

Chapter 1 : Arthur Balfour - Wikipedia

*A fictionalised version of Arthur Balfour (identified as "Mr. Balfour") appears as British Prime Minister in the science fiction romance *The Angel of the Revolution* by George Griffith, published in (when Balfour was still in opposition) but set in an imagined near future of*

He was christened Robert Lewis Balfour Stevenson. At about age 18, he changed the spelling of "Lewis" to "Louis", and he dropped "Balfour" in Stevenson inherited a tendency to coughs and fevers, exacerbated when the family moved to a damp, chilly house at 1 Inverleith Terrace in Illness was a recurrent feature of his adult life and left him extraordinarily thin. His nurse Alison Cunningham known as Cummy [14] was more fervently religious. Her mix of Calvinism and folk beliefs were an early source of nightmares for the child, and he showed a precocious concern for religion. He was a late reader, learning at age 7 or 8, but even before this he dictated stories to his mother and nurse, [19] and he compulsively wrote stories throughout his childhood. His father was proud of this interest; he had also written stories in his spare time until his own father found them and told him to "give up such nonsense and mind your business. A Page of History, During his many absences he was taught by private tutors. In October , he went to Edinburgh Academy , an independent school for boys, and stayed there sporadically for about fifteen months. In the autumn of , he spent one term at an English boarding school at Spring Grove in Isleworth in Middlesex now an urban area of West London. He showed from the start no enthusiasm for his studies and devoted much energy to avoiding lectures. He enjoyed the travels more for the material they gave for his writing than for any engineering interest. To provide some security, it was agreed that Stevenson should read Law again at Edinburgh University and be called to the Scottish bar. In the afternoon of time A strenuous family dusted from its hands The sand of granite, and beholding far Along the sounding coast its pyramids And tall memorials catch the dying sun, Smiled well content, and to this childish task Around the fire addressed its evening hours. In other respects too, Stevenson was moving away from his upbringing. His dress became more Bohemian ; he already wore his hair long, but he now took to wearing a velveteen jacket and rarely attended parties in conventional evening dress. Questioning his son about his beliefs, he discovered the truth, leading to a long period of dissension with both parents: As my father said "You have rendered my whole life a failure". As my mother said "This is the heaviest affliction that has ever befallen me". O Lord, what a pleasant thing it is to have damned the happiness of probably the only two people who care a damn about you in the world. Early writing and travels[edit] Stevenson c. Sitwell was a year-old woman with a son, who was separated from her husband. She attracted the devotion of many who met her, including Colvin, who married her in Stevenson was also drawn to her, and they kept up a heated correspondence over several years in which he wavered between the role of a suitor and a son he addressed her as "Madonna". Stephen took Stevenson to visit a patient at the Edinburgh Infirmary named William Ernest Henley , an energetic and talkative man with a wooden leg. Henley became a close friend and occasional literary collaborator, until a quarrel broke up the friendship in , and he is often considered to be the model for Long John Silver in *Treasure Island*. He returned in better health in April and settled down to his studies, but he returned to France several times after that. He also traveled to Paris to visit galleries and the theatres. His law studies did influence his books, but he never practised law; [37] all his energies were spent in travel and writing. One of his journeys was a canoe voyage in Belgium and France with Sir Walter Simpson, a friend from the Speculative Society, a frequent travel companion, and the author of *The Art of Golf* This trip was the basis of his first travel book *An Inland Voyage* She had married at age 17 and moved to Nevada to rejoin husband Samuel after his participation in the American Civil War. Their children were Isobel or "Belle" , Lloyd , and Hervey who died in In , she had taken her children to France where she and Isobel studied art. Stevenson spent much of the following year with her and her children in France. But he set off to join her in August , against the advice of his friends and without notifying his parents. He took second-class passage on the steamship *Devonia* , in part to save money but also to learn how others traveled and to increase the adventure of the journey. He later wrote about the experience in *The Amateur Emigrant*. It was good experience for his writing, but it broke his health. French

Hotel now " Stevenson House " , Monterey, California where he stayed in He was near death when he arrived in Monterey, California , where some local ranchers nursed him back to health. He stayed for a time at the French Hotel located at Houston Street, now a museum dedicated to his memory called the " Stevenson House ". While there, he often dined "on the cuff," as he said, at a nearby restaurant run by Frenchman Jules Simoneau which stood at what is now Simoneau Plaza; several years later, he sent Simoneau an inscribed copy of his novel *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* , writing that it would be a stranger case still if Robert Louis Stevenson ever forgot Jules Simoneau. By December , Stevenson had recovered his health enough to continue to San Francisco where he struggled "all alone on forty-five cents a day, and sometimes less, with quantities of hard work and many heavy thoughts," [43] in an effort to support himself through his writing. Fanny was now divorced and recovered from her own illness, and she came to his bedside and nursed him to recovery. Fanny and Robert were married in May , although he said that he was "a mere complication of cough and bones, much fitter for an emblem of mortality than a bridegroom. He wrote about this experience in *The Silverado Squatters*. In August , he sailed with Fanny and Lloyd from New York to Britain and found his parents and his friend Sidney Colvin on the wharf at Liverpool , happy to see him return home. Gradually, his wife was able to patch up differences between father and son and make herself a part of the family through her charm and wit. He spent his summers at various places in Scotland and England, including Westbourne, Dorset , a residential area in Bournemouth. Poole after the town of Poole which is situated next to Bournemouth. In Westbourne, he named his house Skerryvore after the tallest lighthouse in Scotland, which his uncle Alan had built " But though you will be angry to hear it, I believe, for myself at least, what is best. *Treasure Island* was published under the pseudonym "Captain George North" and became his first widely popular book; he wrote it during this time, along with *Kidnapped* , *Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* which established his wider reputation , *The Black Arrow*: He gave a copy of *Kidnapped* to his friend and frequent Skerryvore visitor Henry James. During the intensely cold winter, Stevenson wrote some of his best essays, including *Pulvis et Umbra*. He also began *The Master of Ballantrae* and lightheartedly planned a cruise to the southern Pacific Ocean for the following summer. His cousin and biographer Sir Graham Balfour said that "he probably throughout life would, if compelled to vote, have always supported the Conservative candidate. He wrote at age The vessel "plowed her path of snow across the empty deep, far from all track of commerce, far from any hand of help. During this period, he completed *The Master of Ballantrae* , composed two ballads based on the legends of the islanders, and wrote *The Bottle Imp*. He preserved the experience of these years in his various letters and in his *In the South Seas* which was published posthumously. Fanny misnames the ship in her account *The Cruise of the Janet Nichol*. He took the native name *Tusitala Samoan* for "Teller of Tales". His influence spread among the Samoans, who consulted him for advice, and he soon became involved in local politics. He was convinced that the European officials were incompetent who had been appointed to rule the Samoans, and he published *A Footnote to History* after many futile attempts to resolve the matter. This was such a stinging protest against existing conditions that it resulted in the recall of two officials, and Stevenson feared for a time that it would result in his own deportation. He wrote to Colvin, "I used to think meanly of the plumber; but how he shines beside the politician! Stevenson grew depressed and wondered if he had exhausted his creative vein, as he had been "overworked bitterly" [64] and that the best he could write was "ditch-water". He rebelled against this idea: To be drowned, to be shot, to be thrown from a horse " ay, to be hanged, rather than pass again through that slow dissolution. He was 44 years old. The Samoans insisted on surrounding his body with a watch-guard during the night and on bearing him on their shoulders to nearby Mount Vaea , where they buried him on a spot overlooking the sea on land donated by British Acting Vice Consul Thomas Trood. Glad did I live and gladly die, And I laid me down with a will. This be the verse you grave for me: Here he lies where he longed to be; Home is the sailor, home from sea, And the hunter home from the hill. Stevenson was loved by the Samoans, and his tombstone epigraph was translated to a Samoan song of grief. His heirs sold his papers during World War I, and many Stevenson documents were auctioned off in The Stevenson House museum is graced with a superb bas-relief depicting the sickly author writing in bed. Helena, California, is home to over 11, objects and artifacts, the majority of which belonged to Stevenson. Opened in , the museum houses such treasures as his childhood rocking chair,

writing desk, toy soldiers, and personal writings among many other items. The museum is free to the public and serves as an academic archive for students, writers, and Stevenson enthusiasts. The museum collection includes several original items belonging to Stevenson and his family. Bronze relief memorial of Stevenson in St. Stevenson spent the Summer of and wrote *Treasure Island*, his first great work". A garden was designed by the Bournemouth Corporation in as a memorial to Stevenson, on the site of his Westbourne house, "Skerryvore", which he occupied from to A statue of the Skerryvore lighthouse is present on the site. In the story line, Stevenson falls in love with Fanny Osbourne, played by Aline Towne , the mother of two children in a loveless marriage in San Francisco. The couple met in France where Stevenson was recuperating from health issues and moved to San Francisco, where Stevenson worked tirelessly despite lingering health matters in the production of his large volume of literary works. The first note to be printed was sent to Samoa in time for their centenary celebrations on 3 December Stevenson School in Pebble Beach, California , was established in and still exists as a college preparatory boarding school. This was also until recently changed the name of a restaurant on Comiston Road, Edinburgh on the route of a favourite walk that Stevenson often took to the village of Swanston in the Pentland Hills.

Chapter 2 : Behind the Balfour Declaration

The story of the recent Cabinet resignations as told in the letters of Mr. Ritchie and Lord George Hamilton published in Thursday's papers shows a most astonishing want of frankness on the part of Mr. Balfour in dealing with his colleagues.

The truth is much different. His most recent book is *The War on Error*. At the time, as World War I raged, British and Australian forces were fighting deep in Palestine against the Ottomans, and were poised to take Jerusalem. The Balfour Declaration, for all its vagaries, constituted the first step toward the objective of political Zionism as outlined by the First Zionist Congress at its meeting in Basle, Switzerland in 1917. The declaration was the much-awaited opening: This must be our policy. This is made easier with each passing year, as the world that produced the declaration draws ever more remote. The content of the declaration seems no less distant or downright baffling. Some have tried to shift the focus to the League of Nations mandate for Palestine, conferred on Britain in 1922, which not only incorporated the declaration but helpfully added a rationale: For Great Britain had no sovereign rights over Palestine; it had no proprietary interest; it had no authority to dispose of the land. Few of the celebrants or the protesters, however, will have much understanding of what produced the Balfour Declaration—which should not be surprising. In 1914 and 1915, the Allied powers Britain, France, Belgium, Russia, Italy, and later the United States were locked in a devastating war with the Central powers Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and the Ottoman Empire and fearful that they might be fought to a draw. Hence the most documented explanation for the declaration is that the British government hoped to persuade Jews in two wavering Allied countries, the United States and Russia, to insist that their governments stay in the war until total victory. Jewish influence, the British thought, would tilt the debate in Washington and St. Petersburg and could best be activated by the promise of a Jewish restoration to Palestine. This was married to a misplaced fear that Germany might steal a march on the Allies by issuing its own pro-Zionist declaration. To us today, this seems like a vast exaggeration of the power of Jews at the time. That legend finds its crudest and its stupidest expression in the Protocols of the Elders of Zion [wrote Sacher], but many even of those who reject a forgery and a lie have a residual belief in the power and the unity of Jewry. We suffer for it, but it is not wholly without its compensations. It is one of the imponderabilia of politics, and it plays, consciously or unconsciously, its part in the calculations and the decisions of statesmen. The second explanation is that the British rushed to embrace Zionism as a means of justifying their own claim to Palestine in the anticipated postwar carve-up of the Middle East. While this explanation differs from the first, it shares with it a straightforward assumption: But in the collective memory of Zionists and Israelis, there is another factor: That telling goes like this: The Weizmann saga unfolds behind the scenes in London drawing rooms, where this Russian Jewish immigrant, having arrived in England only in 1905, succeeds in persuading—some might say, seducing—the likes of Balfour, Mark Sykes, Alfred Milner, and David Lloyd George, who would soon hold the fate of the Middle East in their hands. The declaration is the personal achievement of one man alone: Four years of patient and calculated work established the link between us and each one of the statesmen in this country. The important people of England speak openly of his personal charm as one of the most effective factors in Zionist propaganda in England. The endorsement of Zionism by most of the Rothschilds in London is also due to his influence. In our history, the declaration will remain linked to the name of Weizmann. In 1914, he published his autobiography, *Trial and Error*, translated over the next two years into Hebrew, German, Dutch, Swedish, Norwegian, Spanish, Italian, and a few years later French. This work firmly cemented his place in the Zionist pantheon as the man who brought forth the declaration. He died in 1927; when, in 1968, Israel celebrated the 50th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration, it issued two stamps, one depicting Balfour, the other, Weizmann. True, when one consults the website of Yad Weizmann, the institute that houses his archives, one discovers that Weizmann was not alone: It is no longer a British imperial grab but the outcome of a carefully constructed consensus of the leading democracies of the day. Their contribution has been largely forgotten. But when the fuller story is told, the Balfour Declaration looks very different. It is no longer in tension with the principle of self-determination, but a statement made possible by the very champion of the principle. And it is no longer an emanation of secret dealings but one of the first instances of

public diplomacy. It is, in short, not a throwback to the 19th century but an opening to the 20th. The key to understanding the fuller story is this: Their policies had to be coordinated. It would have been unthinkable for Britain to have issued a public pledge regarding the future of territory yet to be taken in war without the prior assent of its wartime allies—especially those that also had an interest in Palestine. The declaration was approved by the British cabinet and no other. It was signed by the British foreign secretary and no other. On the face of it, the declaration was a unilateral British letter of intent. In truth, in expressing a broad consensus of the Allies, it might even be seen as roughly comparable to a UN Security Council resolution today. To appreciate this, it is necessary to shift the focus away from London to Paris, Rome, and Washington; and away from Chaim Weizmann to a Zionist leader now barely remembered: Enter Nahum Sokolow Nahum Sokolow? Most Israelis know a Sokolow Street—several older Israeli cities have one. But as this short list suggests, Sokolow has been almost entirely forgotten. Unlike Weizmann, no institute or memorial bears his name, no currency or stamp bears his image. He is buried on Mount Herzl, where he was reinterred in , two decades after his death. Who then was he? Nahum Sokolow was born sometime between and in central Poland and received a traditional rabbinic schooling. But he taught himself secular subjects and soon gained renown as a prodigy, a polyglot, and a prolific writer on a vast array of subjects. In he moved to Warsaw and later assumed the editorship of the Hebrew journal *Hatsefirah* , which became a daily in There he contributed a popular column and wrote much of the rest of the paper, so that his fame spread with the spread of modern Hebrew. Leaving daily journalism in , he became the secretary general of the World Zionist Organization, which was struggling after the death of Herzl two years earlier. Sokolow is the entry point into the fuller story of the Balfour Declaration. Indeed, at the time of the declaration, many Jews around the world gave him more credit for it than they gave to Weizmann. Sokolow thereupon threw himself into lobbying, diplomacy, and propaganda, traveling across Europe, America, and the Ottoman Empire. In , he was elected to the Zionist Executive; in , following the outbreak of war, he relocated to Britain, where he joined forces with the dynamic young Chaim Weizmann in the campaign to win British recognition for Zionist aims. This was partly because Sokolow the Hebrew journalist was better known than Weizmann the biochemist. But Sokolow was also given credit because he accomplished what many thought impossible: How did he surprise everyone, including Weizmann, by his achievement? Why has it been forgotten? And how might its recovery benefit the centennial retrospective on the Balfour Declaration? There was no doubt that the best prospects for Zionism lay in a total Allied victory over the German-backed Ottomans and the placing of Palestine under an exclusively British protectorate. Only in Britain did Zionism have sufficient support in governing circles to overcome deep-seated opposition from critics and doubters across Europe, including among influential Jews opposed to Zionism. And only Britain had the mix of strategic interests, military power, and political will to enforce its writ in Palestine. But the Zionists faced two problems. Britain had already promised to share Palestine with its wartime allies. The Zionists faced two problems. In the spring of , Britain, France, and Russia had finalized a secret agreement to partition the Ottoman empire upon its eventual defeat. Russia was to receive a large swath of eastern Anatolia. But Palestine involved so many conflicting interests that it needed a special status. If the Sykes-Picot agreement had been implemented, it might well have destroyed the prospects of Zionism. Britain, after all, would do nearly all of the expected fighting and dying against Ottoman forces in the Sinai and Palestine. Finally a meeting actually takes place and discussions are entered upon. Sykes there met the foremost leaders and sympathizers of the Zionist movement: From the record of that meeting, it is clear that Sykes held out the prospect that Britain might grant the Zionists some form of recognition—on condition. The French wanted all Syria and [a] great say in Palestine. Some of the Zionists in the room resisted the idea, arguing that Britain should do the work, but Sykes thought otherwise. His handsome appearance, his air of fine breeding, his distinguished manner, his gentle speech, his calculated expression, his cautious action, his well-cut clothes, his monocle, were faithful to a tradition which perhaps is not so highly honored as before the war. Diplomats and ministers felt that he belonged to their club, spoke their language, and was one of themselves. He practiced their art and was entitled to their privileges. Sokolow made the impression of a statesman, albeit one without a state, and this went beyond his prodigious mastery of European languages. Sokolow Goes Forth And so Sokolow went forth—first to engage with Picot in London, then back and forth

to Paris, with an unexpected detour to Rome, all in close coordination with Sykes. It was a daunting mission. On the face of it, both propositions should have seemed preposterous to the French. Yet Sokolow managed not only to disarm suspicion of the Zionist program; he even succeeded in extracting statements of support. Most books on the Balfour Declaration do devote a chapter to the story. After two preparatory meetings with Picot in London, Sokolow headed for Paris. In two separate rounds of talks punctuated by a trip to Rome, he thrice met Jules Cambon, secretary-general of the foreign ministry and one of the great French diplomats of the day, and the second time around had an audience with Prime Minister Alexandre Ribot. To Picot in London, Sokolow had expressed an open preference for British protection, and Picot pushed back. So in Paris he instead emphasized the feasibility of the Zionist project and how it animated Jewish opinion in Russia and America. Two leading historians of French policy, Christopher Andrew and A. And he received it.

Chapter 3 : Arthur James Balfour Prime Minister

Robert Louis Stevenson (13 November - 3 December) was a British novelist, poet, essayist, musician and travel writer. His most famous works are Treasure Island, Kidnapped, Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde, and A Child's Garden of Verses.

While there, he meets the beautiful Catriona Drummond. He had previously met her uncle, Rob Oig, in *Kidnapped*. Her father, James More, is in prison. David now calls on a distant relative, a Balfour lawyer. He convinces him to write him a letter of introduction to Lord Advocate Prestrongrange the chief legal officer in the Scottish government. Bearing his letter of introduction, David now calls on Prestongrange. Prestongrange, however, is reluctant to accept the testimony: Prestongrange asks that David call on him again later to discuss the matter further. He is a wheedling, unpleasant, selfish and conniving man, and David instantly dislikes him. He feels ashamed that Catriona should have such an unworthy father. He particularly befriends the eldest, Barbara Grant. When David remains steadfast, Prestongrange tells him they were testing him to see what he was made of. Later, David visits Catriona. He accidentally tells her about his involvement in the Appin murder case, but she promises never to betray him. David now visits Prestongrange again. He tells David that he will be able to give his evidence at the trial on the 21st of September in Inveraray. There, Hector Duncansby challenges him to a duel. David accepts but is so inexperienced he is disarmed three times. Duncansby tells Prestongrange what transpired and David expresses his concerns about his welfare. Prestongrange assures him that now he need no longer fear for his life. Charles Stewart now tells David he believes that there is a conspiracy: Furthermore, he thinks that David will be prevented from giving his testimony. He warns David that he may be kidnapped and held until after the trial. It is likely that James More will negotiate release from prison by having his servant Neil capture David. David then finds Alan. They are pursued, but Alan manages to escape on board the ship David arranged for him. David remains behind and is captured by Neil and his men. He is now kept imprisoned on the Bass Rock, an island off of North Berwick. He will not be released until the 23rd of September, when he will be too late to give his evidence. He manages to convince one of his captors to release him on the 22nd. Learning that the trial is still ongoing, he arrives in the courtroom in Inveraray. David now suggests that he give his testimony in a written statement to the Crown. Prestongrange tells him it will be useless, however, since in the eyes of the court James Stewart is already a dead man. David also learns that James More not only was behind his imprisonment at Bass Rock, but also gave evidence against James Stewart. Meanwhile, David learns Catriona is in prison. She visited her father in disguise and then switched outfits: Barbara gives him advice on courtship and even arranges for David and Catriona to see each other briefly. David now sails to Leyden to study law. Happily, Catriona is also on board and the two spend all of their time together. She intends to disembark at Helvoetsluys, where her father will meet her. Catriona has no money and nowhere to stay, so David takes her to Leyden. The two take up rooms posing as brother and sister while David pursues his studies. David and Catriona occasionally quarrel: How would it look for the two of them to be living together? James More now arrives. David moves to new quarters so that James can stay with his daughter. Wanting James to think there was nothing improper in his relationship with Catriona, David is distant and cold with her. Not understanding, Catriona is hurt. Meanwhile, David receives letters which he shares with Catriona and her father. The first is a letter from Alan saying he may visit. Another tells David that Ebenezer is dead and the estate now belongs to David. As a result, James More now knows that David is wealthy. James now gives David an ultimatum: David insists he will not marry Catriona against her will. She berates her father and leaves with him. David promises to provide them with a stipend. Alan now visits David. Together, they visit James and Catriona in Dunkirk, France. Alan realizes that Catriona loves David, and tells him he should propose again. David does, and the two agree to marry. Meanwhile, Catriona has now seen her father for what he really is and despises him. When she picks up a letter from an English ship for her father, she gives it to Alan instead. The letter reveals that James has betrayed Alan to the English. James, meanwhile is ill in Paris, and dies after Catriona and David visit. Catriona and David marry and return to Scotland. They have two children, Barbara and Alan. Chatto and Windus, This entry was posted

in Novels.

Chapter 4 : MR. BALFOUR'S CABINET STRATEGY. Â» 3 Oct Â» The Spectator Archive

BALFOUR, ARTHUR JAMES (), *British statesman, eldest son of James Maitland Balfour of Whittingehame, Haddingtonshire, and of Lady Blanche Gascoyne Cecil, a sister of the third marquess of Salisbury, was born on the 25th of July He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge. In.*

He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge. In he became M. When, in the spring of , Lord Salisbury became foreign minister on the resignation of the fifteenth Lord Derby, Mr Balfour became his private secretary. In that capacity he accompanied his uncle to the Berlin congress, and gained his first experience of international politics in connexion with the settlement of the Russo-Turkish conflict. It was at this time also that he became known in the world of letters, the intellectual subtlety and literary capacity of his Defence of Philosophic Doubt suggesting that he might make a reputation as a speculative thinker. Belonging, however, to a class in which the responsibilities of government are a traditional duty, Mr Balfour divided his time between the political arena and the study. Being released from his duties as private secretary by the general election of , he began to take a rather more active part in parliamentary affairs. He was thought to be merely amusing himself with politics. It was regarded as doubtful whether his health could withstand the severity of English winters, and the delicacy of his physique and the languor of his manner helped to create the impression that, however great his intellectual powers might be, he had neither the bodily strength nor the energy of character requisite for a political career. His reputation in the parliament of was that of a dilettante, who allied himself with the three politicians already named from a feeling of irresponsibility rather than of earnest purpose; he was regarded as one who, on the rare occasions when he spoke, was more desirous to impart an academic quality to his speeches than to make any solid contribution to public questions. The House, indeed, did not take him quite seriously. Indolence was supposed to be the keynote of his character—a refined indolence, not, however, without cleverness of a somewhat cynical and superior order. That these views were not shared by Lord Salisbury was sufficiently shown by the fact that in his first administration June January he made Mr Balfour president of the Local Government Board, and in forming his second administration July secretary for Scotland with a seat in the cabinet. The accidents of political life suddenly opened out to him a career which made him, next to Lord Salisbury, the most prominent, the most admired and the most attacked Conservative politician of the day. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, who was chief secretary for Ireland, suffered from an affection of the eyes and found it desirable to resign, and Lord Salisbury appointed his nephew in his stead. The selection took the political world by surprise, and was much criticized. The debates on the Crimes Bill and the Irish Land Bill quickly undeceived them, and the steady and even remorseless vigour with which the government of Ireland was conducted speedily convinced the House of Commons and the country that Mr. Balfour was in his right place as chief secretary. With a courage that never faltered he broke down the Plan of Campaign in Ireland, and in parliament he not only withstood the assaults of the Irish Nationalists, but waged successful warfare with the entire Home Rule party. He combined an obstinacy of will with a mastery of facts unsurpassed by any of his predecessors in the secretaryship. Events, it is true, were in his favour. His work was also constructive, for he broadened the basis of material prosperity and social progress by creating the Congested Districts Board in During this period, from , moreover, he developed gifts of oratory which made him one of the most effective of public speakers. Impressive in matter rather than in manner of delivery, and seldom rising to the level of eloquence in the sense in which that quality was understood in a House which had listened to Bright and Gladstone, his speeches were logical and convincing, and their attractive literary form delighted a wider audience than that which listens to the mere politician. In Mr Balfour served on the Gold and Silver Commission, currency problems from the standpoint of bimetallism being among the more academic subjects which had engaged his attention. On the death of Mr W. Smith in he became first lord of the treasury and leader of the House of Commons, and in that capacity introduced in a Local Government Bill for Ireland. The Conservative government was then at the end of its tether, and the project fell through. For the next three years Mr Balfour led the opposition with great skill and address. But after the opening session matters proceeded more smoothly, and Mr Balfour

regained his old position in the estimation of the House and the country. He had the satisfaction of seeing a bill pass for providing Ireland with an improved system of local government, and took an active share in the debates on the various foreign and domestic questions that came before parliament during His speeches and work throughout this period took a wider range than before his accession to the leadership of the Commons. To his firmness, and at the same time to the conciliatory readiness with which he accepted and elaborated the principles of a *modus vivendi*, the two powers owed the avoidance of what threatened to be a dangerous quarrel. As a member of the cabinet responsible for the Transvaal negotiations in he bore his full share of controversy, and when the war opened so disastrously he was the first to realize the necessity for putting the full military strength of the country into the field. At the general election of he was returned for East Manchester which he had represented since by a majority of , and continued in office as first lord of the treasury. His leadership of the House of Commons in the first session of the new parliament was marked by considerable firmness in the suppression of obstruction, but there was a slight revival of the criticisms which had been current in For the next three and a half years his premiership involves the political history of England, at a peculiarly interesting period both for foreign and domestic affairs. Within a few weeks Mr Balfour had reconstituted the cabinet. He himself became first lord of the treasury and lord privy seal, with the duke of Devonshire remaining lord president of the council as leader of the House of Lords; Lord Lansdowne remained foreign secretary, Mr afterwards Lord Ritchie took the place of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach afterwards Lord St Aldwyn as chancellor of the exchequer, Mr J. Chamberlain remained colonial secretary, his son Austen being postmaster-general with a seat in the cabinet. The task of clearing up after the war, both in South Africa and at home, lay before him; but his cordial relations with Mr Chamberlain q. For a while no cloud appeared on the horizon: Mr Chamberlain went to South Africa in the late autumn, with the hope that his personality would influence the settlement there; and the session of opened in February with no hint of troubles to come. A difficulty with Venezuela, resulting in British and German co-operation to coerce that refractory republic, caused an explosion of anti-German feeling in England and some restlessness in the United States, but the government brought the crisis to an end by tactful handling and by an ultimate recourse to arbitration. Moreover, the budget was certain to show a surplus and taxation could be remitted. As events proved, it was the budget which was to provide a cause of dissension, bringing a new political movement into being, and an issue overriding all the legislative interest of the session. In the separate article on Mr Chamberlain the progress of this movement is sufficiently narrated. As leader of the party and responsible for the maintenance of so great a political engine, he was anxious not to be precipitate. Mr Chamberlain rested his case largely on the alleged diminution in British trade, and the statistics therefore required investigation before the government could adopt any such programme. From the middle of May, when Mr Chamberlain began to press the matter, Mr Balfour had a difficult hand to play, so long as it was uncertain how the party would follow the new lead. The Board of Trade was asked to supply full figures, and while its report was awaited the uncertainty of attitude on the part of the government afforded grateful opportunity for opposition mischief-making, since the Liberal party had now the chance of acting as the conservative champions of orthodox economics. The session ended in August without any definite action on the fiscal question, but in the cabinet the discussions continued. These were the strait free-traders, but at the same time Mr Chamberlain resigned also. The correspondence between Mr Chamberlain and Mr Balfour September 9th and 16th was published, and presented the latter in the light of a sympathizer with some form of fiscal union with the colonies, if practicable, and in favour of retaliatory duties, but unable to believe that the country was yet ready to agree to the taxation of food required for a preferential tariff, and therefore unwilling to support that scheme; at the same time he encouraged Mr Chamberlain to test the feeling of the public and to convert them by his missionary efforts outside the government. Mr Chamberlain on his side emphasized his own parliamentary loyalty to Mr Balfour. The situation was confused by personal suspicion and distrust as well as by economic difficulties. But the public noted that the duke of Devonshire, whose orthodoxy was considered typical, remained in the cabinet. The crisis, however, soon developed further, owing to explanations between the free-trade Unionists. The speech was enthusiastically received by the National Union of Conservative Associations, who had year by year flirted with protectionist resolutions, and who were known to be

predominantly in sympathy with Mr Chamberlain. Next day the duke of Devonshire resigned, a step somewhat bitterly resented by Mr Balfour, who clearly thought that his sacrifices in order to conciliate the duke had now been made in vain. Lord Londonderry now became president of the council, Lord Lansdowne leader of the House of Lords, and Lord Salisbury, son of the late premier, who as Lord Cranborne had for three years been under-secretary for foreign affairs, was included in the cabinet as lord privy seal. During the remainder of the struggle within the Unionist party continued. Mr Chamberlain spoke all over the country, advocating a definite scheme for reorganizing the budget, so as to have more taxes on imports, including food, but proposing to adjust the taxation so as to improve the position of the working-classes and to stimulate employment. There was no doubt about the obstinacy and persistency of both sections, and both were fighting, not only to persuade the public, but for the capture of the party and of its prime minister. Both sides were inclined to claim him; neither could do so without qualification. Whether he would eventually follow in the same direction, or would come back to the straiter free-trade side, continued to be the political conundrum for month after month. Though a few Unionists transferred their allegiance, notably Mr. On the 3rd of October Mr Balfour spoke at Edinburgh on the fiscal question. The Edinburgh speech was again received with conflicting interpretations, and much discussion prevailed as to the conditions of the proposed conference, and as to whether it was or was not an advance, as the Chamberlainites claimed, towards Mr Chamberlain. Meanwhile the party was getting more and more disorganized, and the public were getting tired of the apparent mystification. The opposition used the situation to make capital in the country, and loudly called for a dissolution. It was plain indeed that the fiscal question itself was ripe for the polls; Board of Trade statistics had been issued in profusion, and the whole case was before the country. But, though Mr Chamberlain declared his desire for an early appeal to the electors, he maintained his parliamentary loyalty to Mr Balfour. There were, moreover, public reasons why a change of government was undesirable. The exercise by Russian warships of the right of search over British ships was causing great irritation in English commercial circles during ; after several incidents had occurred, the stopping of the P. On the 23rd of October the outrageous firing by the Russian Baltic fleet on the English fishing-fleet off the Dogger Bank in the North Sea was within an ace of causing war. It was not till the 28th that Mr Balfour, speaking at Southampton, was able to announce that the Russian government had expressed regret, and that an international commission would inquire into the facts with a view to the responsible persons being punished. Apart from the importance of seeing the Russo-Japanese War through, there were important negotiations on foot for a renewal or revision of the treaty with Japan; and it was felt that on these grounds it would be a mistake for the government to allow itself to be driven into a premature dissolution, unless it found itself unable to maintain a majority in parliament. The events of the session of soon foreshadowed the end. The opposition were determined to raise debates in the House of Commons on the fiscal question, and Mr Balfour was no less determined not to be caught in their trap. These tactics of avoidance reached their culminating point when on one occasion Mr Balfour and his supporters left the House and allowed a motion hostile to tariff reform to be passed nem. Though the Scottish Churches Bill, the Unemployed Bill and the Aliens Bill were passed, a complete fiasco occurred over the redistribution proposals, which pleased nobody and had to be withdrawn owing to a blunder as to procedure; and though on the 17th of July a meeting of the party at the foreign office resulted in verbal assurances of loyalty, only two days later the government was caught in a minority of four on the estimates for the Irish Land Commission. For a few days it was uncertain whether they would resign or dissolve, but it was decided to hold on. The real causes, however, which kept the government in office, were gradually losing their validity. The Russo-Japanese War came to an end; the new offensive and defensive alliance with Japan was signed on the 12th of August; the successful Anglo-French agreement, concluded in April , had brought out a vigorous expression of cordiality between England and France, shown in an enthusiastic exchange of naval visits; and the danger, which threatened in the early summer, of complications with France and Germany over Morocco, was in a fair way of being dispelled by the support given to France by Great Britain. The end came in November , precipitated by a speech made by Mr Balfour at Newcastle on the 14th, appealing for unity in the party and the sinking of differences, an appeal plainly addressed to Mr Chamberlain, whose supportersâ€”the vast majority of the Unionistsâ€”were clamouring for a fighting policy. But Mr Chamberlain

was no longer prepared to wait. On the 21st of November at Bristol he insisted on his programme being adopted, and Mr Balfour was compelled to abandon the position he had held with so much tactical dexterity for two years past. Amid Liberal protests in favour of immediate dissolution, he resigned on the 4th of December; and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, being entrusted by the king with the formation of a government, filled his cabinet with a view to a general election in January. The Unionists went to the polls with divided counsels, and sustained a crushing defeat, remarkable nevertheless for the comparative success of the tariff reformers. While Mr Chamberlain had a signal personal triumph in all the divisions of Birmingham, Mr Balfour himself was defeated by a large majority in Manchester. Being in a miserable minority in parliament Unionists against Liberals, 51 Labour members, and 83 Nationalists, some form of consolidation among the Unionists was immediately necessary, and negotiations took place between Mr Balfour and Mr Chamberlain which resulted in the patching up of an agreement expressed in a correspondence dated February 14th, and its confirmation at a meeting of the party at Lansdowne House a few days later. His own administration had been wrecked, through no initiative of his, by the dissensions over the fiscal question. But his wide range of knowledge and interests, his intellectual finesse, his personal hold over his supporters, his statesmanlike grasp upon imperial problems and his oratorical ability, had been proved to a remarkable degree; and in foreign affairs his tenure of power had been conspicuously successful. He left his country indeed in a position of strength abroad, which it had not held since the Crimean War. The Unionist regime as a whole, however, had collapsed. This verdict, however, was one based mainly on temporary reasons, which were soon to be overshadowed by the new issues involved in the change of ministry. As a matter of fact, a year of opposition had not passed before his power in the House of Commons, even with so small a party behind him, was once more realized. The immense Radical majority started with a feeling of contempt for the leader who had been rejected at Manchester, but by he had completely reasserted his individual pre-eminence among parliamentarians.

Chapter 5 : Arthur Balfour | Revolv

Even the leading 'revisionist' Zionist, Vladimir Jabotinsky, a man of harsh political commitment, could see that any historic compromise between Arabs and Jews in the aftermath of the Balfour Declaration was a virtual impossibility.

Balfour finds difficulty in filling up his Cabinet. If the spirit in which his negotiations are conducted resembles that in which he treated Mr. Ritchie and Lord George Hamilton, no man of ordinary spirit, and also no man of ordinary prudence, would care to place himself in his power. The story of the recent Cabinet resignations as told in the letters of Mr. Balfour in dealing with his colleagues. We do not say that Mr. Very possibly they would have felt compelled to resign in any ease; but at any rate they were entitled to know the very material fact that Mr. Chamberlain had tendered his resignation. The withholding of that fact has given Lord George Hamilton an unquestionable right and Mr. Ritchie and Lord Balfour of Burleigh also, if, as we presume is the case, they too were not told to feel that he was not treated as a man has a right to expect to be treated when he is dealing with friends and colleagues, i. When friends and colleagues are dealing with each other over a disputed point they expect to be informed, and especially by any person who is acting as a leader, and so is in the position of a trustee for the body of which he is the head, of all the facts, and can justly claim that no concealment of v kind shall take place. It is not material to say that Mr. Balfour," and concerned those two alone ; or to urn that Mr. These are lawyer-like excuses, but they do not hold in cases where, as among political colleagues, absolute candour is the essential condition. Balfour had to consider was, not what Lord George Hamilton had a strict right to know, but what he would naturally and properly prefer to know before he took the step of resignation. Balfour should have asked himself: Is it possible that Lord George Hamilton and the other Free-traders would be in any way affected by the knowledge of Mr. If so, I am bound to impart to them that knowledge, and not to let them act in the dark. Balfour may have wanted to remove Mr. Ritchie, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and Lord George Hamilton from his Cabinet, and did not, therefore, tell them a fact that might have made them remain in office. Balfour wished to clear his Cabinet of its chief Free-traders, and if he did, we see no objection from his point of view. A Prime Minister should preside over a united Cabinet, and must be conceded an absolute right, if he deems it expedient, to get rid of colleagues with whom he differs on funda- mental points. But in that case it was Mr. In that case no one could possibly have suggested that Mr. Balfour had by an adroit MOVE "jockeyed" his colleagues out of the Cabinet. As it is, that suggestion is being made on every side, and those who, like ourselves, are Mr. The truth is, we fear, that Mr. Balfour had determined, as he had a right to do, to shed these three colleagues in any case, but would not face the irksome task of telling them so. Therefore he weakly withheld the knowledge which ought to have been theirs, and in effect, though not in actual intention, stooped to a very disagreeable subterfuge. That is the best excuse which we, who admit Mr. But though we honestly believe in its validity, how can we expect those who have not our personal faith in Mr. The ordinary man simply will not consider such a refinement, and -is merely amused or disgusted, as the case may be, at the cleverness with which he holds that Lord George Hamilton and his colleagues were " done " by the Prime Minister. What makes the whole transaction the more disagreeable is the fact that though the others were not, the Duke of Devonshire was told that Mr. Chamberlain had resigned, and that this announcement induced him to withdraw his threatened resignation and continue in the Cabinet. He apparently held wrongly, as we think that Mr. The result, if not the intention, of the manceuvre practised by Mr. Balfour in regard to Mr. By concealing the letter at first he obtained the resignations which he desired to take place. By producing it a little later he prevented a resignation which he greatly desired to avoid. In other words, Mr. Balfour wished to clear off such stubborn Free-traders as Mr. Ritchie, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and Lord George Hamilton, and to create vacancies in the great offices of Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for India, which could be filled in by men of the kind he now affects i. At the same time, he wished to keep the Duke of Devon- shire with him because of the immense influence on public opinion exercised by the Duke. Unhappily, the Duke allowed himself to be an instrument in Mr. He let the knowledge of Mr. No one who knows any- thing of the Duke of Devonshire, of his courage and single-mindedness and fair-dealing, will doubt that if he once realises the position in which he has placed

himself as regards his late colleagues, he will be cut to the quick. He is the last man in the world with whom it would be safe to use such a manoeuvre as we have described, provided that he grasps its nature. At the same time, he is not a man to expect anything but simple straightforward action from his friends, and it is possible that he has not yet understood the full significance of Mr. Indeed, we may say that it is certain that he has not yet realised it, for if he had he must, we feel sdrO, have put himself right with his old colleagues by resignation. When, then, the Dulls does realise fully what has happened, we may be sure that our politicians will learn from him a lesson which they ate not likely to forget as to the need of perfect candour within a close body of men like a Cabinet. If a Cabinet is to be more than a Vestry Committee, it must while it remains a Cabinet be inspired, throughout by the frankness that exists among the members of an honourable and united family. If the Duke of Devonshire finds himself in a humiliating and difficult position at the present moment, it is because this frankness and open dealing were not observed by the person especially called upon to observe them in a Cabinet,- i. But though the Duke cannot fairly be blamed for the breach of this sound rule of conduct, he cannot, we fear, be absolved from negligence in the matter of another rule not less sacred in the affairs of men united by the ties of political honour. That rule is that men who agree on a special lino of policy must act together, and that when one of them is approached in his individual capacity, and asked to do or not do a particular thing, he must insist on consult- ing the men with whom he is acting, and make his position clear to them. The Duke, that is, when he was asked to reconsider his intention of resignation because Mr. Chamberlain was resigning, may or may not have been right in yielding, but at any rate he should not have yielded till he had conferred with those Free-trade members with whom he was acting. He should have said to Mr. Before I take any definite ster I must tell the men with whom I am acting what I propose to do. All the traditions of our public life demanded such a line of action, and it is most astonishing that the Duke should have forgotten their application to his case. That he did forget those traditions we know, because Lord George Hamilton tells us that no communication of the new fact was made to him. In a word, the Duke forgot the great principle of public life,â€”that if you are acting politically with certain men at a Cabinet crisis, those men, as your friends, have a right to know whatever step you propose to take before you take it. As we have said before, we are sure that the Duke of Devonshire only ignored this principle through inadvertence. The fact, however, remains that he did ignore it, and that it is now his duty to place himself right with the country. That he will do so as soon as he has read Mr. If his resignation comes, it will, we can only add, be impossible to exaggerate the sense of relief that will be experienced by his friends and admirers throughout the nation.

Chapter 6 : The Forgotten Truth about the Balfour Declaration Â» Mosaic

Mr. A.J. Balfour, the English statesman, was the principal guest at the fourth annual dinner of the Edinburgh Sir Walter Scott Club, which took place in Edinburgh a fortnight ago.

MATHEW Lecture given to the History Group of The Norfolk Club, 14 April to mark the centenary of the Sykes-Picot Agreement Abstract These three war-time initiatives are presented as part of a compressed, uncoordinated, two-year sequence set against the changing circumstances of international rivalries, imperial anxieties, and domestic politics. Such stark inconsistencies, in the compelling context of war, forced a high degree of official secrecy over the content of the policies. This combination of contradiction and concealment, corroding trust in British good faith, did serious long-term damage to relations between the imperial power and the Arab and Jewish communities under its authority, the consequences enduring to the present day. As for imperial insecurity – a chronic, perennial condition that afflicted all colonialist nations – this was much aggravated by the War, especially in relation to the political integrity of the Eastern Empire and access to it, critically, through the Levant – where serious threats were perceived as emanating from Germany and France. There were no alternative scenarios. The War did, however, produce differing emphases among policy-makers, notably between so-called Westerners and Easterners, depending on which battle-grounds they wished to privilege – European or Middle Eastern. The only exception was to be the area lying to the west of a line drawn from Aleppo south to Damascus – ie present day Lebanon and north-west Syria – in which there were substantial non-Arab and Christian populations, and in which France had a long-term imperial interest. But when the leaders of an Arab delegation to London in referred to that commitment, Churchill was reported by his short-hand copyist as replying: When was the promise? They started meeting at the end of – only weeks after the McMahon promise to Hussein – drawing up rough proposals in January , travelling to Petrograd to seek Russian approval Russia an interested party as the historic defender of Orthodox interests and personnel in the Holy Land , and winning the stamp of approval from the British and French governments in May – Sir Edward Grey signing off in London. There had been no mention whatever of Zionism in his Agreement – Sykes at the time indeed regarding the movement with anti-Semitic-flavoured hostility. In the words of Geoffrey Lewis, in his recent book Balfour and Weizmann: But by then Sykes was dead, victim of the influenza epidemic just a few weeks short of his 40th birthday – so passes from the scene. It was, however, a forlorn request. On such confusions, Arthur Balfour provides eloquent contemporary testimony. Lloyd George, however, had no time for hand-wringing. And three days later, conferring with the French in Paris: A bit more specificity, however, is required – especially with regard to imperial worries. One must never forget, in any analysis of foreign policy, the over-riding concern with imperial security. British political expansionism in the late 19th and early 20th centuries – anxiety-driven, fearful, negative in spirit – was overwhelmingly preoccupied in Africa and the Far East, as well as in the Middle East with the continuation of British rule in India, and all that that implied in terms of trade, finance, the national balance of payments, military manpower, and that vaporous but critical necessity for a great power – prestige: This is very far from being the case. A little later, on expansionist policy generally in the Middle East, he remarked: Asquith was no expansionist, and, southern Mesopotamia apart, harboured no imperialist ambitions in the Middle East. Neither the McMahon nor the Sykes initiatives involved any British annexation of Palestine apart that is from the Sykes-Picot designations of Haifa and Acre as mentioned. Palestine, with biblical resonances that appealed to the former chapel boy from north Wales, had to be annexed, not internationalised. But there was no inevitability here. Again one must emphasise contingency. Lloyd George encountered much opposition to such priorities – indeed almost sufficient, in the judgment of John Grigg, to unseat him in the spring of by a combination of soldierly Tories and resentful Asquithians – following the lead of Douglas Haig and the chief of the Imperial General Staff, Sir William Robertson. Britain could only promise a national Jewish homeland if the territory in question was hers to dispose of. And the Zionist leader, Chaim Weizmann, rode quite deliberately on the back of the new expansionism. It is also the case – and this is a key point – that Britain, in its attempts to marginalise the French, was able to move from the internationalisation under

Sykes-Picot to the outright annexation required for the implementation of Balfour, because of the very decisive improvement in its comparative military position in Palestine. With Allenby marching on Jerusalem in December , and progressing north into Syria in the course of , Britain was the paramount force on the ground. France being then overwhelmingly engaged on the Western Front, her Syrie Integrale ambitions could now be more or less ignored. The correspondence in question, , was not, of course, some private, internal Whitehall messaging. The letters, sent to Hussein from Cairo, were in Arabic. And as The Palestine Deception sets out, the journalist Joseph Jeffries offered his own public translation in early 1918 this taken up in a couple of debates in the House of Lords in March and June of that year, in which Edward Grey and others, including three former imperial governors, Lords Islington, Lamington, and Sydenham, argued the case for official publication 1918 only to be met with total resistance by the new Conservative Colonial Secretary, the Duke of Devonshire and his colleagues in the House. Well, the principal adviser, as it happened, was the senior official at the Colonial Office, Sir John Shuckburgh who, fully aware of the stark contradiction between McMahon in 1916, promising Palestine independence, and Balfour in 1917, offering the territory as a Jewish National Home, wrote privately in 1917. When queried during the War on the promises by his Arab friends, T. Lawrence, Official secrecy, absurdly, continued until publication was finally permitted in 1918, at the time of the St. The worst of all worlds politically, in terms of trust and good faith 1918 a correspondence unofficially available and officially suppressed for the best part of a quarter-century. With Sykes-Picot, at least partial concealment was maintained from May till November 1917, and the Agreement would probably have continued unrevealed had the Bolsheviks in Russia, on coming to power, not provocatively and deliberately spilled the beans with full texts in both Izvestia and Pravda on 23 November 1917. The archaeologist, David Hogarth, who worked closely with T. Lawrence in the Arab Revolt, and who ran the Arab Bureau in Cairo for a time in 1918, commented that year: But the Zionists were also left in the dark, their leader, Chaim Weizmann, a man in regular contact with politicians at the highest level, only finding out eleven months on in April from his Manchester Guardian friend C. Even the American president, Woodrow Wilson 1918 whose support for the Zionist cause the British were actively seeking 1918 had been fed only the most garbled information by Arthur Balfour when he visited Washington in April 1918. But it was a very delicate business, for of course they were secret. As for his own Declaration of November 1917, I shall be brief. It was a private letter sent to Lord Rothschild 1918 Lionel Walter Rothschild 1918 but news immediately got out, a jubilant public meeting being held in London shortly after. But there was no formal announcement in Palestine 1918 again this mess of public knowledge and official denial. That did in fact follow in Jerusalem 1918 but not until April 1918 29 months on from its issuance. It is difficult to see the sense in all this, especially after the War had finished. It was bound to cause suspicion and offence among the very people who had to be won over to an acceptance of the Declaration 1918 especially when modern communications more or less guaranteed reportage in the Near East. Was it all a matter of casual arrogance in relation to people of whom ministers and officials in London knew little? And what of the flippancy displayed by the philosopher-statesman Arthur Balfour himself? When Cambon reminded him of the biblical prophecy that a restored King of the Jews would mean the end of the world, Balfour replied: The present impasse in Israel-Palestine has century-old roots, and shows no sign whatever of being alleviated. They will not voluntarily allow, not even a new master, but even a new partner. And so it is for the Arabs 1918. Outrage, as identified by Lloyd George, and across a range of political and physical forms, was guaranteed to continue. But, less obviously perhaps, the contradictions and secrecies conditioned Zionist political behaviour as well 1918 and again in ways that persist to the present day. The failure of Mark Sykes and others to inform Weizmann of the Anglo-French Agreement was hardly confidence-inspiring: It was the consequence, I have argued elsewhere Journal of Palestine Studies, Winter 1968, of a number of War-time contingencies and not of any substantive long-run historical process. The Zionists knew that the men behind the policy, Balfour included, were to varying degrees anti-Semitic; and that the majority of British Jews, like those in Western Europe and the United States, were opposed to the Declaration. And, at the highest levels of government, it had been unambiguously opposed from the outset by Lord Curzon and the Jewish India secretary Edwin Montagu. From Baghdad, Gertrude Bell wrote to her parents in November 1917. Given the seeming fragility of the British commitment, dating back to the Sykes-Picot confusions, and uncertain as to its permanence, Zionists 1918

coming in the main from the illiberal societies of eastern Europe” resorted vigorously to two lines of action that have been part of the so-to-speak Zionist genome ever since” the rapid establishment of inalienable facts on the ground, and the intensive lobbying in the offices of the main metropolitan power” Britain in the past, the United States today, never shy of accusing their opponents of anti-Semitism, and representing what might be seen, variously, over the past century as a compelling combination of assertive power and existential insecurity. Given this, and the profound, enduring Arab disaffection in Palestine, it is all too obvious that we are still living with the legacies of McMahon, Sykes, and Balfour. There are few, if any, other places in the world where the century-long past is as present, and as invidiously active, as it is in the post-colonial Near East.

Chapter 7 : Encyclopædia Britannica/Balfour, Arthur James - Wikisource, the free online library

That one - Arthur James Balfour, or AJB as he was known at the time of the declaration (he wasn't made a Lord until a few years later) - was born in Scotland in July and served in the British government for 28 years, including a term as prime minister ().

It had been of immense service to these singular Romans that they held a common faith, which inspired them with both piety and enthusiasm. And though the piety was not incompatible with calculation, and the enthusiasm generally had an eye in business, these qualities were none the less efficient. Their religio really bound the individual lives into a common life, and subordinated personal interests to those of the community. But, in the second century, this theory of the nature of the things and of the human obligations consequent upon it, was far advanced in a process of decay. It had long been difficult for reasonably honest people even to pretend to believe in the mythological fables held sacred by their forefathers; and, for a considerable time, the Augurs had been suspected of smiling, perhaps of winking, at one another during the performance of their sacred office. There was much refined depravity among the upper classes, much ignorance, suffering, and sheer brutality among the lower; though it is greatly to be doubted if the Rome of Hadrian was one whit worse than the Paris of Louis the Fifteenth, the London of George the Second, or the [] Petersburg of Catherine the Second; to say nothing of the Papal Rome of thirteen centuries later. As confidence in the old and somewhat cold, national religion had waned, foreign, chiefly Oriental, superstitions of a more emotional cast had found wide acceptance. Beside all these, more or less too often less! Flourishing prototypes of our Cagliostros and Blavatskys abounded; while for these wolves and foxes, innumerable sheep and geese had been prepared by the over-civilisation which, then as now, sapped manhood and debased and distorted womanhood. Such half-cretinised products of over-civilisation; neurotics, exhausted by unceasing indulgence of the senses and the emotions, creatures flabby in body, with the acute sensibility of the weak mind in place of intelligence, are puppets in the hands of a really virile and able impostor. No one attains that high position until he has reached the point of being able to believe his own fictions for so long as his interest require that prodigious effort. The confident assertion of such a genius of fraud sweeps the neurotic and the Gigadibsii off their feet. The former are carried away, as it were, by a nervous avalanche; the latter because, never [] having possessed any solid intellectual foundation, their feet go up and their heads down, like those of boys on a slide before the swoop of a burly man. Amidst this seething multitude, the seeker after higher manifestations of human nature would hardly distinguish more than three. For the rarely counted, but by no means lowest, type, illustrated by those who strive to do the duty which lies before them to the best of their ability and with as little speculation as possible, usually remains invisible. The visible three, who possessed not only the will to act up to a standard of duty, but a theory of the nature of things more or less connected with their practice, were the Stoics including the better class of Cynics , the Jews, and those ultra-liberal Jews by doctrinal filiation who were known as Christians. The best men among the Roman upper classes were either professedly Stoics, or deeply tinged with Stoicism. That philosophy is the most thoroughly materialistic which has ever been promulgated; it is also essentially pantheistic, and logically committed to Determinism. Cynicism was merely the rigorous carrying-out of the ascetic principles which all Stoics professed; just as Monachism is only the Sermon on the Mount reduced to practice. And, if the baser Cynicism led to the degradation of Stoicism, it did not sink it further than the baser Monachism was soon to sink Christianity. The Jew was just what he is now. He occupied the same sort of position in Roman society as he did in English society a century ago. He was unenfranchised and despised, but influential; ridiculed, but courted. And he exhibited, as it seems to be his fate always to exhibit, human nature, here in its brightest and best, and there in its darkest and worst, colours. Authentic accounts of the practices and of the teaching current among them may be found in Justin Martyr and in the Didache. I am still grateful to them for whiling away the tedium of many a dull sermon to which I was compelled to seem to listen. We are made wise by the events of nearly seventeen hundred years. The Barbarians have done exactly what it was to be expected they would do. And, in all this time, the struggle for mastery between the scientific spirit of post-prophetic Judaism, and of that prophetic Judaism, already

coloured by Hellenism, which bore the name of Christianity, has gone on, until, now, Judaism stands substantially where it did; while the simple Christian faith of the second century has been overlaid and transmuted by Hellenic speculation into the huge and complex dogmatic fabric of Ecclesiastical Christianity. Finally, the scientific spirit, freed from all its early wrappings, stands in independence of, and for the most part in antagonism to, its ancient rivals. Its cosmology, its anthropology, are incompatible with theirs; its ethics are independent of theirs. That, if I mistake not, is in broad outline the state of affairs among us; and the future of our civilisation as certainly depends on the result of the contest between Science and Ecclesiasticism which is now afoot, as the present state of thing is the outcome of the former strife. Therefore it is eminently satisfactory to find that one, at any rate, of our political chiefs, already occupying a high place, and sure to go higher, not merely in official rank, but, if I may have an opinion on such a matter, in the estimation of his countrymen, whatever their politics, is fully awake to these facts; that he clearly sees the important consequences, both speculative and practical, which are likely to flow from an antagonism in the world of thought of a much sharper and more serious kind than has ever yet existed; and, perhaps, notes the significant circumstance, that force no longer waits upon the orders of only one of the combatants; that the heretofore weaker has become strong and is daily growing in power. Readers of the Foundations of Belief must be very learned and very acute if they do not find much to instruct them; very dull, if enjoyment of dialectic fence is not largely mingled with their gratitude for that instruction; and, if they are not devoid of the literary sense, they must feel the charm of a style which flows like a smooth stream, sparkling with wit and rippling with sarcasms enough to take away any reproach of monotony. To devote more than a passing word to the glories of the shield, the weight of the spear, and the sharpness of the sword of Achilles, would be a sorry compliment to that hero. And, glad as I should be to linger over Mr. This is to discuss, assuredly in no controversial spirit, but solely with the desire to get things clear in my own and other minds, what appear to me to be the [] fundamental positions of Mr. In this frame of mind, I desire to make the most liberal allowance for the difficulties in which his plan of campaign has involved even so skilful a tactician. Balfour has not merely undertaken to define the opinions of a school to which he professedly has an antipathy: Thus the probabilities seem to be heavily against the success of Mr. Balfour that I am glad to make my entire agreement with this statement, provided always that I may substitute Agnosticism, as I understand it, for Naturalism, as he defines it. Naturalism, on the other hand, obtains the honour of a full description in *limine p.* Naturalism proper has nothing to do with the specific doctrines of Materialism or of Idealism, of Determinism or Libertinism, but is compatible with any of these doctrines. For one may surely hold that he knows nothing about any supernatural powers, and even is unacquainted with the means of knowing about them, and yet totally refuse to commit himself to the denial of their existence? The elementary consideration so often, but it would seem quite uselessly, urged, that a man may say he knows nothing of any Saturnians and does not believe we shall ever have the means of knowing, and yet leave the existence or non-existence of inhabitants in that planet quite open, is surely worth some attention. The choice of a term which is open to so much misunderstanding seems to me unfortunate, from all points of view, except, perhaps, that of the pure polemic. I object to making Agnosticism the scapegoat, on whose head the philosophic sins of the companions with whom it is improperly associated may be conveniently piled up. Before now, I have had occasion to speak of the pedigree of Agnosticism; and I have vainly endeavoured to placate its enemies by showing that it is really no child of mine, but that it has a highly respectable lineage which can be traced back for centuries. I will not repeat anything I may have said elsewhere, but I think the opportunity fitting to set forth, for the first time, the particular passage in an essay by Sir William Hamilton, published in , and [] first read by me about the year , which, so far as I am concerned, is the original spring of Agnosticism: But, like Ixion, we embrace a cloud for a divinity. Here is the cardinal proposition of Agnosticism, as I understand it, set forth, with a force and clearness that have never been surpassed, sixty-six years ago. The discipline of natural science, however, is in no respect more important and more valuable than its constant practical admonitions [] to swear by no master. And a note added, after the mature reflection of twenty years, in the Discussions expands this passage: He is at once known and unknown. Am I wrong in thinking that M. Cousin would not repudiate this doctrine? But riper years have brought rooted dislike to the language, and distrust of the dialectic process, exemplified by the

passage I have last cited. It seems to me that the admission of a state of mind intermediate between knowledge and no-knowledge is fatal to all clear thought, and holds the door open to the return of one or other of the many forms of the Absolute which Hamilton took so much trouble to expel. There is no intermediation between a straight line and a bent line: There is nothing intermediate between darkness and light: Is it not better to keep silence about matters which speech is incompetent to express; to be content with resolving in the deeps of the mind the infinite possibilities of the unknown? I am at this moment [unknowing] of what my gardener is doing, but it is certainly nothing unknowable. So far, therefore, Mr. And it is as common to all of them to include mental as well as physical phenomena among the subject-matters of knowledge. I am loth to quote myself, but in a discussion about Agnosticism I hope I may be forgiven for doing so. Seventeen years ago I wrote thus: Balfour, on the other hand, seems to me to employ it in a sense peculiar to himself, if I may judge by what follows the bracketed sentence in the citation given above. The explanatory and apologetic note which follows does not touch my difficulty; on the contrary, his explanation makes matters worse, and the apology appears to be due for another wrong. Thus it would appear that, not content with devising dogmatic definitions and catechisms for philosophers of another way of thinking, Mr. Balfour proposes, incidentally, to remodel their technical terminology, and to attach original and hitherto quite unheard-of signification to old-established terms. I am afraid it must be admitted that the brilliancy which hovers over the pages of the Foundations of Belief is sometimes so vague and shifty that, like a hostile search-light, it often spreads confusion where it professes to illuminate. One thinks to seize something logically tangible, and lo! Even now, I am not quite sure of Mr. I think modern usage generally confines the application of the word to operations of the mind concerned with the phenomena of what is termed the external world. I do not think any one would say that we perceive love, or hatred, or mathematical axioms. On the other hand, as I have just pointed out, Hume and I may add, Locke set a precedent, which might be cited to justify the application of the term perception to the subject-matter of all knowledge. I apprehend, however, that it cannot be Mr. Balfour objects to their doing. The following skimming appears to give us the cream of Mr. Here, and here only, can we discern anything which deserves to be described as Knowledge. Here, and here only, may we profitably exercise our reason or gather the fruits of Wisdom. Such, in rough outline, is Naturalism " p. Unfortunately, the limitation of Natural Science to such branches as I have just mentioned, to the exclusion of Zoology and Physiology, would be as original an innovation, and even more startling and less justifiable, than those already discussed. Now, the study of animals involves that investigation of all the activities they manifest which is the province of the department called Physiology. From Haller, in the middle of the last century, down to the latest physiological birth of time, the right of the physiologists to deal with the animal mind, as well as with the animal body, has never been questioned. Thus no conception of Natural Science which excludes Psychology can possibly be entertained. But, if Natural Science rightfully includes Psychology, the phenomena of Consciousness fall within its province. And if the physiologists had not too much to do at home already, and stretched forth their hands over the whole realm of mind, I know of no logical barrier strong enough to bar an indefinite extension of the dominion of Natural Science in this direction. *Quieta non movere* is an admirable maxim in many practical contingencies. It may be good policy, therefore, not to stir ambitions hitherto dormant, by a fruitless attempt to deprive Natural Science of territory of which it has long had undisputed possession, and to restrict it to the world of material, even including purely vegetative, phenomena. There is no worse statesmanship than that which irritates those whom it is powerless to constrain. For Empiricism, at any rate, this easy deduction is readily verified. I suppose I may assume that Locke, generally labelled the father of the experience philosophy, is a representative of Empiricism. If Locke says that experience is the origin of all knowledge, we must bear in mind that he means internal experience as well as external. In fact, I know not who can hope to escape the name, except the Fichtean idealist, for whom the activity of the Ego is the sole source of phenomena. Even Berkeley assumes sensation to have no external cause in God. Positivism I leave to take care of itself. As to Agnosticism, as I am concerned only with looking after the interests of that form of it which I profess myself, the perusal of the preceding pages will probably suffice to indicate that I wholly repudiate Mr. The catechism is open to equally serious objection.

Chapter 8 : How AP in reported the Balfour Declaration for a Jewish homeland | The Times of Israel

LONDON: It was Arthur James Balfour's hand that signed one of the most incendiary government letters documented in global history. Today marks the th anniversary of the Balfour Declaration.

Balfour made the controversial decision, with Lord Lansdowne , to use the heavily Unionist House of Lords as a check on the political programme and legislation of the Liberal party in the Commons. Legislation was vetoed or altered by amendments between and , leading David Lloyd George to remark that the Lords had become "not the watchdog of the Constitution, but Mr. The exhausted Balfour resigned as party leader after the crisis, and was succeeded in late by Bonar Law. Balfour caricatured by XIT for Vanity Fair , Balfour resigned as Foreign Secretary following the Versailles Conference in , but continued in the government and the Cabinet after normal peacetime political arrangements resumed as Lord President of the Council. He put forward a proposal for the international settlement of war debts and reparations the Balfour Note , but it was not accepted.. Bonar Law became Prime Minister. With 28 years of government service, Balfour is considered to have had one of the longest ministerial careers in modern British politics, second only to Winston Churchill. At the end of , most of his teeth were removed and he suffered the unremitting circulatory trouble which ended his life. In the past, he had suffered occasional phlebitis and by late he was immobilised by it. At his request a public funeral was declined, and he was buried on 22 March beside members of his family at Whittingehame in a Church of Scotland service although he also belonged to the Church of England. By special remainder , the title passed to his brother Gerald. His obituaries in The Times , The Guardian and the Daily Herald did not mention the declaration for which he is most famous outside Britain. He was considered a dilettante by his colleagues, but apparently Lord Salisbury did not share that opinion when he gave junior posts in his government to his nephew. Harold Begbie , a journalist, in a book called Mirrors of Downing Street, criticised Balfour for his manner, personality and self-obsession. It is an attitude of mind which a critic or a cynic might be justified in assuming, for it is the attitude of one who desires rather to observe the world than to shoulder any of its burdens; but it is a posture of exceeding danger to anyone who lacks tenderness or sympathy, whatever his purpose or office may be, for it tends to breed the most dangerous of all intellectual vices, that spirit of self-satisfaction which Dostoevsky declares to be the infallible mark of an inferior mind. Arthur Balfour this studied attitude of aloofness has been fatal, both to his character and to his career. He has said nothing, written nothing, done nothing, which lives in the heart of his countrymen. To look back upon his record is to see a desert, and a desert with no altar and with no monument, without even one tomb at which a friend might weep. One does not say of him, "He nearly succeeded there", or "What a tragedy that he turned from this to take up that"; one does not feel for him at any point in his career as one feels for Mr. George Wyndham or even for Lord Randolph Churchill ; from its outset until now that career stretches before our eyes in a flat and uneventful plain of successful but inglorious and ineffective self-seeking. There is one signal characteristic of the Balfourian manner which is worthy of remark. It is an assumption in general company of a most urbane, nay, even a most cordial spirit. I have heard many people declare at a public reception that he is the most gracious of men, and seen many more retire from shaking his hand with a flush of pride on their faces as though Royalty had stooped to inquire after the measles of their youngest child. Such is ever the effect upon vulgar minds of geniality in superiors: But this heartiness of manner is of the moment only, and for everybody; it manifests itself more personally in the circle of his intimates and is irresistible in week-end parties; but it disappears when Mr. Balfour retires into the shell of his private life and there deals with individuals, particularly with dependants. It has no more to do with his spirit than his tail-coat and his white tie. Its remarkable impression comes from its unexpectedness; its effect is the shock of surprise. In public he is ready to shake the whole world by the hand, almost to pat it on the shoulder; but in private he is careful to see that the world does not enter even the remotest of his lodge gates. Balfour is the most egotistical of men, and a man who would make almost any sacrifice to remain in office. It costs him nothing to serve under Mr. Lloyd George; it would have cost him almost his life to be out of office during a period so exciting as that of the Great War. He loves office more than anything this world can offer; neither in philosophy nor music, literature

nor science, has he ever been able to find rest for his soul. It is profoundly instructive that a man with a real talent for the noblest of those pursuits which make solitude desirable and retirement an opportunity should be so restless and dissatisfied, even in old age, outside the doors of public life. *Mirrors of Downing Street: Some political reflections*, Mills and Boon, p. Wright wrote in the preface to the first volume that the project would have been "in vain" had he not received the donation from Balfour. Balfour argued the Darwinian premise of selection for reproductive fitness cast doubt on scientific naturalism, because human cognitive facilities that would accurately perceive truth could be less advantageous than adaptation for evolutionarily useful illusions. From the humblest form of nervous irritation at the one end of the scale, to the reasoning capacity of the most advanced races at the other, everything without exception sensation, instinct, desire, volition has been produced directly or indirectly, by natural causes acting for the most part on strictly utilitarian principles. Convenience, not knowledge, therefore, has been the main end to which this process has tended. A fictionalised version of Arthur Balfour identified as "Mr. Balfour" appears as British Prime Minister in the science fiction romance *The Angel of the Revolution* by George Griffith, published in 1904 when Balfour was still in opposition but set in an imagined near future of 1914. The indecisive Balfour identified as "Halfan Halfour" appears in "Ministers of Grace", a satirical short story by Saki in which he, and other leading politicians including Quinston, are changed into animals appropriate to their characters. Styles of address "Mr Arthur James Balfour" This allowed him to sit in the House of Lords.

Chapter 9 : Robert Louis Stevenson - Wikipedia

It's an unimpressive piece of paper, just one page of double-spaced typescript, headed "Foreign Office November 2nd," and signed in black ink with a scratchy pen by "Arthur James Balfour".

Freedman, who committed himself to finding and telling the facts about Zionism and Communism. He gave me copies of materials on the Balfour Declaration which I might never have found on my own and encouraged my own research. He died in April The Institute for Historical Review is providing means for the better understanding of the events of our time. Attempts to review historical records impartially often reveal that blame, culpability, or dishonor are not to be attached wholly to one side in the conflicts of the last hundred years. To seek to untangle fact from propaganda is a worthy study, for it increases understanding of how we got where we are and it should help people resist exploitation by powerful and destructive interests in the present and future, by exposing their working in the past. Regrettably, some of the company in that award would be hard to bear! The Balfour Declaration may be the most extraordinary document produced by any Government in world history. It took the form of a letter from the Government of His Britannic Majesty King George the Fifth, the Government of the largest empire the world has even known, on which -- once upon a time -- the sun never set; a letter to an international financier of the banking house of Rothschild who had been made a peer of the realm. Arthur Koestler wrote that in the letter "one nation solemnly promised to a second nation the country of a third. Yours sincerely, Arthur James Balfour. This was not done until after the establishment of the Civil Administration in Then why was the "Declaration" made a year before the end of what was called The Great War? This horse chestnut propaganda production was not dislodged from the mass mind by the short bursts of another story which was used officially between the World Wars. So let us dig into the records and bury the chestnuts forever. To know where to explore we must stand back from the event and look over some parts of the relevant historical background. The terrain is extensive and the mud deep, so I shall try to proceed by pointing out markers. It outlined the factors which he believed had created a universal Jewish problem, and offered a program to regulate it through the exodus of unhappy and unwanted Jews to an autonomous territory of their own in a national-socialist setting. Herzl offered a focus for a Zionist movement founded in Odessa in , which spread rapidly through the Jewish communities of Russia, and small branches which had sprung up in Germany, England and elsewhere. Though "Zion" referred to a geographical location, it functioned as a utopian conception in the myths of traditionalists, modernists and Zionists alike. It was the reverse of everything rejected in the actual Jewish situation in the "Dispersion," whether oppression or assimilation. In his diary Herzl describes submitting his draft proposals to the Rothschild Family Council, noting: I shall welcome all men of goodwill -- we must be united -- and crush all those of bad. I believed that we have the historic mission of being the exponents of universalism among the nations and therefore were more than a people identified with a specific land. Nothing prevents us from being and remaining the exponents of a united humanity, when we have a country of our own. To fulfill this mission we do not have to remain literally planted among the nations who hate and despise us. If, in our present circumstances, we wanted to bring about the unity of mankind independent of national boundaries, we would have to combat the ideal of patriotism. The latter, however, will prove stronger than we for innumerable years to come. He then used this to open his way to higher levels of power. But when offered money for Palestine, the Sultan replied that his people had won their Empire with blood, and owned it. When my Empire is divided, perhaps they will get Palestine for nothing. But only our corpse can be divided. I will never consent to vivisection. He started a Zionist newspaper, Die Welt, and was delighted to hear from the United States that a group of rabbis headed by Dr. Gustave Gottheil favored a Zionist movement. All this, and more, in a few months. It was Herzl who created the first Zionist Congress at Basel, Switzerland, August , [B] There were "delegates"; some were orthodox, some nationalist, liberal, atheist, culturalist, anarchist, socialist and some capitalist. And his anti-assimilationist dictum that "Zionism is a return to the Jewish fold even before it is a return to the Jewish land," was an expression of his own experience which was extended into the official platform of Zionism as the aim of "strengthening the Jewish national sentiment and national consciousness. But the Russian Jews thought

Herzl was patronizing them as Askenazim. They found his "western dignity did not sit well with our Russian-Jewish realism; and without wanting to, we could not help irritating him. Zionism strives to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law. The Congress contemplates the following means to the attainment of this end: The promotion on suitable lines of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers. The organization and binding together of the whole of Jewry by means of appropriate institutions, local and international, in accordance with the laws of each country. The strengthening and fostering of Jewish national sentiment and consciousness. Preparatory steps towards obtaining Government consent where necessary to the attainment of the aim of Zionism. The efforts of so-called Zionists to found a Jewish national state in Palestine contradict the messianic promise of Judaism as contained in the Holy Writ and in later religious sources. Judaism obligates its adherents to serve with all devotion the Fatherland to which they belong, and to further its national interests with all their heart and with all their strength. However, those noble aims directed toward the colonization of Palestine by Jewish peasants and farmers are not in contradiction to these obligations, because they have no relation whatsoever to the founding of a national state. This will not discourage us. We will seek other means to accomplish our end. The Orient question is now the question of the day. Sooner or later it will bring about a conflict among the nations. A European war is imminent. The great European War must come. With my watch in hand do I await this terrible moment. After the great European war is ended the Peace Conference will assemble. We must be ready for that time. We will assuredly be called to this great conference of the nations and we must prove to them the urgent importance of a Zionist solution to the Jewish Question. We must prove to them that the problem of the Orient and Palestine is one with the problem of the Jews -- both must be solved together. We must prove to them that the Jewish problem is a world problem and that a world problem must be solved by the world. And the solution must be the return of Palestine to the Jewish people. He offered the Sultan of Turkey help in re-organizing his financial affairs in return for assistance in Jewish settlement in Palestine. It is merely an expedient for colonization purposes, but, be it well understood, an expedient founded on a national and political basis. Some who favored it formed the Jewish Territorial Organization, under the leadership of Israel Zangwill. For these territorialists, the renunciation of "Zion" was not generally felt as an ideological sacrifice; instead they contended that not mystical claims to "historic attachment" but present conditions should determine the location of a Jewish national homeland. However, Jews and crypto-Jews known as Dunmeh had played a leading part in the Revolution. Victor Jacobson, [22] the first Zionist who aspired to be not a Zionist leader but a "career" diplomat, and although he built up good political connections through social contacts, "always avoiding the sharpness of a direct issue, and waiting in patient oriental fashion for the insidious seed of propaganda to fructify," [23] yet some of those engaged in the work, notably Vladimir Zev Jabotinsky, came to despair of success so long as the Ottoman Empire controlled Palestine. They henceforth pinned their hopes on its collapse. It is our duty to convince the Turks that Zionist policy then shifted to the Arabs, so that they might think of Zionism as a possible make-weight against the Turks. But Zionists soon observed that their reception by Arab leaders grew warmer as the Arabs were disappointed in their hopes of gaining concessions from the Turks, but cooled swiftly when these hopes revived. The more than 60 Arab parliamentary delegates in Constantinople and the newly active Arabic press kept up "a drumfire of complaints" against Jewish immigration, land purchase and settlement in Palestine. But the strength of the national will forged for itself two main roads towards its goal -- the gradual extension and strengthening of our Yishuv Hebrew: But this barrier was covertly surmounted, partly due to the venality of Turkish officials, [30] as delicately put in a Zionist report -- "it was always possible to get round the individual official with a little artifice" ; [32] and partly to the diligence of the Russian consuls in Palestine in protecting Russian Jews and saving them from expulsion. Arab independence could be prevented by the intervention of England and France, Germany or Russia. The Eastern Jews hated Czarist Russia. He will be spoken to. Fifty years later, the combined emblems became the flag of the Zionist state. The "Shield of David" is of Assyrian origin: It appeared on the heraldic flag of the Jews in Prague in Their yacht, the Hohenzollern, put in at Haifa, and they were escorted to Jerusalem by 2, Turkish soldiers. Between and , there was an immigration of some , Eastern Jews. Though cut by the Aliens Bill of the Balfour Government, which became law in the summer of ,

immigration continued so that by there was a Jewish population in England of some , A leader of the fight against the Aliens Bill and against tightening up naturalization regulations in was Winston S. Born in the Crimea, and nurtured in the atmosphere of assimilation and revolutionary agitation in Russia, Jacobson had organized clubs and written about Zionism in Russian Jewish newspapers. After the First World War, the era of the direct and indirect bribe and the contact man gave way to one in which the interests of nationalities, represented by diplomat-attorneys, had to be met, wrote Lipsky: He had to win sympathy as well as conviction. Here they hold jubilant peace conferences in which they talk against war But the same righteous governments, who are so nobly, industriously active to establish the eternal peace, are preparing, by their own confession, complete annihilation for six million people, and there is nobody, except the doomed themselves, to raise his voice in protest although this is a worse crime than any war Among invited contributors was the immensely wealthy Russian Jew Alexander Helphand who, as "Parvus," was later to suggest to the German left-wing parties that Lenin and his associates be sent to Russia in to demoralize still further the beaten Russian armies. The Great War Until mid, the surface of European diplomatic relations was placid, reflecting successfully negotiated settlements of colonial and other questions. But certain British journalists were charged by their contemporaries "that they deliberately set out to poison Anglo-German relations and to create by their scaremongering such a climate of public opinion that war between the two Great Powers became inevitable. The Advocacy of War and Rearmament , A. Every anti-German diatribe in British newspapers added to German government concern as to whether it was part of a policy instigated or condoned by Downing Street. Further, there were groups in every major European country which could see only in war the possible means to further their interests or to thwart the ambitions of their rivals. This is why the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir-apparent to the Austro-Hungarian throne, on 28 June in Sarajevo, soon set Europe crackling with fire, a fire which naturally spread through the lines of communications to colonial territories as far away as China. On 28 July, Austria declared war on Serbia. Germany sent an ultimatum to Russia threatening hostilities if orders for total mobilization of the Russian army and navy were not countermanded.