment. Accordingly, when we delayed recognition of SADR this was in the basis that both Morocco and the Polisario Front were working with the UN SG and the Security Council to agree on the modalities of a process that would allow the people western Sahara to exercise their right to self-determination, in a manner consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant documents of the OAU and AU. However, the April 9, Reply of the Government of Morocco to the UN peace plan unequivocally seeks to deny the people of Western Sahara their right to self-determination, contrary both to fundamental and inviolable international law and the earlier solemn commitments made by the Government of Morocco. With regard to the later consideration, I am convinced that the UN SG and his personal envoy are correct to conclude that Morocco does not accept the settlement plan to which it had agreed for many years, and that it also now does not accept essential elements of the peace plan. Your Government then proceeds to define these parameters as an autonomy solution that would rule of the possibility for the independence option to be submitted to the population of Western Sahara. You must agree, Your Majesty, this constitutes undisguised attempt to deny the very right to self-determination the UN is bound by its Charter to defend and advance, whose exercise by the people of Western Sahara it has sought for almost two decades. We have in the past expressed our profound and unequivocal appreciation of the important contribution that Morocco made to our own struggle for self-determination, within the specific contexts of the struggle against the apartheid system in our country. This created a strong base for the development of the world relations of friendship and solidarity both our countries have successfully sought to build since our liberation in. In this regard, we have regretted and continue to regret the fact that, owing to unresolved question of Western Sahara, Morocco is not able to play its due role in the renewal of our continent as a full and active member of the OAU and the AU. At the same time, with regard to the similarly outstanding and critically important issue of Palestine, we have also worked on the basis that our countries are united in their resolve to do everything in their power to help ensure that the Palestinian people also exercise their right to self-determination, up to and including independence. All these conclusions have emanated from the experience to which we were exposed during the most difficult periods in our own history, when the King Mohamed V and Hassan II, the Governments and people of Morocco adopted

and stuck to the principled position that we and our people had to be supported to exercise our right to self-determination. We took it as a matter of faith that even with regards to the issue of Western Sahara, regardless of the history of colonisation in this part of Africa, Morocco would remain true to its tradition of loyalty to the principle of self-determination for all peoples. We thought we understood that the central objective Morocco was pursuing in the UN led negotiations was to ensure that the people of Western Sahara exercised their right to self-determination, without let or hindrance, while rejoicing in the conviction that they would decide freely to become part of Morocco. Most regrettably, the April 9, Reply of the Government of Morocco to the personal envoy of the UN SG has convinced us that we were mistaken in this view. It now seems clear that Morocco has absolutely no intention to respect the right of the people of Western Sahara to determine their destiny. It is therefore, out of the question for Morocco to engage in negotiations with anyone over its sovereignty and territorial integrity. And yet, as with question of Palestine, the issue of Western Sahara ineluctably includes matters of territory and sovereignty over this territory. To insist that these should not be an inherent part of any solution is to argue that no just solution should be sought. Recent developments arising from the decisions of your Government make it impossible for us to continue to hope that our recognition of SADR is a material factor in favour of what the Security Council described as a just, lasting and mutually acceptable political solution, which would provide for the self-determination of the people of Western Sahara. The avoidable cul-de-sac caused by the positions advanced by the Government of Morocco has created the situation that any further delay on our part to recognise SADR will inevitably translate into an abandonment of our support of the right of the people of Western Sahara to self-determination. For us not to recognise SADR in this situation is to become an accessory to the denial of then people of Western Sahara of their right to self-determination. This would constitute a grave and unacceptable betrayal of our own struggle, of the solidarity Morocco extended to us, and our commitment to respect the Charter of the United Nations and the constitutive act of the African Union. It would also suggest that what I have just said is mere words, with no obligations on us to respect solemn international agreements. Your Majesty may also be aware of the fact that the recent Assembly of the African Union agreed that our country should host the Pan African Parliament. The people of Western Sahara will be entitled to send their elected delegates to this parliament, as representatives of the people of SADR. It would clearly be untenable that we should deny these delegates entry into our country on the basis that we do not recognise them as legitimate representatives originating from an African State that is recognised by the AU and participates in its works as a Member State. It would be a matter of great joy to us if the breathing space this extension provides could be used finally to conclude the protracted negotiations concerning Western Sahara, in keeping with earlier international decisions that gave all of us hope that a just peace was possible. In the light of the developments to which I have referred, we have begun discussions with the Polisario Front to agree on the modalities of the opening of the Embassy of the Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic in our country. In all fairness I must also inform your Majesty that in addition to this, we will continue to support the UN and the AU efforts to enable the people of Western Sahara to exercise their right to self-determination, using all available and legitimate means at our disposal. In the meantime, we will accord to the Polisario Front all such rights and privileges that are due to all Member States of the AU in the context of meeting our obligations to the AU and the peoples of Africa to provide a home for the Pan African Parliament. Permit me, Your Majesty, to take advantage of this communication to convey our sincere thanks for your message of congratulations following the decision of the FIFA Executive Committee to accept our offer to host the Soccer World Cup, as well as our conviction that Morocco would have the same possibility in the future. Please accept your Majesty the assurance of our highest considerations.

Chapter 9 : Germany Declares War on Russia | World History Project

*The German Government were, therefore, obliged to make representations to the Government of His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias and to insist upon a cessation of the aforesaid military acts.*

Macdonald did not rescind the Passfield White Paper. He simply denied that it had been the intention of the government to stop immigration, and in fact, in subsequent years, Jewish immigration to Palestine increased significantly. Please tell your friends about MidEastWeb. Please forward these materials in e-mails to friends and link to this URL - <http://www.mideastweb.com>: Printed material should bear this notice: Reproduction in any other form - by permission only. That position has been reaffirmed and again made plain by my speech in the House of Commons on the 17th of November. In my speech on the 3rd of April, I used the following language: This is an international obligation from which there can be no question of receding. That is the duty from which they will not shrink and to discharge of which they will apply all the resources at their command. That declaration is in conformity not only with the articles but also with the preamble of the mandate, which is hereby explicitly reaffirmed. In carrying out the policy of the mandate the mandatory cannot ignore the existence of the differing interests and viewpoints. These, indeed, are not in themselves irreconcilable, but they can only be reconciled if there is a proper realization that the full solution of the problem depends upon an understanding between the Jews and the Arabs. Until that is reached, considerations of balance must inevitably enter into the definition of policy. A good deal of criticism has been directed to the White Paper upon the assertion that it contains injurious allegations against the Jewish people and Jewish labor organizations. It is recognized that the Jewish Agency have all along given willing cooperation in carrying out the policy of the mandate and that the constructive work done by the Jewish people in Palestine has had beneficial effects on the development and well-being of the country as a whole. These rights and position are not TO BE prejudiced; that is, are not to be impaired or made worse. The effect of the policy of immigration and settlement on the economic position of the non-Jewish community cannot be excluded from consideration. But the words are not to be read as implying that existing economic conditions in Palestine should be crystallized. On the contrary, the obligation to facilitate Jewish immigration and to encourage close settlement by Jews on the land remains a positive obligation of the mandate and it can be fulfilled without prejudice to the rights and position of other sections of the population of Palestine. We may proceed to the contention that the mandate has been interpreted in a manner highly prejudicial to Jewish interests in the vital matters of land settlement and immigration. It has been said that the policy of the White Paper would place an embargo on immigration and would suspend, if not indeed terminate, the close settlement of the Jews on the land, which is a primary purpose of the mandate. It is desirable to make it clear that the landless Arabs, to whom it was intended to refer in the passage quoted, were such Arabs as can be shown to have been displaced from the lands which they occupied in consequence of the land passing into Jewish hands, and who have not obtained other holdings on which they establish themselves, or other equally satisfactory occupation. The number of such displaced Arabs must be a matter for careful inquiry. It contains no such prohibition, nor is any such intended. What it does contemplate is such temporary control of land disposition and transfers as may be necessary not to impair the harmony and effectiveness of the scheme of land settlement to be undertaken. Cognate to this question is the control of immigration. It must first of all be pointed out that such control is not in any sense a departure from previous policy. From onward, when the original immigration ordinance came into force, regulations for the control of immigration have been issued from time to time, directed to prevent illicit entry and to define and facilitate authorized entry. The right of regulation has at no time been challenged. They were concerned to state that, in the regulation of Jewish immigration, the following principles should apply: That principle is vital to any scheme of development, the primary purpose of which must be the settlement both of Jews and of displaced Arabs on the land. The considerations relevant to the limits of absorptive capacity are purely economic considerations. The practice of sanctioning a labor schedule of wage-earning immigrants will continue. In each case consideration will be given to anticipated labor requirements for works which, being dependent upon Jewish or mainly Jewish capital, would not be or would not have been undertaken unless

Jewish labor was available. With regard to public and municipal works failing to be financed out of public funds, the claim of Jewish labor to a due share of the employment available, taking into account Jewish contributions to public revenue, shall be taken into consideration. As regards others kinds of employment, it will be necessary in each case to take into account the factors bearing upon the demand for labor, including the factor of unemployment among both the Jews and the Arabs. Immigrants with prospects of employment other than employment of a purely ephemeral character will not be excluded on the sole ground that the employment cannot be guaranteed to be of unlimited duration. The principle of preferential, and indeed exclusive, employment of Jewish labor by Jewish organizations is a principle which the Jewish Agency are entitled to affirm. But it must be pointed out that if in consequence of this policy Arab labor is displaced or existing unemployment becomes aggravated, that is a factor in the situation to which the mandatory is bound to have regard. But if their efforts are to be successful, there is need for cooperation, confidence, readiness on all sides to appreciate the difficulties and complexities of the problem, and, above all, there must be a full and unqualified recognition that no solution can be satisfactory or permanent which is not based upon justice, both to the Jewish people and to the non-Jewish communities of Palestine.