

BROKEN PROMISES OF THE MANDATE: A STUDY OF THE PALESTINE  
MANDATE SOCIETY AND ITS IMPACT  
ON THE PROLIFERATION OF ZIONISM  
WITHIN PALESTINE AND GREAT BRITAIN

by

Brendon L. Larimore, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of  
Texas State University in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of  
Masters of Arts  
with a Major in History  
August 2015

Committee Members:

Elizabeth A. Bishop (Committee Chair)

Bryan S. Glass

James E. McWilliams

**COPYRIGHT**

by

Brendon L. Larimore

2015

## **FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT**

### **Fair Use**

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgment. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

### **Duplication Permission**

As the copyright holder of this work I, Brendon L. Larimore, refuse permission to copy in excess of the "Fair Use" exemption without my written permission.

## DEDICATION

I wish to dedicate this thesis first to my family, friends and mentors that have helped me throughout my academic career. In particular, I would like to thank my mentors who serve as the Committee Members for this thesis: Dr. Elizabeth Bishop, who made me realize that an interest in Middle East Studies could be possible, Dr. Bryan Glass who sparked my interest in the Barbary Coast and how Great Britain was responsible for actions taken in the Middle East following World War I, and Dr. James McWilliams for serving as the Advisor for my Bachelor's Thesis, which comprises most of the first chapter.

To my mother and father and my sister who stressed to me the importance of a higher education beyond even college, it is necessary to give great thanks and appreciation for all they have done for me.

For my closest friends I have met during my time here at Texas State, first Jonathan Truett Selby, who taught me that I needed to be more confident within myself and what I was trying to accomplish. Secondly, to Benjamin Antonio Cordero who, along with Jonathan, was always there for me when I needed someone to talk to about the stress of my goals and aspirations. To Colby Ryan Ake, whom I consider to be my big little brother, I am grateful for the time we shared while here in San Marcos. And lastly but not least to Dylan Elijah De La Cruz, despite being someone I have known the shortest amount of

time, we have been through it all. Traveling to all the countries within the British Isles and Ireland, and exploring the National Archives in London, were two of the most important times in my life. Dylan, you are a lifelong friend and my brother forever. Along with my closest friend from High School, Herman Sie Noll and my closest childhood friend Courtney Marshall, these men have served as brothers to me when I grew up not having one. Tragically my brother died of heart failure before I was born. Growing up, I always wanted to belong and these men, who I would go to hell and back for, are my group of friends that I feel honored to call my brothers for life. I love you all.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to acknowledge the seemingly endless resources at The Albert B. Alkek Library located at Texas State University in San Marcos, The Perry-Castañeda Library located at the University of Texas in Austin and The National Archives of the United Kingdom, located in Richmond, London, United Kingdom.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION: A PROMISING FUTURE.....	1
II. ESTABLISHING THE MANDATE: AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT WITHIN THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE CREATION OF THE PALESTINE MANDATE .....	6
III. ADMINISTRATION OF THE MANDATE: AN EXAMINATION OF A BRITISH CONTROLLED PALESTINE AND THE PALESTINE MAN- DATE SOCIETY .....	31
IV. LIVING WITHIN THE PALESTINE MANDATE: EXAMINING PALESTINIAN REACTIONS DURING THE PALES- TINE MANDATE.....	84
V. CONCLUSION: BROKEN PROMISES: THE AFTERMATH OF THE ZION- IST AND BRITISH CONTROLLED PALESTINE .....	103
APPENDIX SECTION.....	107
LITERATURE CITED.....	109

## **ABSTRACT**

Following World War I, leaders of the most important nations on the globe wondered how they were going to prevent a crisis like the war from happening again. United States President Woodrow Wilson in his Fourteen Points address, stated that an organization which was based on international diplomacy was necessary. What effects did the League of Nations have on the Palestine Mandate specifically and how did Wilson's relationships affect the power structure of the Mandate? What impact did this have on the Arab population within Palestine?

Out of the Fourteen Points address came the idea for the League of Nations. In Paris, the leaders of the victorious nations carved up Germany and the Ottoman Empire. Wilson's desire to create the League and his subsequent failure would become a cornerstone of his presidency. Wilson created a relationship with British Prime Minister David Lloyd George and World Zionist Leader Chaim Weizmann, which secured the creation of the Palestine Mandate. This Mandate would be controlled by the British and the Zionist Jews. Palestine was to be "A home for the Jews."

Through examination of primary source materials from Wilson, Lloyd George, Weizmann and the records of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, I have found a relationship that was formed that would irrevocably influence the course of history. Weizmann and Wilson were determined to make the Palestine Mandate a reality. Once Wilson had learned that American participation with the League of Nations would not be accomplished, he worked with British Prime Minister David Lloyd George to give Great Britain control of the Mandate.



The British Mandate for Palestine, as it would come to be known, was seen as a cooperative effort between the British, Jews and Arabs in order to form a nation where all sides could prosper. My research question involves measuring the amount of intent that Wilson had towards Pro-Zionist causes in order to make Palestine that “home” for the Jews. It is to show that Wilson’s diplomatic actions were the catalyst for many issues that the world would face in the subsequent decades. During the League of Nations, the Americans believed that British control of the Mandate was the only viable option for it to succeed. Weizmann and Wilson, along with Lloyd George, created a nation which would soon become one of the greatest points of conflict during the twentieth century.

The British Mandate for Palestine created a dramatic change in how the Mandate was perceived globally. Administered by the British government, the Mandate remains a prime example of Britain’s imperialistic tendencies. It is my assertion that Palestine is one of the final reaches of Britain’s formal empire. Through primary source material obtained in the National Archives in London, specifically those documents from the Colonial and Foreign Office, I gained an understanding of what went wrong with the Mandate and how it failed. The conundrum of how the Mandate was administered between the period of 1919 and 1939 is discussed. These specific documents include letters from the Palestine Mandate Society, a group that was influential within Britain and provided some of the most vocal opposition to how the Mandate was administered within Jerusalem. The hope of the British government was that a joint effort would occur between the British and Zionist Jews, and that they would be able to cooperate with the overwhelming Arab population. The efforts of the British and Zionist Jews were quickly seen as volatile and improper in the eyes of the Arabs. The Arabs believed that they were subjected to unfair demands by both the British and the Zionists. These actions led to a larger sense of distrust created within the Mandate.

The office of the High Commissioner became the most influential position within the government of the Mandate. In essence, the Governor of the Mandate was to enact the demands and requests of Whitehall in London. Perhaps the most important factor to recognize is the disconnect between London and Jerusalem at this time. The Palestine Mandate Society (CO 733/186/2), (CO 733/150/11) was the most vocal opposition to their governmental actions. The conflict between the Society and the Office of the High Commissioner came to an abrupt halt when one of their most valued members, Scotsman Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope, was assigned to become the High Commissioner of Palestine for some of the most important years of the Mandate (1931 to 1937). My overall research question focuses on how the British Empire failed to maintain control of the Mandate. What actions taken by the British directly led to the abandonment of the Mandate?

Another important question I seek to answer is between 1919 and 1939 was there an actual Palestinian identity? Discussion of Palestinian Identity begins in earnest here. The purpose of the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 was to create nations which would not fall under the control of the defeated German and Ottoman Empires.

Throughout my research of both primary and secondary source material, two major questions have surfaced. The first question was, did Palestinians outside of the Mandate recognize the problems that the British government had trying to administer the mandate? And secondly what effect did the Palestine Mandate Society and its proliferation of Zionism have on Palestine?

Illustration 1. Map of Palestine under British Mandate circa 1922.

From "Some Truths About Palestine" *The Times of London*, 1922.



## **I. INTRODUCTION: A PROMISING FUTURE**

The end of World War I led to hopes by many throughout the globe that any significant threat of tyranny would be squashed following the defeat of Germany and the Ottoman Empire. Woodrow Wilson and David Lloyd George, would create a cooperative effort that through the strength of the international community, that benefited off the strengths of debate and compromise. Woodrow Wilson was the creator of the League in spirit and his Fourteen Points delivered to the United States Congress a precursor to the actual drafting of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

The hope of the leaders within The League of Nations and the Mandate system in general, was that it would provide stability to those nations and societies that have none. The Balfour Declaration was one of the first steps to the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people. It provided support for the Zionist cause to be established and supported in Palestine, but promised that the rights of the Arab Palestinian people would not be compromised. The first chapter of this thesis will explore the relationship between Woodrow Wilson and Chaim Weizmann and how Wilson's support of Zionism affected Palestine during its creation and the subsequent administration by the British government.

Woodrow Wilson's hard-headed approach to international diplomacy proved that while he could be stubborn, many others in the League would be bothered by his actions and believed that he was possibly going overboard. Chaim Weizmann used his connections within Great Britain and the United States to fulfill his mission of finding a national home for the Jewish people. The relationship between the Jewish people and the United States is unique, due to the influence on economics and the social aspects that dominated

the immigration issue at the turn of the twentieth century. Through a careful examination of how the Mandate was created by Wilson, Weizmann and Lloyd George, it will provide a framework to the issues that will be covered in full within the thesis.

In addition to the pull Zionism has on the United States, it also had an important influence on Great Britain. However, Zionism in Great Britain, could arguably be seen as more profitable for political gain rather than social or economic gain. Members of the Palestine Mandate Society, a group created in order to proliferate Zionism within Palestine, consisted of high-ranking members of the British government such as David Lloyd George, Arthur James Balfour, Cecil Chelwood, and Ramsay MacDonald. These men along with others such as John Buchan, Wyndham Deedes, Josiah Wedgwood and Herbert Sidebotham all championed the cause of Zionism within Europe, and specifically in Great Britain. They supported their belief by arguing that a strong relationship between the Jewish people and the British provided stability for the British Empire moving forward. It would deliver to the British economic trading possibilities that they previously only dreamed of.

That is why the second chapter, which focuses on the Palestine Mandate Society and the Administration of Palestine itself is so important. To date, there has not been significant research done on the Palestine Mandate Society and the influence of its members. Within the first chapter of this thesis, “promises” were made that nothing would infringe upon the rights of the Arab Palestinians. Essentially, the members of the Mandate Society, which led the British Administration of the Mandate, provided lip service to the world when they said that the Mandate would be a cooperative effort. Their drastic support of

the Zionist cause is without question, one of the most important political developments of the twentieth century. Through the examination of sources written by members of this society, it will highlight the view shared by them, that a strong relationship between Zionism and Great Britain would be beneficial to the empire. It allowed them to gain a foothold within the Middle East and would also help them trade internationally. Documents found at the National Archives in London, give the impression that the support of Zionism was stronger than originally expected. Josiah Wedgwood was an influential Member of Parliament and perhaps the most publicly outspoken about the back room support of Zionism. The restructuring of the Balfour Declaration, in theory, allowed for more equal opportunity for the Jews and Arabs. The Palestine Mandate Society “promised” to their members and the members of their ideology that they would support Zionism within Palestine to the fullest.

An examination of British-administered Palestine and its affect on the Palestinian population within the third chapter explains the struggles faced by these peoples and the oppression they encountered from the British and the Jews. The Palestine Mandate as a test result shows signs of weakness. Its Parliamentary governmental structure, which mirrored Whitehall in London, had no place within the former Ottoman Empire. The Arab Revolts and the subsequent militarization by all sides showed the dire situation that the three groups found themselves in. The restructuring of Ottoman traditions by the British, most importantly the *Mukhtar* system, shows how problematic the Mandate had become. In an attempt to modernize the once supposedly “backwards” people, the British had initi-

ated a wrath that caused both the Zionists and Arabs to start distrusting the British government and became a recipe for disaster.

By the end of the Mandate, the British Government had run a deficit so large that it became unsustainable. In 1948, following the dissolution of the Palestine Mandate and the steps taken to form the National home for the Jewish people, their “promise” to Zionism, no matter how “broken,” had been completed.

An Ottoman or Arab controlled Palestine was no more, the creation of the state of Israel by World Zionist Leader Dr. Chaim Weizmann had fulfilled his promise to the Zionist cause by giving them not only the home they desired, but in the location that they had wanted, their ancestral home. It is the hope of this thesis that the extensive examination of the Palestine Question as stated will show the problems which all three sides dealt with during the period between 1920 and 1948.

To argue that the British Mandate for Palestine was full of “Broken Promises” is to argue the viewpoint of each side. The British could argue that it was full of broken promises because of the efforts put forth to increase the reach of the empire in order to provide greater support back home. It was viewed as for the good of the British Empire and any steps and measures taken by the government to support that were justified. For the Zionists, the lack of immigration at the outset and the dearth of economic opportunities forced them to fight for stronger change for their cause. Working in symphony with each other, the Palestine Mandate Society and its members at the core of the British government doubled their efforts for the Zionist cause. They “promised” each other that a

strong relationship would allow them to prosper together. The Arabs however share the brunt of most of these “broken promises.” The Balfour Declaration promised them that their rights would not be infringed. This however, as the thesis will show, is clearly not the case. The Arab Palestinians struggled to gain a foothold within the day-to-day structure of the Mandate. They realized that the Balfour Declaration was set up to make their lives difficult. The Arabs never believed and never trusted either the British or the Zionists that they would never take advantage of them. Eventually, after strong resistance against the Zionists and British, they were able to gain some of their rights back.

The transition from the British Mandate for Palestine into Israel is a complicated evolution of political debates. The fight over who was in the “right” permeated the debate throughout the twentieth century. This thesis will attempt to uncover and explain all of the “broken promises” that lay in the wake of the British Mandate for Palestine, one of the most complicated political situations ever. What originally was a joint effort between the three groups would only end up in “broken promises.”



## **II. ESTABLISHING THE MANDATE: AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT WITHIN THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE CREATION OF THE PALESTINE MANDATE**

French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau described United States President Woodrow Wilson as “a fellow who thinks himself the first man for 2,000 years who has known anything about peace on earth? Wilson imagines he is a second messiah.”<sup>1</sup> Wilson’s attitude supporting this was the perception that the President manifested during the Paris Peace Conference following the First World War. President Wilson was adamant about the necessity for not only the United States but also the other great global powers of Britain and France to solve the issues that followed after World War I. The idea is that Wilson being perceived by his colleagues such as Clemenceau as a “second messiah” displays his ruthless nature of wanting to save the world from the terrors of foreign powers, even if doing so would prove detrimental to his own country. It was the willingness of President Wilson to be involved in global affairs that showed why his participation in the creation of the League of Nations was flawed.

In *Woodrow Wilson’s Case for the League of Nations*, President Wilson explained not only the need for intervention in the world but how the League would help the overall

---

<sup>1</sup> United Press Cable, “*Versailles Revelations*.” Wall Street Journal, Nov, 14, 1924,<http://libproxy.txstate.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.txstate.edu/docview/130140883?accountid=5683>

goal of international peace and stability. President Wilson described the League as a “partnership, a permanent partnership, of the great and free self-governing peoples of the world to stand for the right for civilization.”<sup>2</sup> It was Wilson’s belief that the League could be the major factor in the future prevention of major conflicts like the First World War. This attempt at preventing wars, as history had determined, was not to be. The actions of the League of Nations and the subsequent Treaty of Sévres and Treaty of Versailles, laid the groundwork for the German economic meltdown, which eventually brought numerous countries into the Second World War. The economic downturn in Germany began because they were desperate. In turn, it was the precursor to the actions of the National Socialist Worker’s Party, also known as the Nazis, and their leader Adolf Hitler. The rise of Hitler was exactly what the League of Nations was supposed to prevent and the ascent of Hitler is why the League failed.

During the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, Wilson was part of the Big Four, a group of top leaders who consisted of David Lloyd George of Great Britain, Georges Clemenceau of France, and Vittorio Orlando, the representative for Italy.<sup>3</sup> Following the apparent resolution of the German Problem, the League and its leaders then attempted to resolve the issues decimating the Ottoman Empire. When they began fixing the issues of the world it was certainly clear that the League attempted to be a force for good. However, how was Wilson going to deal with the problems of the Near East?

---

<sup>2</sup> Woodrow Wilson, *Woodrow Wilson’s Case for the League of Nations* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1967), 25.

<sup>3</sup> United States Department of State, *Papers Relating to the foreign relations of the United States The Paris Peace Conference, 1919* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1942-47), 311.

Before the start of the Paris Peace Conference, President Wilson was introduced by the mutual diplomatic acquaintances of Louis Brandeis and Colonel Edward House to World Zionist Organization Leader Dr. Chaim Weizmann. To find the reasoning behind the desire of the Jews to make Palestine their home it is necessary to explore the dimensions that made up the Zionist leader, Chaim Weizmann, and how he used his political and diplomatic influence. His travels through Europe and America created diplomatic relationships that helped further his cause for a national home and allowed him the credibility to sway the opinions of the world's leaders going into the Paris Peace Conference of 1919. Chaim Weizmann was a Russian-born Jew, who was involved in a multitude of Zionist causes from an early age. Zionism was described by Weizmann "as a force for life and creativity residing in the Jewish masses."<sup>4</sup> While being a leader for the Zionist cause, he did take issue with the concept from renowned author Theodor Herzl, whom Weizmann classified as the Father of Modern Zionism. In 1896, Herzl penned *Der Judenstaat-The Jewish State* in which he talked about the need for a home for the Jewish people. Weizmann incorrectly was quick to point out that Herzl "did not mention Palestine."<sup>5</sup> The selection process for the relocation of the Jewish people will be discussed in the following chapter with a more in-depth analysis of *Der Judenstaat*. Mostly, Herzl debates between Argentina or Palestine as the two major locations for Jewish settlement.

Perhaps what was important was the personality of Herzl rather than the actual

---

<sup>4</sup> Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error*. (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1949), 176.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

details of his publication, which did not provide anything new to the Zionist cause.<sup>6</sup> It can be argued that Weizmann used his personal experiences of travel and his desires for wanting Palestine to be designated as the national home of the Jewish people, as a personal goal which he hoped to achieve. He imagined that there must be a time in the future where the Zionists would be able to govern their own people and that despite the British always being for the Zionist cause there would be a need to eventually evolve as a people. Weizmann was the emerging leader of the Pro-Zionist movement, on the brink of finding a national home for the Jewish People in the land of Palestine that was under contention following the First World War.

Weizmann lobbied Wilson for his support in the creation of a Jewish homeland. He garnered this support through the words of Colonel Edward House. Edward M. House. Colonel House was a diplomat and politician from Texas, who was considered the right hand man of President Woodrow Wilson, in regards to the United States ratification of the Treaty of Versailles and his foreign policy platform. He gave words of encouragement to the release of the Balfour Declaration and the support was to be indirectly transmitted due to Wilson's issues with American ratification of membership into the League of Nations. Wilson did not forget the support of Weizmann and his Zionist cause as he went to Paris. This determination of Wilson's opinion, allowed preconceived opinions to be developed by the League of Nations members. Wilson did have a part to play in the creation of Palestine despite it being called the British Mandate for Palestine. The British Government would control the state until better opportunities arose for the people of

---

<sup>6</sup> Ibid, 43.

Palestine to take control of their own land. This was a direct action that was explained within the publication of the Mandate and the Balfour Declaration, the document which provided support from the British government in the establishment of the National Jewish State within Palestine. This position in favor of the British Mandate is an argument that is not covered by many historians. President Woodrow Wilson had an important role in the creation of Palestine and his relationship with Weizmann affected the outcomes of the Peace Conference.

Following the Armistice with Germany in 1918, the world had seen how one country or a group of countries could cause so much harm to the global community. In reaction, Wilson created the idea of the League of Nations, an entity in which countries could come together to solve their differences without resorting to violence. In January of 1918, Wilson gave the address before Congress known as the Fourteen Points. The Fourteen Points outlined policies that would create peace and civility rather than death and destruction following the end of the war. For the argument of this paper, however, it is the fourteenth and final point that had a dramatic effect on the Peace Conference in 1919. It states: "A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike."<sup>7</sup> This "general association" was the creation of the League of Nations, a group that would make an irrevocable mark on the course of history. The formation of the League shows that the tendencies for Wilson and his "savior" status were

---

<sup>7</sup> Avalon Project, 'President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points,' Yale Law School, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/wilson14.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp) (accessed April 2, 2012).

already starting to rise to the surface as an attribute, which can be perceived both as a strength and a weakness. In *Woodrow Wilson's Case for the League of Nations*, Wilson describes the League of Nations and the subsequent Treaty of Versailles as being an "American document." President Wilson stated that he "will defend to the last the rights of human beings wherever they are."<sup>8</sup>

The historiography of the Paris Peace Conference focuses mostly on Germany. Numerous secondary sources on the League of Nations deal with Germany while in these same sources the subject of the Ottoman Empire and Palestine are put to the back burner. There is essentially no debate between historians that Palestine was purely a British invention; however, as outlined above, it is the argument that this is not the case. Perhaps the most influential secondary source on the relationship between President Woodrow Wilson and the Middle East, also referred to in this time as the "Near East," is *The Wilsonian Moment* written by Erez Manela. Manela attempted to write a paper on the foreign relations of the United States in Egypt before the Second World War. Instead the author focused on Wilson. This source provides insight towards the common perception that President Wilson was a "prophet of a new era in world affairs."<sup>9</sup> This quote by Manela supports the idea that Wilson was influential in not only the creation of Palestine but, as Manela argues, that Wilson was also responsible for the "Self-Determination" of the Egyptian people. Manela does in many ways, however, provide a glorified hagiographic

---

<sup>8</sup> Wilson, *Woodrow Wilson's Case for the League of Nations*, 25-26.

<sup>9</sup> Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 3.

view of President Wilson and his views on foreign policies towards other countries.

Beyond Manela, there is another secondary source that intricately discusses the formation of Palestine following the war. *Palestine Papers* analyzes the situation that Palestine found itself in while examining major primary sources. In the chapter “*Who Shall Have Palestine?*” the author Doreen Ingrams discusses the attitude of President Wilson towards Palestine and says that Wilson was following in the direction of “an international police than of American administration.”<sup>10</sup> Wilson hoped to support the Mandate, but due to political reasons, the United States was unable to administer the Mandate. This source provides evidence that Wilson was a man who seemed hell-bent on solving all of the world’s problems. Thus, in light of the argument presented earlier, it is entirely possible that he had a significant hand in the creation of Palestine, so much as to give it his personal endorsement.

Another important angle discussed that provides overall context to the argument of Wilson and self-determinism is the secondary source, *A Shattered Peace*. In this source, David Andelman contends that despite the United States Congress rejecting participation in the League of Nations long-term, along with the Sykes-Picot accord, the creation of the Mandate was an American invention. This invention was where the boundaries of the Middle East had been laid out before the Paris Peace Conference. These boundaries, were used by Britain and France. When the Ottoman Empire was “formally

---

<sup>10</sup> Doreen Ingrams, *Palestine Papers 1917-1922 Seeds of Conflict* (New York: George Braziller, 1972), 39.

divided,”<sup>11</sup> it provided support of the argument that Wilson, who commissioned the report, had further influence in regard to Palestine than history has given him credit for. Only a few sources pertain to the Middle East at the Paris Peace Conference. This is a stark contrast to the mountain of materials that can be examined in regards to Post-War Europe and, in particular Germany. The idea that Wilson had a significant influence in the formation of Palestine is miniscule. However, the relationship between President Woodrow Wilson and Dr. Chaim Weizmann is a diplomatic relationship that needs to be examined in order to fully understand the issues laid out before the world following the Great War.

President Woodrow Wilson was introduced to Weizmann through a mutual friend, Charles Prestwich Scott<sup>12</sup>, a month before the Paris Peace Conference. Scott believed that Wilson should discuss the matters regarding the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire and that Weizmann was the “recognized leader of the Zionist movement... and is in complete possession of the facts in regard to the present position in Palestine, as it affects alike the Jews and the Arabs.”<sup>13</sup> In *The Manchester Guardian: A Biography of a newspaper*, David Ayerst states that “Scott liked to think that he had a ‘special relationship’ with President Wilson. In a sense this was true. Through Colonel House he heard on several occasions how much the President relied on the *Guardian’s* ‘whole hearted support for his

---

<sup>11</sup> David Andelman, *A Shattered Peace* (Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2008), 71-72.

<sup>12</sup> Charles Prestwich Scott, Main Editor of *The Manchester Guardian* newspaper from 1872-1929. Zionist and friend to Woodrow Wilson and David Lloyd George.

<sup>13</sup> Arthur S. Link., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. vol. 53 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 572.



policies.<sup>14</sup> In response to this letter sent by Scott, Wilson replied about a week before the Peace Conference started that he “hopes to have a real confidential talk with him.”<sup>15</sup> This source provides evidence to the argument that in meeting with Weizmann before the beginning of the Conference, Wilson would have already decided his course of action to which he was to take in the next six months at the Peace Conference.

In a letter to his wife, Vera, before the meeting with President Wilson, Weizmann essentially gave a status report of the Zionist cause and where it stood before the proceedings took place. He stated that after talking with Edward House, America was in favor of a “Jewish Palestine, for the British Protectorate.”<sup>16</sup> In this letter Weizmann was eager to have the confidential talk, which Wilson had mentioned would take place and was interested to hear first-hand the opinion of the President. Following the supposed meeting, Wilson sent to Scott an article published on January 20<sup>th</sup>, 1919 in the *Christian Science Monitor*. The confidential meeting between Wilson and Weizmann did indeed take place. The article stated that after meeting with President Woodrow Wilson, Weizmann had gained the full support of the President and that the idea of a Jewish Palestine was to be “full and unhampered” and in addition to the endorsement of Jewish rights they would be given the opportunity at the Peace Conference to finally settle the rights of the people.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Ayerst, David. *The Manchester Guardian: A Biography of a Newspaper*, 410.

<sup>15</sup> Arthur S Link. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. vol. 54 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 717.

<sup>16</sup> Jehuda Reinharz, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*. Series A, vol. IX (Rutgers: Transaction Books, 1977), 92-93.

<sup>17</sup> “President Wilson and Jewish Rights,” *Christian Science Monitor*, Jan 20, 1919

This statement by Wilson provided a precursor to the actual events of the Paris Peace Conference.

The letters written before the beginning of the Conference describe the meeting between Wilson and Weizmann and showed that a decision had already been made for one of the most influential causes, Zionism. This meeting with Wilson made Weizmann confident that he would be able to achieve his goal of a national home for the Jewish people. This goal was originally seen as too daunting and perhaps an impossible dream. The possibility that due to a particular group's enormous influence, the Arabs already had their fate decided before the conference is puzzling. The idea of debate and discussion was in fact the goal of the Paris Peace Conference and the League of Nations: it was the hope that countries from around the globe would in a mutual setting, and through their own representation, have their thoughts and opinions heard in front of the world's most powerful quartet of Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando. This concept is entirely idealistic.

At the start of the Paris Peace Conference, Wilson gave a speech about the reasons for the creation of the Covenant of the League of Nations, and how it was possible for the League to be a force for good in the world. There is a laundry list of countries which were discussed and debated, from Germany to Far Eastern Countries, all of which were determined to find a place in the world which best suited them. Wilson, in his opening remarks about the League to the Peace Conference, describes it as "necessary" for

progress to be made in the world.<sup>18</sup> Wilson believed that by creating and joining the League of Nations it could be a powerful force for peace and that the Paris Peace Conference was just the first step in order to resolve any further issues that could arise throughout the globe.

The most interesting aspect of the League is the dynamic between the ways that the League dealt with Germany in stark contrast to that of the world. While most of the issues involving Germany dealt with war reparations, most of the other territories discussed in Paris dealt with land ownership. The League not only did away with the issues that led Germany to become a fierce enemy to most of the world's powers, the group of world leaders now turned their attention to the crumbling Ottoman Empire, an impressive group of lands lead by the Sultan Mehmed VI, the last leader of this enormous and formerly prestigious empire. The Ottomans followed the path of being against the Russians and sided with the Germans. The Tanzimat<sup>19</sup> and the restructuring of the empire, led to a complete overhaul, which included political, economic and religious structures. However, their perceived obsolete nature coupled with the massive amounts of lands that were under the control of the Sultanate, provided an opportunity for the League to have a say in lands that included Turkey, Greece and most importantly in regards to this paper: Palestine.

---

<sup>18</sup> United States, Department of State. Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United States The Paris Peace Conference 1919. vol. III (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1943), 178.

<sup>19</sup> Tanzimat, (Turkish: "Reorganization"), series of reforms promulgated in the [Ottoman Empire](#) between 1839 and 1876 under the reigns of the sultans [Abdülmejid I](#) and [Abdülaziz](#). These reforms, heavily influenced by European ideas, were intended to effectuate a fundamental change of the empire from the old system based on theocratic principles to that of a modern state. From <http://www.britannica.com/event/Tanzimat>

In a *New York Times* article on 3 December 1922, the King Crane Commission, which was started by the United States in the summer months of 1919 following the Paris Peace Conference, came back with the results from the people of the Ottoman Empire that were to be rebranded as individual or Mandate states in the case of Palestine, the Palestinians chose the United States, rather than any other global power. They “disliked French, distrusted British and opposed the Zionist Plan.”<sup>20</sup> Had the United States taken control, the tale of Wilson being a savior to the world would have been one that could possibly not be contested; however, this course of action was not the case. Wilson understood that this particular document wanted America to run the Mandate. He remained steady in the idea that the Palestine Mandate should be British. He had by the creation of the Mandate created unity amongst the global community. To take control after all of that was accomplished would have, most likely, been a counterproductive move that might have created instability in a world that had just achieved a small measure that was necessary for long-lasting peace. Chaim Weizmann did not simply rely on the help of the British people to further his Zionist causes. Weizmann realized that if he was going to accomplish his goals he must also gain support from America. In 1917, he turned to the United States for assistance. He carefully chose his allies in America to help his cause.

To that end, Weizmann developed a friendship with Louis D. Brandeis, a man that was, at the time, newly appointed to the United States Supreme Court. Brandeis became a leader for the Zionist cause in America. In the *Curse of Bigness*, Brandeis describes that

---

<sup>20</sup> “Crane and King’s Long-Hid Report on the Near East” *New York Times*, Dec 3, 1922.

“Palestine is fit for the Modern Jew and second that the modern Jew is fit for Palestine.”<sup>21</sup>

As a leader of Zionism in America and due to his high profile nature of being a Supreme Court Justice, Weizmann turned to Brandeis, saying in a letter to the Justice that “It is essential to have not only President’s approval of text, but his recommendation to grant this declaration without delay... Your support is urgently needed.”<sup>22</sup> In his publication, Brandeis explicitly asked for the support of the American people for the Zionist cause by combining this ideology with the idea of American patriotism. Brandeis states: “Your loyalty to America, your loyalty to Judaism, should lead you to support the Zionist cause.”<sup>23</sup>To gain the support of President Wilson before the Balfour Declaration was not as simple. Wilson was the man who appointed Brandeis to the Supreme Court. This strong statement shows how Weizmann used the clout and reputation of Louis Brandeis to gain support for his cause.

The resulting document is one that will cause chaos and mayhem throughout the twentieth century within Palestine. The Balfour Declaration was released on November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1917 to the lukewarm support of Chaim Weizmann. As Sykes excitedly distributed the document to Weizmann, he said “Dr. Weizmann, it’s a boy!”<sup>24</sup> Weizmann said that he

---

<sup>21</sup> Louis Brandeis, *The Curse of Bigness*. (New York: Viking Press, 1935), 211.

<sup>22</sup> Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, 206.

<sup>23</sup> Brandeis, *The Curse of Bigness*, 217.

<sup>24</sup> Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, 208.

did not “like the boy at first.”<sup>25</sup> This “boy” as Sykes called it was the Balfour Declaration, and that created the possibility for the Palestine Mandate. Weizmann acknowledged that it was better than the alternative of no national home. This desire provided the drive for Weizmann at the Paris Peace Conference and in that previously quoted letter to his wife Vera, he states that he “believes that we could even strengthen our demands.”<sup>26</sup> On February 27th 1919, the Zionists would finally have their platform on the global stage of the League of Nations and make their demands known.

The delegations at the Paris Peace Conference in Versailles were broken into councils and the representatives who participated in these groups were dependent on their jobs within the individual delegations. The most influential group was the Council of Four which consisted of Wilson, Lloyd-George, Clemenceau, and Orlando. The Council of Ten heard most of the day to day talks within the Paris Peace Conference. The Council of Ten consisted of Woodrow Wilson and Robert Lansing, David Lloyd-George and Arthur James Balfour, Georges Clemenceau and Pinchon, Vitorrio Orlando was accompanied by Sidney Sonnio. The group also consisted of two Japanese Diplomats, who acted as observers. This group met with members from throughout the world who had concerns of how the nations throughout the globe were going to be redistributed following the Great War. The group was then parsed down into the Council of Four, because the four heads of state needed to officially decide their decision alone in order to provide the

---

<sup>25</sup> Ibid, 208.

<sup>26</sup> Reinharz, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann Series A vol. IX* (Rutgers: Transactions Books, 1977), 92.

best possible outcome for the Allied powers.

The Council of Ten was prepared to hear the desires and wishes of the Zionist Delegation within Versailles. Despite the then well-known fact that Weizmann was the leader of the Zionist cause and the strongest supporter of Zionist's aspirations towards achieving a home for the Jewish people, another Zionist leader, Nahum Sokolow, was in charge of the delegation that addressed the League. Sokolow, was a Zionist journalist and a close friend and advisor to Dr. Chaim Weizmann. In 1906 he became the Secretary General to the World Zionism Congress and travelled throughout Europe and North America in order to promote the Zionist cause and gain support. He was also a critical factor in the distribution of the Balfour Declaration. Along with Aaron Aaronsohn, they both took the floor in front of the Supreme Allied Council. Sokolow introduced himself as the "representative of the Zionist Organisation and the Jewish Population of Palestine."<sup>27</sup> The leaders of the delegations present were the previously-mentioned quartet of power of Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando, along with the secretaries like Robert Lansing from the United States and close advisor to Wilson, Balfour from the British Empire, Pichon from France and Sonnino from Italy. While these were not the "bigwigs," they were to report their thoughts back to their respective heads of states, thus their presence was necessary.

In addition to these important figures within the Treaty of Versailles, another key individual who had a dramatic impact on the formation of the League of Nations and the

---

<sup>27</sup> United States Department of State. *Papers relating to the Foreign relations of the United States The Paris Peace Conference 1919* vol. IV (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1943), 161.

drafting of the League of Nations covenant was Colonel House. Wilson appointed House to be the lead delegation official, responsible for the drafting of the Mandate system within the negotiations in London, after the successful ratification of the Treaty of Versailles. This would imply that House, before his departure of the diplomatic mission, had a dramatic impact on the influence of the United States within the creation of the Palestine Mandate. In *Woodrow Wilson's Right Hand*, author Godfrey Hodgson explores the life of House. The final chapters within the text explore his participation in the creation of the League and the professional relationship between Wilson and himself. Hodgson argues that it was House who structured the League due to the stress of the war on Wilson. Hodgson argues that House could even be considered the "...father if not the midwife of the league."<sup>28</sup> Wilson wrote to House in 1916 stating that "I agree with you that we have nothing to do with local settlements-territorial questions, indemnities, and the like-but are concerned only in the future peace of the world."<sup>29</sup> This provides evidence to the idea that Wilson wanted to be a force for good within the World.

However following the initiation of the League of Nations, a rift grew between Wilson and House. Wilson believed that he had compromised too much, while acting in his place within the American delegation. This brought cause for Wilson to argue with and eventually become detached from House. This also serves as the reason why Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and Robert Lansing would serve as the main advisors to Wilson in

---

<sup>28</sup> Hodgson, Godfrey. *Woodrow Wilson's Right Hand: The life of Colonel Edward House*. (Yale University Press: New Haven, CT, 2006), 198.

<sup>29</sup> Wilson to House, December 24, 1915. Papers of Woodrow Wilson, vol. 35, p.387-388.



Paris following the departure of House. Hodgson illustrates how House believed that Wilson had become “stubborn and angry, and he was never a good negotiator.”<sup>30</sup>

Their argument before Paris created a divide in which House lost most of his major influence within Wilson’s inner-circle and the actual peace talks in Paris. Hodgson then argues that House attempted to supersede Wilson’s authority by working closely with Georges Clemenceau. Hodgson suggests that the break between Wilson and House was fueled by two possibilities. The first is that Wilson’s mental status was destabilized by his stroke and his subsequent illness led to anguish and the distrust of many within his inner circle besides his wife Edith. The second is that the pressure forced upon Wilson by the failure of the League within the United States Congress, caused the distrust between House and Wilson. The isolationist Congress disagreed with Wilson’s desires to join the League of Nations following the First World War. It did not matter that the League was Wilson’s invention. The United States Congress and, specifically, the Republicans within it would not allow it.

Edward House was a key figure within the Paris Peace Conference and the mandatory states which evolved from it. Despite his break from Wilson, House believed that it was his duty to make sure the Paris Peace Conference was a success in his view. Colonel Edward House was a strategic diplomat focused on changing the world in order to help his friend and his country. In a way, House had influence within the Council of Ten, and is mentioned before the upcoming statement. The relationship between Wilson

---

<sup>30</sup> *Woodrow Wilson’s Right Hand*, 238.

and House can be used as a model for many other relationships shared between President Wilson and his diplomatic counterparts. Wilson believed himself to be a healer to the world and the League of Nations was the start of that healing. Hodgson describes the relationship between the two as a broken relationship filled with contempt. It was broken because House dealt with issues which Wilson believed he had failed on. The specific negotiations between House and Cecil, Balfour, Clemenceau and the like caused Wilson to distrust House. The *Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, paint a different story. Charles Seymour states “what is certain is that there was never anything approaching a quarrel between the two.”<sup>31</sup> Based on the contrasting opinion of these two authors, it calls into question the viability of Wilson’s personal relationships. They can be described as complicated and troublesome. The relationship between House and Wilson is a model for the relationship between Wilson and Weizmann.

While Edward House and Woodrow Wilson were the main diplomats at the Paris Peace Conference, their relationship at times did delve into the personal, with discussion involving the caring of how their respective wives, families and their own health were doing. The relationship between Wilson and Weizmann, however, was strictly business. Weizmann used his influence to gain favor with Louis Brandeis first, as a gateway to Wilson. Weizmann states that he first met Brandeis as a part of the American delegation to the Zionist Annual Conference. Weizmann argues that Brandeis believed the Zionist Organization to be purely an economic body.<sup>32</sup> Weizmann describes his trip to the United

---

<sup>31</sup> Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*, Houghton-Mifflin, vol.4, 516.

<sup>32</sup> Trial and Error, 261.

States as exhausting but necessary. It is the relationships formed within his meetings with these “donors” that showed Zionism had support within America.<sup>33</sup> Rather than extensive direct support from Wilson personally, the President used House to institute the United States’ support for the Balfour Declaration.

Similarly to House, Nahum Sokolow was the main contributor to his delegation’s actions taken at Versailles. Sokolow put forth the “Statement of the Zionist Organisation regarding Palestine”<sup>34</sup> and distributed it to all of those present in the room. He stated that the delegation had “come to claim their historic rights to Palestine.”<sup>35</sup> Giving credit to both France and Britain in regards to their strides for Zionism, he told stories of despair and suffering that the Jewish people had dealt with throughout history. The Allied Powers laid down the guidelines that the Palestine government was to be “entrusted to Great Britain as Mandatory of the League.”<sup>36</sup> Once Sokolow had his say, Weizmann asked to speak. He explained that the war had left the Jewish people weaker than any other in the world.<sup>37</sup> Afterwards, the Council of Ten came to the conclusion that Palestine could not hold a large number of inhabitants due to its relatively small size.

The Zionist delegation had their moment in the spotlight that Weizmann yearned

---

<sup>33</sup> Hodgson, 155.

<sup>34</sup> *Papers relating to the Foreign relations of the United States The Paris Peace Conference 1919*, 161.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid, 162.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid, 163.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid,164.

for since the signing of the Balfour Declaration. The endorsement of all of the major powers, especially Wilson with the help of Brandeis, helped their cause by giving them the diplomatic credibility they needed to effectively convey their message on a grandiose scale. Wilson's meeting with Weizmann buoyed the latter because he knew the President supported the idea of a homeland for the Jews in Palestine under the British Government. This support was exactly what was asked for in the demands put forth by the Zionists. Weizmann strongly influenced Wilson within situations regarding Zionism and demonstrates that his "messiah" complex was once again beginning to emerge as Wilson felt he needed to help the Jewish people claim their homeland and was willing to work through the cooperation of the League of Nations to achieve this goal.

Following the successful declaration of the Mandate, harkening back to his feelings after the resolution of the Balfour Declaration, Weizmann assumed he himself could still do more to further the Jewish people. After the United States Congress did not ratify the Treaty of Versailles and withdrew the country from the League of Nations and the Treaty, Weizmann felt a slight amount of betrayal that created animosity towards those that had aided his cause in the past. This animosity towards the Americans is displayed in a letter between Weizmann and Sir Alfred Mond in which Weizmann proclaimed that Brandeis "is an American first and a Zionist only a few minutes in the day, and therefore has lost touch with Jewry and the actualities of Palestine."<sup>38</sup>

Wilson's influence reached its tipping point in the actual release of the Palestine

---

<sup>38</sup> Bernard Wasserstein, *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*. Series A, vol. X (Rutgers: Transaction Books, 1977), 194.

Mandate. The President had acknowledged that Weizmann and the Zionists deserved to be settled in Palestine. He also acknowledged that the British Empire should be put in charge of the Mandate. This governance by the British would provide stability for not only Britain but also the Jewish people in order to create a long-lasting peace.

Just as Wilson had done for Germany, he stopped the need for war and destruction and had done the same for Palestine and the Jews. He had given them a home by helping their leader present his demands in front of council in their group of global peers. Wilson and the American Zionists, in particular Louis Brandeis, along with the British could take credit for being the saviors of the Jewish people. The League had accomplished exactly what Wilson had hoped for at the outset: peace and civility amongst the people of world. In this sense it was a confirmation of everything that he had done. While Weizmann imagined that Balfour was a main proponent of the Zionist belief, Wilson was seen as a great leader who was able to unite nations in times of war and bring peace amongst their peoples. The strong diplomatic influence of Wilson is why Weizmann felt it necessary to gain and maintain the approval of the Americans along with the British and French during the Paris Peace Conference.

The final version of the Palestine Mandate was ratified on December 3, 1924.<sup>39</sup> The Mandate, a result of the work of Weizmann, America and Britain, begins with an explanation. The term that is explained is the term "Palestine.. it states that following World

---

<sup>39</sup> United States Department of State. The Palestine Mandate. (Salisbury: Documentary Publications, 1977), III.

War I and subsequent international agreements have given the term.. a new meaning.”<sup>40</sup> It details the idea that originally Palestine was thought to be simply a description of a geographical nature. However, now it was “an area which is administered by Great Britain under a mandate from the League of Nations.”<sup>41</sup> The Mandate also discussed the issues of the Balfour Declaration and how it established the national home for the Jews. It continues on that in 1922 the United States Congress ratified the idea: “the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.”<sup>42</sup>

The Mandate also notes that the “Principal Allied Powers have selected His Britannic Majesty as the Mandatory for Palestine.”<sup>43</sup> Britain was given all the powers that were necessary to be an effective government. It was the responsibility of Britain to put into effect rules that would establish and maintain the Jewish National Home. Article Five of the Mandate states that “The Mandatory shall be responsible for seeing that no Palestine territory shall be ceded or leased to, or in any way placed under the control of the Government of any foreign power.”<sup>44</sup> In essence the British were now controlling a land that had been under dispute for centuries. The responsibility of the protection of the Jews now was solely under the British Empire.

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid, 3.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid, 3.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid, 8.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, 13.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid, 13.

The final ratification of the Twenty-seven articles that are contained in the Palestine Mandate was the culmination of everything Weizmann wanted at this point in time. He supposed that under the Mandate the Zionists would evolve as a country and eventually become a dominant majority capable of running their own autonomous government. However, at this time it was simply not feasible. With the support of Woodrow Wilson, Louis Brandeis and the American Zionists, Weizmann had created an ally and vice versa. It is well documented that there is a long-standing relationship between America and the Jewish people and this was proven by the role the United States played in furthering the interests of Zionism on an international stage.

Britain, which was described many times by Weizmann as a mainstay for the Zionist cause, could now assert its power as a leader for the Jews. This will be a subject discussed in the following chapter exploring the relationship between Britain and Zionism. The League of Nations created by President Wilson and what he described as an “American” idea had accomplished its goal. It had resolved their conflicts with the German people and the Treaty of Versailles and had formulated solutions that dealt with countries around the world that were in turmoil following the First World War. Most importantly to Wilson and the other Allied Powers, it had done so in a diplomatic way in which there was no bloodshed. While Wilson had inserted his influence along the way, there was a possibility that if the Americans had controlled the Mandate his influence would have gone even further.

The issues that arose after the League of Nations dissolved were two-fold. The creation of the British Mandate for Palestine generated the beginnings of the Arab-Israeli

conflict and the establishment of the new nation, led by Weizmann. Weizmann would, in the 1940s, become the first President of Israel. The creation of Israel is still a major point of conflict in the Middle East today. The influence of President Wilson, in terms of which Weizmann was concerned, allowed him to gain the confidence necessary to become a world-renowned diplomatic leader for a specific group of people. Wilson's endorsement of the Jewish national home led to Weizmann being seen as a patriarch to the Jewish people. It is in the environment of the League of Nations that all of this could be accomplished. It cannot be overstated that Wilson and the Allies' actions have created the problems which are still debated to this day, despite their desire that the League be a positive force. The second issue that Wilson and his League of Nations had was on Germany itself.

The actions taken in the Treaty of Versailles decimated the German people in order to make them pay for their actions during the war. It crippled their economy causing inflation that was exacerbated by the overall worldwide depression of the late 1920s and early 1930s. This postwar situation created a nationalist faction of Germans that were angered by the loss of the War and the actions taken by the other global powers with the Treaty of Versailles. The Germans felt as though they were being taken advantage of, thus creating an environment for Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist German Workers Party. Hitler promised that Germany would once again be strong and that the Treaty of Versailles would never be repeated. He used this cry to gain power and eventually become the Supreme Chancellor of Germany.

No one person can simply ignore the fact that Germany was angered by the ac-



tions taken by the League and put in motion a number of events that exceeded the problems Germany had created during the First World War, leading into the Second World War. It is with these two major motions that President Wilson and the creation of the League of Nations have had a profound effect on the world. Despite their intentions of worldwide peace, the League of Nations created more problems than it solved.

### **III. ADMINISTRATION OF THE MANDATE: AN EXAMINATION OF A BRITISH CONTROLLED PALESTINE AND THE PALESTINE MANDATE SO- CIETY**

In the immediate aftermath of First World War, the world's victorious nations (United States, Great Britain, and France) sought to make the world a more peaceful place. United States President Woodrow Wilson created the idea of instituting a "League of Nations."<sup>45</sup> This was a collective group that would meet together and conference with each other to find ways to sort out all of the difficult issues which faced the world's nations following one of its biggest conflicts. Specifically, the League of Nations was created to put sanctions on Germany so they would not be able to create an international crisis in the future. This involved putting financial sanctions on them that they would pay off for decades. One of Germany's greatest allies during World War I was the Ottoman Empire. The Ottomans controlled lands from as far west as Morocco on the Barbary Coast of Africa, to as Far East as Turkey and beyond. This provided a challenge for the participants in the League of Nations.

Because the Ottoman Empire was so vast, along with the proliferation of the Tanzimat, once the empire fell divisions amongst the groups arose. The separation of previously Ottoman-controlled territories occurred and each of the victorious nations from

---

<sup>45</sup> Woodrow Wilson, *Woodrow Wilson's Case for the League of Nations* (Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1967), 25.

the war sought land as a reward. Most imperative to this research however, is the question of the land of Palestine. President Woodrow Wilson argued that the League of Nations and American intervention into the political course of others, was the “American” thing to do, in order to prevent large conflicts from ever occurring again.<sup>46</sup>

Interaction with external political ideologies can create smaller conflicts that sometimes balloon into larger ones that threaten the greater global community. It was the hope among the World’s leaders during the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 that the world would become more stable and that the “big three” would be able to bring peace to the world. However, it was the actions of the British government in the creation of and administration of the British Mandate for Palestine that threatened to affect the course of history throughout the twentieth century.

The territory of Palestine is an interesting case. Situated directly on the coast of the Mediterranean, directly north east of Egypt, it provides a valuable location for trade within the region of the Middle East. That being said, its larger significance is strictly for religious reasons. Religions such as Judaism, Christianity and Islam claim the lands surrounding Jerusalem as Holy Land. Due to the reach of the Ottoman Empire, the population was overwhelmingly Arab at the time of the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. The full demographic breakdown of the Mandate in 1920 was stated in the *Interim Report on the Civil Administration of Palestine*. The report states that there were approximately 700,000 people within Palestine and that “four-fifths” were Moslem. Within this group were Bedouin Arabs, and mixed race individuals that spoke Arabic and were considered

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid, 26.

Arab. The report also states that 77,000 were Christian, and part of that Orthodox, but they also spoke Arabic. There were only a small number of Protestants.<sup>47</sup> Therefore, it is clear that the obvious issue was the amount of friction that any outside force would provide.

The issue of multiple religions claiming Jerusalem as their holy land created the conflict that is Palestine. In the Jewish religion, Zionism is seen as an attempt to strengthen the cause of the political aims of the Jewish people and return them to the holy land. Individuals such as Theodor Herzl did not demand a return to Palestine, rather, the convenience of the First World War, led Weizmann to state that the “natural” choice, was Palestine. The rise of Zionism derives from a late nineteenth century and early twentieth century concept. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the leader of the World Zionist Organization sought to make Palestine a “home for the Jews.” This is a direct reaction to Theodor Herzl who argued that Zionism was Judaism and that its proliferation and growth was imperative to the Zionist cause. The question of who was a Zionist is an important one, as this thesis will discover. Many Britons aligned themselves with the Zionist cause because as Josiah Wedgwood pointed out, it would be for the betterment of the British Empire to gain the trust of the Jewish people. However, it was the nationalistic tendencies of Zionism which Herzl portrayed that led to Zionism being widespread throughout the world. Therefore throughout the United States and Great Britain the rise of Zionism and the return to Palestine became more and more prominent. They would be able to contribute not only to Palestine but to the British Empire. As Weizmann grew into the leader of the

---

<sup>47</sup> An Interim Report of the Civil Administration of Palestine, July 30, 1921.

Zionist cause, he used his political and social connections in order to gain support for his overwhelming cause. First, Weizmann needed to convince British Prime Minister Sir David Lloyd George that the Jewish people deserved their own land. In a meeting between Sir Herbert Samuel, Charles Prestwich Scott and David Lloyd George at Euston Station in London in December 3, 1917, Lloyd George and Samuel questioned Weizmann on the viability of the Jewish homeland. Eventually all parties were in agreement.<sup>48</sup> The most important documents involving Zionist participation within Palestine include The Balfour Declaration, which set the stage for the British government maintaining and administering the Mandate.

Weizmann stated in his autobiography, *Trial and Error*, that he did not want the Mandate to be administered by the British Government. The importance of this statement is that after he gained the support of the British, Weizmann used his Zionist connections within the United States, specifically Associate Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis and the Zionist Organization of America, to push the idea that the Jews deserved a homeland. Brandeis would eventually convince Balfour that he should meet with Weizmann to discuss the possibility of a separate Jewish State. Balfour stated to Brandeis in a meeting at the White House “You are one of the Americans I had wanted to meet.”<sup>49</sup> Weizmann wanted the United States to take control of whatever land the Jews eventually colonized. This was due to the religious ties that he believed the United States and the Zionists shared. However, when the United States Congress refused to ratify the country’s partici-

---

<sup>48</sup> *Trial and Error*, 149-150.

<sup>49</sup> *Trial and Error*, 193.

pation in the League of Nations,<sup>50</sup> Weizmann was left with only one option. The League decided that Great Britain would draft and create the “British Mandate for Palestine.”<sup>51</sup> It was officially ratified as part of the Treaty of Sèvres during the San Remo Conference in 1920. While not specifically controlled by the United States, Colonel House, on behalf of President Woodrow Wilson, assured Weizmann that the British government would be more than capable of controlling and administering their new found “homeland” and to provide support for the Balfour Declaration.<sup>52</sup> As I have found in previous research, Weizmann reluctantly agreed to the British Mandate.<sup>53</sup> He would continue to be influential within the Mandate during its existence and even into the future, as he would become the first President of Israel.

The Palestine Mandate can, in a word, be described as complicated. Much can also be said about the complexities of the British Empire during the twentieth century. Historians such as John Darwin have argued Britain’s political desires in their strong imperialistic tendencies.<sup>54</sup> Ideally, the British Empire would like to have an informal empire, based solely on trade and commerce domestically and abroad. Darwin argues that formal empire, in which the government must become fully intertwined with the land they are controlling, become too expensive and eventually led to the downfall of the gov-

---

<sup>50</sup> Henry Cabot Lodge, “League of Nations”

<sup>51</sup> Treaty of Sevres, Section VII, Syria, Mesopotamia, Palestine, Article 95. [http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Section\\_I\\_Articles\\_1\\_-\\_260](http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/Section_I_Articles_1_-_260)

<sup>52</sup> Trial and Error, 208.

<sup>53</sup> Brendon Larimore, BA Thesis, 2012

<sup>54</sup> Darwin, John. The Empire Project.

erned. My research has shown that nearing the end of the Mandate, Britain incurred an enormous amount of debt that eventually led to the abandonment of the Mandate. The British Government caused trouble for all groups involved and left the land of Palestine destabilized for decades. At the beginning of the Mandate, it declares “promises” that the British government gave to the Arab people of Palestine. The purpose of the League of Nations and the Palestine Mandate were to allow the Jewish people to settle into a national home while remaining respectful of the majority Arab population.

The British Government sought to strike a balance between both the Jewish and Arab populations within the Mandate. Officially, the British Government stated that they were attempting to be neutral in the administration of the Mandate. They would not favor the Jewish Zionists or the Arab Palestinians in any way. However, due to the actions taken by the British Government in both London and Jerusalem, in particular, the overwhelming increases in the Zionist population and the economic opportunities afforded to them by the British, they were clearly in favor of the Zionist cause. This caused a massive amount of friction between the governors and the governed. Any action or declaration proposed or even fulfilled by the British Government drew the ire of one side or the other and in some cases, both. Perhaps one of the most controversial actions taken at the beginning of the Mandate was the initial colonization process.

The purpose of the Mandate was to allow the Jewish people to move to Palestine and thus increased immigration measures were passed to that end. Under the supervision of Dr. Chaim Weizmann and the British Government, Jewish colonists began to return to Palestine in increasingly larger numbers. How the process of immigration began is another

er story. The actions of High Commissioner for Palestine Herbert Samuel and others within the administration would create the precedent that the British government was only proliferating the ideals of neutrality to save face back home in Britain. Their actions did not illustrate their beliefs. Weizmann argued to Wilson and Lloyd George that the Jewish people and the United States and Great Britain shared a common social bond.<sup>55</sup> This bond proved to overpower and influence British political policy throughout the Mandate period.

The Palestine Mandate Society was a group of individuals within London who were strongly in favor of the Zionist Cause.<sup>56</sup> It is the prominence of the members within the Society that call into question the official stance of the British Government. In a document uncovered at the National Archives in London, CO 733/186/2, dated 12 March 1930, there is a focus on the requests of the Mandate Society and how they believed that the government should be administered and what actions they should take to ensure that the Jewish cause was fully implemented within Palestine. They argued that the administration government was not doing enough to fulfill their promises to the Jewish people. It also brings into question the British public's perception of impartiality as British Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald is listed as an Honorary President. MacDonald served between 1929 and 1935. Within the document, they recommend that he be removed from

---

<sup>55</sup> Paris Peace Conference 1919, Zionist Presentation to the League of Nations

<sup>56</sup> CO 733/186/2 Shows reasoning behind establishment of the Palestine Mandate Society



any publication involving the criticism of the British Government because it is “decidedly pro Jewish.”<sup>57</sup>

What is intriguing about these board members is that they were incredibly prominent members of the British Government and of British society. The Prime Minister and the House of Lords are the institutional framework of the British Government. They are the government representatives, which are responsible for the foreign and domestic policies. The list of Honorary Presidents in the Mandate society includes Lord Sir Arthur James Balfour, Former British Prime Minister (1916-1922) Sir David Lloyd George and British Prime Minister (1929-1935) Ramsay MacDonald. The President of the Palestine Mandate Society was listed as Viscount Robert Cecil of Chelwood, the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs between 1915 and 1919. These men were the leaders of the British Government. The shift in the parliamentary party politics of the 1920s shows that these men and the roles that they were positioned in, had a dramatic effect on the nation and its policies both foreign and domestic. Since the time of the Glorious Revolution, the British public has placed a dramatic amount of trust with their elected officials in order to accomplish goals that they desire.

The Committee itself consisted of Committee Chairman and Governor of Canada Colonel John Buchan, Chief Secretary to the High Commissioner for Palestine Sir Wyndham Deedes, Blanche Dugdale (wife of author Edgar Dugdale and niece of Arthur James Balfour), Secretary of State for the Colonies Malcolm MacDonald (son of Ramsay Mac-

---

<sup>57</sup> CO 733/186/2 List of Palestine Mandate Society Members, Questions impartiality of Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald.

Donald), Director of Intelligence during the First World War Lieutenant General George Macdonagh, journalist and Zionist Herbert Sidebotham, Secretary of State for Scotland Sir Archibald Sinclair, feminist politician Ethel Snowden (wife of the Chancellor of the Exchequer Phillip Snowden), Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster the Right Honorable Josiah Wedgwood, and Honorary Secretary and Treasurer Denis Alfred Jax Buxton. All of these individuals were also intricately connected with each other. Many of them would dedicate books to the mission of Zionism and the proliferation of their views to each other. This demonstrates that at no point during the creation of or administration of the Mandate was the British Government ever truly impartial. They had convincingly shown that the British Government was for the Zionist cause within Palestine.

Before the official establishment of the Mandate, Palestine was designated as an Occupied Enemy Territory, following the defeat of Germany and the Ottoman Empire. It remained a basic military state until the establishment of the Mandate. Some historians such as D.K. Fieldhouse have argued that Palestine being perceived as successful and peaceful following the war presented a false sense of security with the establishment of the Mandate.<sup>58</sup> Fieldhouse believes that the British Government had failed to create a stable government for the Palestine Mandate and therefore it should be deemed a failure. Huneidi argues that the constant backing of the Zionist cause multiplied the problems that

---

<sup>58</sup>D.K. Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East, 1914-1958*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006) 153.

Britain faced with controlling the Mandate.<sup>59</sup> Fieldhouse argues that it was a joint failure between the three groups.

Sir Arthur James Balfour and Sir David Lloyd George were two of the most crucial architects of the British Mandate for Palestine. Balfour was the author of the Balfour Declaration, written in 1917, which supported the Zionist cause and have the implementation of Palestine being a “home for the Jews.” The official document states that “His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of the object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country”.<sup>60</sup>

The Balfour Declaration states that “nothing” would be done to prejudice the civil and religious rights of the Arabs within Palestine. However, Balfour was an “Honorary President” of the Palestine Mandate Society, a group which had strong Zionist ties, ensuring the progression of the Jewish people within the Mandate. As evidenced within *Trial and Error* by Weizmann, Balfour was favorable of the Zionist position within Palestine. The note was delivered to Lord Baron Rothschild, a British Jew. The influence of the Jewish religion upon the Administration government can be seen as overwhelming. An argument can be made that the British Government was never neutral and this affected

---

<sup>59</sup> Hunedi, Sahar. A Broken Trust.

<sup>60</sup> Balfour Declaration, Foreign Office, November 2nd, 1917. <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/E210CA73E38D9E1D052565FA00705C61>

the outcome of the Mandate before it was even instituted. By having Ramsay MacDonald, the British Prime Minister at the time of the document, be the third “Honorary President” of the Society, Britons who sympathized with the Zionist cause were sending a clear message that Zionism was a goal of the Palestine Mandate and any thought that they might be neutral was simply a falsehood. The Palestine Mandate Society and some of its executive members had experience within the region. Herbert Samuel and Arthur Wauchope would serve as High Commissioners for Palestine, as well as a few of the members like Wedgwood and Sidebotham who served as, and became various secretaries within, the government in Palestine.

Beyond the Honorary Presidents, the actual Officers and Committee members of the Mandate Society had a dramatic impact on the British Government and most likely their influence on the Administration of the Mandate government itself.

In order to examine the individuals within the Palestine Mandate Society, I used the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography to study specific individuals who may or may not have been extensively examined in the consensus historiography of the subject. These biographical sketches proved imperative to the success of this project.

Viscount Lord Robert Cecil of Chelwood was listed as the President of the Mandate Society. Cecil was the cousin of Arthur James Balfour. Familial ties are a common theme that will be highlighted throughout this chapter. Cecil began his political career as a Member of Parliament for Marylebone. However during the First World War and its immediate aftermath, Robert Cecil was appointed the Under Secretary for the Colonies. Cecil was a representative for the British Government during the Paris Peace Conference

in 1919 and the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles. This meant that he would be directly involved with the actions of the League of Nations at the conclusion of the war. According to the biography by Martin Ceadel, Cecil was focused on preventing wars and violence from occurring. This was his original intent in becoming involved with the Red Cross and eventually the League of Nations. Cecil was one of the Chief advisors for the British Government during the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, which would indicate that due to his familial ties to Balfour, he supported the concept that Palestine was to be the home for the Jews.<sup>61</sup>

Colonel James Buchan eventually rose to fame as the Governor-General of Canada. However during the First World War Buchan was a fiction author and correspondent for *The Times* and was asked to draft communiqués to the War and Foreign Offices. Described as a master propagandist, Buchan's talents would serve him well as he chaired the Palestine Mandate Society, a group that would ask the British Government to increase their efforts towards the Zionist cause in order to give greater opportunity for Jewish land ownership and immigration into Palestine. Buchan was the principal individual calling for change in how the Zionist Jews were treated within the Mandate.<sup>62</sup>

It was the individuals within the Committee of the Palestine Mandate Society that shared extensive ties and in fact held office in crucial positions within the government. This immediately calls into question the idea of British impartiality. Perhaps the most prominent of this statement is Sir Wyndham Deedes. From 1921 to 1923 Deedes was the

---

<sup>61</sup> Viscount Robert Cecil of Chelwood, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32335>

<sup>62</sup> Colonel James Buchan, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32145?docPos=1>

Chief Secretary for Sir Herbert Samuel, the First High Commissioner for Palestine.

Samuel is quoted as saying that there was a “strong strain of idealism within him which drew him powerfully to the holy land.”<sup>63</sup> As previously mentioned, Samuel was Jewish and a well-known Zionist. It can be argued that Samuel and Balfour surrounded themselves with allies at the beginning of the Mandate. Deedes was one of the key individuals who attempted to stop the Turkish alliance with the Germans during the First World War. Before he assumed his role as Chief Secretary, Deedes met with and befriended Dr. Chaim Weizmann, the main protagonist for the Zionist cause within the Mandate in the early twentieth century. This lends credence to the argument that there were high-ranking officials within the Administration that had a closer connection to the cause of Zionism than the British government would like to admit. Author Andrew Chandler argues that Deedes appreciated his personal relations more than his professional relationships. Despite his short tenure, Deedes was forced into action by having to deal with the Jaffa Riots of 1921, which had Jewish Zionists demanding that they be given equal opportunities and liberties within the Mandate, and essentially sparked a violent outrage. Deedes followed his heart rather than his head, and supported the Zionists.

In addition to individuals who had important positions with the Administration government, are the people who influenced policy throughout the post-war and inter-war period. Blanche Dugdale was a part of the Naval Intelligence group during the First World War. Dugdale had strong ties to the Zionist cause from the very beginnings of her

---

<sup>63</sup> Sir Wyndham Deedes, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32768>

life. She was Jewish, and she was related to Sir Arthur James Balfour and Robert Cecil.<sup>64</sup> As a Zionist, Dugdale contributed greatly to the realm of Palestine. In *Chaim Weizmann*, a work published in 1944, she discusses the relationship between Weizmann and Sir Arthur James Balfour. As a relative of Balfour, she shares a personal connection to Weizmann. She states that Balfour “pointed to Weizmann as the man who made [him] a Zionist.”<sup>65</sup> The debate of where the Jewish national home should be also inserts itself into this text. Uganda and Palestine are the two locations which are mentioned that are the most prominent destinations. A meeting between Balfour and Weizmann in 1906 rendered an interesting interpretation of the Jewish Question. Weizmann asked Balfour “Would you change London for Paris, Mr. Balfour? No-but London is the capital of my country. Jerusalem was of ours, when London was a marsh.”<sup>66</sup> Dugdale then makes the case that Zionism became one of the most important causes that Balfour would ever take up. Zionism became a cause that was fully supported by Balfour following his defeat in Parliament. He would constantly remain in contact with Weizmann and visited Palestine as Weizmann’s guest. It is no accident that Balfour was an individual who was influential in the creation of the document that bears his name. Balfour arguably devoted the final years of his political career fighting for the Zionist cause. Blanche Dugdale founded the League of Nations Union with Viscount Lord Robert Cecil in order to proliferate the ideals of international diplomacy throughout the world. Dugdale was a key member of

---

<sup>64</sup> Blanche Dugdale, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62138>

<sup>65</sup> Weisgal, Meyer. *Chaim Weizmann*. 131.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid*, 132.

the British delegation to the League of Nations in 1932 and had a personal familial relationship with Chaim Weizmann.

The interconnected nature of all of these individuals shows that Zionism essentially ran in a tight-knit circle. Decisions were made by few that affected many, the selection of Palestine, albeit a natural choice by Balfour and Weizmann, is just one basic example of that fact. Author Claire Percy said that Dugdale saw Palestine as her “second country and stayed with the Weizmanns at their home in Jerusalem at Rehovoth.”<sup>67</sup> She was one of the only gentiles in Weizmann’s inner circle and, in fact, this allowed her to act as a representative for both the British Government and the Zionists.

It is important to note that well-known political families were also key figures within the Mandate and the Mandate society. British Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald and his son Malcolm MacDonald were two important individuals within the Palestine Mandate Society and they demonstrated a precedent that within the Mandate Society interconnections and personal relationships were key. Ramsay MacDonald was the Prime Minister for Great Britain between 1929 and 1935. This is the exact time when two events took place. The first was the document asking for more opportunity for immigration and the second was Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope’s tenure in Palestine. As Albert Montfieur Hyamson argued within *Palestine: A Policy*, Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope’s tenure between 1931 and 1937 was the “heyday of Zionism” within Palestine.<sup>68</sup> Albert Montfieur Hyamson wrote *Palestine: A Policy* in 1942, near the end of the British Man-

---

<sup>67</sup> Blanche Dugdale, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62138>

<sup>68</sup> Albert Montfieur Hyamson, *Palestine: A Policy*, (Meuthen Press, 1942), 147.



date for Palestine. Its focus is to explain how the British Government administered the Mandate during the previous two decades and justify their actions towards their commitment to Zionism.

Hyamson himself was a high-ranking member of the British administration within Palestine. Hyamson was named the Commissioner for Migration by High Commissioner Sir Herbert Samuel during the first administration of Palestine. Hyamson would be Samuel's right hand within the administration of the Mandate. As the Commissioner for Migration, Hyamson was responsible for the regulation of the Jewish population immigrating into Palestine. This, however, is a prime example of the fact that the British Government concealed its true intentions. Hyamson is yet another example of how the Palestine Mandate Society was interconnected with the workings of high-ranking officials within the British Government. Unlike Josiah Wedgwood, Hyamson was not a Member of Parliament, but it does not undercut his importance to His Majesty's Government. There is no mention of the Palestine Mandate Society, despite Hyamson's acquaintances like Balfour and Herbert Samuel being instrumental within its power structure.

Instead, Hyamson writes *Palestine: A Policy* as a defense of the actions of the British Government during the time of the Mandate. He is adamant and consistently reiterates the point that while Britain worked to establish Palestine as the national home for the Jews, it should not be at the expense of any native population. Hyamson believes in this text that he must defend the actions of the British Government against those Arab Palestinians that believed that they were being taken advantage of. This however, as Wedgwood would argue, was not the aim for the British Government, as the Palestine

Mandate Society fought to make sure that Palestine was transformed totally for the Zionist cause.

Hyamson uses this text to show what the British did right within the Mandate. Focusing primarily on the Churchill White Paper, which is an official document written by Winston Churchill during his tenure as Under Secretary for the Colonies, responded to the critics of the Balfour Declaration to ensure the successful institution of those laws. Distributed during his time as the Colonial Secretary, it showed how Churchill perceived the Mandate as an idealistic possibility, which would place the Jews in complete control. As will be discussed in the third chapter, Churchill's tenure as the Colonial Secretary led to a strained relationship with the Arab Palestinian population, as they struggled to express themselves within the Mandate as the Zionist cause began to gain a stranglehold within Palestine.

Churchill attempted at that time to ask for the grievances that this group had with the British Government. The response included a laundry list full of problems and issues that plagued them. Hyamson does agree with Wedgwood that the British people "genuinely wanted to benefit Jewry and thought that in accepting the Mandate they would be able to do so."<sup>69</sup>

Hyamson was very important to Sir Herbert Samuel, who himself was a Zionist and the first High Commissioner for the Mandate. As his Secretary of Immigration, Hyamson personally oversaw the continual growth of the Jewish population within the Mandate throughout the 1920s. The purpose of the Palestine Mandate Society is to

---

<sup>69</sup> Hyamson, Albert Montefiore. *Palestine: A Policy*. 154.

strengthen the Zionist cause within Palestine under any circumstance. As Hyamson wrote this text in 1942, nearing the end of the Mandate, it can be seen as a symbol to demonstrate how the British proliferated the Zionist cause without concern for the native populations.

Specifically, Hyamson focuses on the King-Crane Commission and debates the merits of who should control the mandate and how they should do so. The King-Crane Commission of 28 August 1919, was an important step in the natural progression of the Mandatory system within the Middle East and the League of Nations following the First World War. Henry King and Charles Crane led the Commission. King and Crane were asked by United States President Woodrow Wilson to conduct a fact-finding mission in which they were to ascertain the desires of the population of the Ottoman Empire in reference to Colonization. Broken into three different portions regarding Syria, Mesopotamia and Armenia, this document delivers recommendations as to who should run the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration in the South, East and North.

For the purpose of this thesis, the section which is of the greatest significance is the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration South, or (OETA) South. This territory consisted of the greatest amount of the population and included the most contentious city in Palestine, Jerusalem. Within the King-Crane Commission report, a population breakdown of religious demographics exists. The population of the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration South showed Moslems at 515,000, Christians at 62,500, Jews at 65,000, and others at 5,000. The total population within this territory was 647,500. Many different choices were suggested by the Ottoman population including a separation of Palestine

from Syria, a United Syria and an autonomous Palestine within the Syrian State. These are all possible options that were explored by King and Crane in 1919. Their recommendation for Syria was that “whatever foreign administration is brought into, should come in not at all as a colonizing Power in the old sense of that term, but as a mandatory under the League of Nations with the clear consciousness that ‘the well-being and development’ of the Syrian people form for it a ‘sacred trust.’”<sup>70</sup> They suggest that the Mandatory Administration should have a limited term and only enough power to ensure the success of the new state. It also suggests that they provide annual reports to the League of Nations in order to examine the success of the new state. However, the opinion of most within the Commission was that the United States should have taken control of the Mandate within Palestine, but the domestic political fighting within the United States Congress, in regard to the role of isolationism within a post First World War world, did not allow for this. The Commission’s recommendation for the question of Palestine was as follows. “We recommend, in the fifth place, serious modification of the extreme Zionist programme {sic} for Palestine of unlimited immigration of Jews, looking finally to making Palestine distinctly a Jewish state.”<sup>71</sup>

They argued this under the precepts of the Balfour Declaration which states that “the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, ...it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious

---

<sup>70</sup> The King-Crane Commission

<sup>71</sup> The King-Crane Commission. <http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/9a798adb322af-f38525617b006d88d7/392ad7eb00902a0c852570c000795153?OpenDocument>

rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.”<sup>72</sup> King and Crane feared that the Zionist program, which was to be implemented, would have a dramatic effect on other territories in the region and that Syria would be one of the first external forces to suffer. The argument that the Jewish people have a “right” to Palestine based on the settlement of the previous 2,000 years “can hardly be considered.”<sup>73</sup> This shows that the political ambitions of Weizmann, Balfour and Wilson were all trying to supersede the suggestion of common sense. Most obvious, the issue that arises from this conflict is the fact that “The places which are most sacred to Christians those having to do with Jesus-and which are also sacred to Moslems, are not only not sacred to Jews, but abhorrent to them. It is simply impossible, under those circumstances, for Moslems and Christians to feel satisfied to have these places in Jewish hands, or under the custody of Jews.”<sup>74</sup> They refer to the actions of the Zionists as “extreme” and recommend that “Jewish Immigration be definitely limited and that the project for making Palestine distinctly a Jewish commonwealth should be given up.”<sup>75</sup> Finally, they stated that as a result of the Paris Peace Conference, America was the first choice of 1,152 petitions presented which accounted for sixty percent of the total amount and which no other nations gained fifteen percent of the petitions delivered.<sup>76</sup> This is yet another recommendation which Wilson ignored upon its release in

---

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid.

<sup>74</sup> King Crane Commission, Ibid.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid.

the *New York Times* in 1931. Not only did Wilson not carry out the will of the Commission, his support of Zionism through House and Brandeis to Weizmann, and the backing of the British Administration created a contradiction to what the population of Palestine wanted.

Hyamson does admit that through their testimony to the King-Crane Commission the local populations believed that the United States would be able to enforce the Mandate effectively. However the League of Nations chose Great Britain to control the Mandate after the United States was unable to gain full membership within the League due to the political block of the United States Congress. Later on, the Peel Commission was seen as an attempt by the British Government to right the wrongs that occurred within the 1930s. Their focus was to restructure how the Mandate administration handled the day-to-day operations within Palestine, mostly consisting of judiciary matters. But also consisting of labor struggles from the Jews, which under the restructure of the government, diminished the amount of those Jews who were allowed to immigrate into the country. Hyamson highlights that there were multiple Zionist groups that intended to proliferate their viewpoints throughout the world. The two major organizations were the Zionist Federation of Great Britain and Ireland and the World Zionist Organization.

*Palestine: A Policy* is a *mea culpa* to the actions taken by the British during the time of the Mandate. When talking about the MacDonald White Paper of 1939, Hyamson does admit that the “Arabs of Palestine want to secure themselves against being dominated by any other people.”<sup>77</sup> Palestine was dominated in number by the Arab Palestinians.

---

<sup>77</sup> *Palestine: A Policy*, 191.

Roughly 630,000 of the entire population of Palestine's 700,000 were Arab. The political capital was dominated largely by the Zionist and the Jewish people within the Mandate. They used their advantages such as garnering the support of the British and the Americans to embolden their cause. But as Wedgwood has previously mentioned, there is only a certain group of individuals within the Zionist cause who can be instrumental and helpful for the British. Hyamson pleads for "intellectual cooperation" between the Jews and Arabs.<sup>78</sup>

Hyamson was responsible for many texts involving British, Palestine and Zionism. *Palestine under the Mandate 1920-1948*, focuses on the importance of Zionism, and the British sympathies towards it during the time of the Mandate between 1920-1948. This text is an update to an incomplete text because the previously mentioned text was released in 1942. Most of the issues that were faced during the establishment of Israel between 1942 and 1948. The argument is that most of the obligations of the Balfour Declaration were fulfilled as required by the League of Nations. He uses the fact that the obligations were fulfilled to declare the Mandate as a success. Hyamson argues that the establishment of the Central Mandate Administration by the British provided a level of order for Palestine, the likes of which was not seen for decades if not centuries following the fall of the Ottoman Empire after World War I. Hyamson harkens to the notion that due to the lack of enforcement from the central government, Palestine suffered from a lack of control and the British were finally able to change this. As this text was written in 1950, it

---

<sup>78</sup> Palestine: A Policy, 209.

can be seen by the reader as an aftermath report of the actions taken by the British within Palestine for those nearly three decades.

Malcolm MacDonald was the Secretary of States for the Colonies and would have a dramatic impact with the release of his White Papers. They argued that the Balfour Declaration was completed and that a partition of Palestine was necessary. It argued that the Mandate had been in existence for nearly twenty years and that it was now a natural progression that immigration would increase even more, in order to sustain the growth of the Jewish people.<sup>79</sup> He was the son of Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald, who was instrumental in the political aspects of the Mandate during its inception in 1922.

Lieutenant General Sir George Macdonogh was an important figure during World War I. He became one of the intelligence officers responsible for the creating the “morale aversion” tactic against the Germans. Macdonogh was an influential member of the British Army and his opinion was highly valued due to his background in international affairs. Evidence would illustrate that the Mandate Society thought of his opinion and his international views very highly.<sup>80</sup> The Palestine Mandate Society had chosen the elite of British society and their views on foreign affairs.

Another influential voice on the subject of Zionism and Palestine was author Herbert Sidebotham. Sidebotham was a member of the Editorial Staff of the *Manchester Guardian* and his direct superior was Charles Prestwich Scott, an individual responsible for introducing Dr. Chaim Weizmann to President Woodrow Wilson before the Paris

---

<sup>79</sup> MacDonald White Paper of 1939, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/brwh1939.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/brwh1939.asp)

<sup>80</sup> Lieutenant General Sir George Macdonogh, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38446>



Peace Conference in 1919. *The Manchester Guardian* was one of the most critical newspapers of the time. Thanks to Charles Prestwich Scott, it followed a Liberal left-leaning philosophy. Perhaps the most direct comparison to the question of Zionism within Palestine is how *The Guardian* covered the Irish Question. In *Partners Together in this Great Enterprise*, author David Schmidt states that Scott was an “open-minded liberal who favored the nationalistic ideals of Zionism.” Schmidt also states that many Zionists believed that “Weizmann persuaded Balfour and Lloyd George to become Zionist, but that they were committed Zionists long before they met Weizmann.”<sup>81</sup> Scott argued that Weizmann was the “recognized leader of the Zionist movement... and is in complete possession of the facts in regard to the present position in Palestine, as it affects alike the Jews and the Arabs.”<sup>82</sup> Sidebotham was a Zionist who supported Scott and Balfour’s view on Jewish immigration into Palestine. In *England and Palestine*, Herbert Sidebotham writes about the Palestine Mandate as it happened. Published in 1918, it focuses mostly on what the Mandate will become, what is Britain's role associated with Zionism and how it will benefit both sides.

Sidebotham follows along the lines of numerous other texts, examining the role of Zionism within Britain and in the Middle East. What is unique about Sidebotham’s text, perhaps due to the date of publication, is the focus on the events in Palestine during two different periods: the Romans and the Greeks. Sidebotham explores the development of

---

<sup>81</sup> David Schmidt, *Partners Together in this Great Enterprise*, Loc 750, Kindle Edition

<sup>82</sup> Arthur S. Link., *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. vol. 53 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986), 572.

Jewry to Islam within Palestine and how it shifted due the fact that both of these groups were originally Semitic. In addition, how Germany's desire to control aspects of the Middle East and their alliance with the Ottoman Empire affected the actions taken during World War I.

The few chapters which break from the norm which formulate his opinion on the subject are "The Old British Policy in Turkey", in which he focuses on the relationship between the geographic location of the Ottoman Empire and Russia, and how it made the situation very tense for the British as they were worried about naval supremacy throughout Europe. By examining a source discussing an event as it is occurring, it allows the reader to see the event in the viewpoint in which it was experienced, with no knowledge of the future or the outcome. Sidebotham writes *England and Palestine* from the presumptive perspective. He formulates entire arguments under the basis that the British Empire would be successful in its defeat of Germany and the Ottomans. This shows that Sidebotham was willing to expand the empire in different realms, specifically within the Middle East. However, the most important chapter within this text is the one entitled "Some Objections Considered." All of these texts are important because they explore the rationale and thought processes of these individuals in two different ways.

Sidebotham categorizes these objections into four types. The first is that personal or racial objections can be classified as "prejudiced" objections. Second, is that there are objections that are religion based. Third, that objections can be based against the interests of the country. The fourth and final objection its that the New Jewish State should be considered a British protectorate. All of the objections listed are defended by Sidebotham and

quickly squashed. This is clear because Sidebotham is a Zionist and if there was any doubt that the British public believed that the Jewish population would not be successful within Palestine, Sidebotham treats it as his mission to prove them wrong.

In *Great Britain and Palestine*, Sidebotham writes more of a personal narrative than that of a policy-making piece. He discusses the time in which he met Dr. Chaim Weizmann after being introduced by Charles Prestwich Scott, the editor of the *Manchester Guardian*, in 1916.<sup>83</sup> This is evidence that these individuals were connected. Sidebotham writes about the British Palestine Committee in which he admits that the Committee “seeks to reset the ancient glories of the Jewish nation in the freedom of a new British Dominion in Palestine.”<sup>84</sup> Sidebotham was responsible for the establishment of the British Palestine Committee, which was formed in 1916. This provides evidence that the British Government had planned Palestine to be a home for the Jews, well before the official Balfour Declaration. Sidebotham was responsible for publishing two works on Zionism and Palestine. *England and Palestine: Essays towards the restoration of the Jewish State* was published in 1918 and *Great Britain and Palestine* was published in 1937.<sup>85</sup>

Sir Archibald Sinclair was the Secretary of State for Scotland, however it is the position that he held before that office, which is of the greatest importance to the Palestine Mandate Society. Sinclair was the personal aide to Winston Churchill during the First

---

<sup>83</sup> Sidebotham, *Great Britain and Palestine*, 29.

<sup>84</sup> Sidebotham, *Great Britain and Palestine*, 50.

<sup>85</sup> Sir Herbert Sidebotham, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36084>

World War. As Under Secretary of the Colonies during the 1920s, Churchill had firsthand interactions with the Palestine Mandate during its earliest years. Also as leader of the Liberal Party within Westminster, he provided support for the Partition plan that argued that only a full Jewish State such as Palestine would be able to support the amount of Jews fleeing Europe.<sup>86</sup> His support of Herbert Samuel and the changing dynamics of British politics at the turn of the 1930s proved that Sinclair was a devoted member to the cause of the Liberal Party and replaced Samuel as the Parliamentary leader upon Samuel's defeat. Once again, this provides evidence that the Palestine Mandate Society was incredibly interconnected with individuals who were influential not only on views within Great Britain but Palestine as well. In a sense, they were a cohesive unit that privately influenced public policy. While attempting to remain neutral, they failed due to their personal views. Everyone within the Committee and on the Executive Board were in some way connected to Zionism or British political policy.

At the Zionist Congress of 1921, a resolution was passed expressing the official statement of the Zionist cause that the Jewish People wished to live with the Arab people "on terms of unity of mutual respect and that together they would make the common home into a flourishing community."<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, the paper stated that "the Palestine Zionist Executive has no intention to possess any share in the British Administration gov-

---

<sup>86</sup> Miller, Rory. *Britain, Palestine and Empire*, 131.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid*, 1922.

ernment within Palestine.”<sup>88</sup> This statement implies that the British government was completely separate from the Zionist Committee.

The original intentions of the British Administration Government were that self-government would eventually be the goal for Palestine. Its purpose was that Palestine would be the “home for the Jews.” One of the original goals was that of cooperation between Jews and Arabs. They were to coexist in order to work in harmony, which would make the Mandate a success. As the British Government found out, the Arab Palestinian population was not in favor of the actions they were wishing to take. During his time as Under Secretary for the Colonies, Winston Churchill travelled to Palestine in order to discuss the issues that the Arab population had not only with the British Government, but with the Zionist establishment within the Mandate. One of the major grievances that Arabs believed they had experienced was use of the term “Israel” by Zionist leaders, when describing Palestine.<sup>89</sup>

British White Papers is the term that is used to explain the release of Official Documents from the British Government, regarding official domestic and foreign policies. The release of the British White Paper in 1922 was to reaffirm the goals of the Balfour Declaration and to clarify any issues. The release of the British White Papers in 1922 and 1939 by Churchill and MacDonald, explain how complex the situation within the Mandate was during that twenty-year span. These two primary documents laid a foundation for the history of Palestine during the early twentieth century. Historians such as

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid, 1922.

<sup>89</sup> Huneidi, A Broken Trust.

Howard Grief argue that the 1922 Churchill White Paper intentionally sabotaged the good intentions of the League of Nations in the creation of the mandate system, in particular Palestine. Grief states that Churchill had “redefined the Jewish National Home to mean not an eventual independent Jewish state but limited to a cultural or spiritual center for the Jewish people. He argues that this “ended all hope of achieving the envisaged Jewish state under their auspices.”<sup>90</sup> Along with the rejection of the 1922 White Paper by the Fifth Congress of Palestinian Arabs, which argued that the League of Nations must be stopped altogether, along with the institution of the Mandate system, provides an interesting precursor to the supposed “cooperation” between the Jews and Arabs.<sup>91</sup> Winston Churchill wrote the British White Paper during his tenure as the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. Its purpose was to examine the political situation during the time of the British Mandate for Palestine. Churchill wrote that with consideration from “High Commissioner Herbert Samuel, the Balfour Declaration is seen as over exaggerated and is not a direct line of support”<sup>92</sup> towards the Jewish National Home in Palestine. The White Paper declared that it was “necessary to ensure that persons who are politically undesirable be excluded from Palestine.”<sup>93</sup> One important distinction within the White Paper of 1922

---

<sup>90</sup> Grief, Howard. *Legal Rights and Title of Sovereignty of the Jewish People to the Land of Israel and Palestine under International Law*. ACPR Policy Paper No. 147, 6.

<sup>91</sup> Cohen, Michael. *Churchill and the Jews, 1900-1948*.

<sup>92</sup> British White Paper, 1922.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid*, 1922.

is that it portrays the Zionist Commission as a completely separate entity within Palestine and not affiliated with the British Administration government.

The Right Honorable Josiah Clement Wedgwood was a politician who following the First World War, focused on two specific questions: The Dominion of Indian question and the Jewish question regarding Palestine. It was during his tenure within the Privy Council that Wedgwood would use his political capital in order to publish his text *The Seventh Dominion*.

*The Seventh Dominion* was published in 1928. Wedgwood dedicates the text to Mrs. Edgar Dugdale, who was also a member of the Palestine Mandate Society and an influential member within the realm of Zionism and British politics in the early twentieth century. Most importantly, this text seeks to explain why the British should be accepting of the Jewish people immigrating into Palestine. The main argument is that those who would immigrate into the Mandate would be of use to the British Empire. He states within his preface that the Imperial Conference in 1926 affected how the British perceived their role within Palestine. The release of the updated Balfour Declaration in 1926 argues that each member within the Commonwealth should be considered independent and Free states, which serve the better interests of the British Empire.

Wedgwood alludes to the concept that being supportive of the Jewish cause would help the British within the Middle East and their political interests as well. The ending of the preface, however, exudes great interest in the existence of and the amount of power wielded by the Palestine Mandate Society. Wedgwood states "It is true that in the House of Commons we have set up a pronouncedly aristocratic pro-Palestine Committee of sev-

enty members, with a Jew as a secretary, to watch the development of the Mandate policy in Palestine. Outside Parliament also an energetic English committee-including those friends of the good cause, Sir Wyndham Deedes, Mrs. Dugdale and Mrs. Snowden-carry on against the anti-Semitism of the suburbs.”<sup>94</sup>

The question that is asked within the first line of the text is “Do we, or do we not want to have the new Izrael [sic] a Dominion within the British Empire?” This is an important query that questions the impartiality of the British Government during the time of the Palestine Mandate. Originally, the purpose was that they would follow the mandatory rules passed by the League of Nations and provide a national home for the Jewish people. The Balfour Declaration in 1917 made Palestine a “home for the Jews.” This was before the official ratification of the Palestine Permanent Commission of the League of Nations passed the Mandatory Rules. This was largely due to Sir Arthur Balfour being a strong supporter of the Zionist cause. He, along with others not mentioned by Wedgwood, were vital members of the Palestine Mandate Society. They strongly influenced policy within Britain during the 1920s and 1930s. They supported and strongly proliferated the Zionist cause to essentially take control of the Mandate, and were not considerate of the Arab Palestinian population. This is a direct contradiction to the official policy of His Majesty’s Government, which stated “nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities within Palestine.”<sup>95</sup> The Palestine Mandate Society provided a work-around for those individuals that were influential in the de-

---

<sup>94</sup> *The Seventh Dominion*, xii.

<sup>95</sup> The Balfour Declaration, 1917.



velopment of foreign policy regarding Palestine. The society allowed them to exert their Zionist leanings and have been seen as a counterbalance to the supposed dealings of the government.

By alluding to the Palestine Mandate Society, he acknowledged that the group existed and their goals for Zionism were clear. As mentioned previously within this thesis, the Palestine Mandate Society had some of the most powerful men within the British Government as key members within their hierarchy. Balfour, Lloyd-George, and Ramsay MacDonald were the Honorary Presidents. The President was Viscount Cecil Chelwood who would be in attendance for many key talks including the 1926 Imperial Conference.

Within the text Wedgwood discusses multiple factors that were a part of the Mandate. Taxation, Agriculture, Police and Education were all key points that would eventually make the Mandate an independent state. Wedgwood argues that if Palestine were to ever succeed, “the three peoples must grow together, acquiring common interests and a common public opinion.”<sup>96</sup> By stating that the “three people must grow together,” it supports the public perception stated by the British Government which believed that following and enacting the Balfour Declaration would be to ensure that Palestine be a National Home for the Jews without the infringing upon the rights of the Arab Palestinian population.

Wedgwood presented the average Jew in Palestine as valuable to the Empire. He believed that those that would immigrate into the Mandate would be affluent and intelli-

---

<sup>96</sup> *The Seventh Dominion*, 44.

gent and would proliferate their cause and allow the Mandate to grow into a Jewish national home. Wedgwood believed that if the British were able to befriend and make the Jewish people their allies, it would allow them to have a position within the Middle East. The entirety of the text focuses on the different facets of Zionism, both religious and political. He argued that Religious Zionism served a purpose for the Jewish people and gave them a reason to fight for their cause. Political Zionism, however, was a different animal. Recalling the history of the late nineteenth century, Wedgwood examined Theodor Herzl as the subject for his main argument.

Theodor Herzl was responsible for the type of Zionism which would have an effect on the globe's political happenings throughout the early twentieth century. Within *Theodor Herzl Assimilationist to Zionism*, Jacques Korberg illustrates how Herzl became a Zionist. This is imperative to note because it was Weizmann who would learn Zionism from Herzl. Herzl's definition of Zionism is unique. Korberg states that he "redefined Jewry as a nation and proceeded to scan the symbols and rituals of Judaism for nationalist associations."<sup>97</sup> This illustrates how Herzl's thinking had a dramatic effect on the global concept of Zionism. In Herzl's own work, *Der Judenstaat*, he explores the options for the home of the Jewish people. Within this text he offers two choices: Argentina or Palestine. "Shall we choose Palestine or Argentine? We shall take what is given us, and what is selected by Jewish public opinion." He continues on by saying that "Argentine is one of the most fertile countries in the world, extends over a vast area, has a sparse population and a mild climate. The Argentine Republic would derive considerable profit from the cession

---

<sup>97</sup> Korberg, Jacques. *Theodor Herzl from Assimilationist to Zionist*. 175.

of a portion of its territory to us.”<sup>98</sup> However, he presents Palestine as a more compelling home for the Jews.

“Palestine is our ever-memorable historic home. The very name of Palestine would attract our people with a force of marvelous potency. If His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey. We should there form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism. We should as a neutral State remain in contact with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence. The sanctuaries of Christendom would be safeguarded by assigning to them an extra-territorial status such as is well-known to the law of nations. We should form a guard of honor about these sanctuaries, answering for the fulfilment of this duty with our existence. This guard of honor would be the great symbol of the solution of the Jewish Question after eighteen centuries of Jewish suffering.”<sup>99</sup>

These statements by Herzl show that Palestine was on the shortlist of locations for immigration, long before the Balfour Declaration. As Weizmann was a disciple, it is no doubt that he chose Palestine because he believed that this was the rightful home for the Jewish people. The choice of the Jewish council was not Argentina, Uganda or the like. It was Palestine, and this would set off a chain reaction of events that would dramatically alter the course of the twentieth century. Perhaps the most telling quote from Herzl on Palestine is that “If you will it, it is no mere dream.”<sup>100</sup>

World Zionist Organization leader Dr. Chaim Weizmann was an admitted disciple of Herzl and his teachings. The argument made by Weizmann and Herzl is that the Jewish people had for too long been the vagabonds of the globe and it was their right as a society and as a religion to secure a national home. Following the First World War, when the

---

<sup>98</sup> Herzl, Theodor, *Der Judenstaat*.

<sup>99</sup> Herzl, Theodor. *Der Judenstaat*. <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/25282/25282-h/25282-h.htm#TN>, 1896.

<sup>100</sup> Weisgal, Meyer. *Chaim Weizmann*. 8.

League of Nations took up the troubles of humanity at the Treaty of Versailles, Weizmann used that opportunity to make his move. Weizmann used his political influence within Great Britain and the United States in order to make the League of Nations follow the Balfour Declaration.

Wedgwood closes *The Seventh Dominion* by examining the state of Zionism during the time of the Mandate. He argues that being a Zionist while being an Englishman should not be something someone is ashamed of. He says that most people that hate the Jews are “uneducated” and that the perception of them is strongly influenced by actions taken during Biblical times such as bartering and the ability to be financially stable. He argues that they were “foreigners” and that all “foreigners are disliked by the settled folk among whom they come especially if they cling together and cannot mix.”<sup>101</sup>

Wedgwood believes that the support of Zionism from the British goes beyond just the boundaries of Palestine. He argues that the intelligent Englishman sympathizes with the Jews because they see their struggle throughout history and realize that they are simply attempting to succeed and fit in.

Wedgwood closes with the statement:

“The true implications of Zionism go much further than Palestine, much further than the often excessive self-consciousness of nationalism. If we in England understand our part and do our duty Zionism will give peace and justice as well as pride to the Jews, both of Palestine and of the Diaspora-after 2,000 years.”<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> The Seventh Dominion, 118.

<sup>102</sup> The Seventh Dominion, 128.

This statement explores the option that support of the Jewish cause and Zionism was in his eyes mandatory by the British in order to be the greatest of benefit for both sides. Britain, Zionism and Palestine, in his mind, were all connected. Wedgwood would spend the 1920s touring the globe discussing the concept of Zionism. Despite being heavily involved with the realm of International politics, Wedgwood remained a competent and well-trusted Member of Parliament who was able to keep his focus on his constituents back in Britain.

However, along with Josiah Wedgwood, interactions with the British press involving the Palestine Question were prominent within British society. In a series of articles, *The Times* correspondent Philip Graves wrote a series of articles entitled “Some Truths About Palestine.” These articles were published from April 3rd to April 10th of 1922. Each of the articles covers a different facet of the Palestine Mandate. Graves states that President Woodrow Wilson played an important role in the creation of the Palestine Mandate and that through Colonel House the United States shared their support for Zionism with the British Government. Graves also states that the Zionist Commission was seen as an advisory body to the Administration Government. Also, Graves notes that the British were becoming unpopular with the Arab population because they believed that the Zionists were being propped up.<sup>103</sup> The following day, Graves published an article that was the speech of Sir Herbert Samuel, who stated that the “British would never consent to the setting up of Jewish Government to rule a non-Jewish majority.”<sup>104</sup> Much like the Aliyots

---

<sup>103</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine,” April 3rd, 1922.

<sup>104</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine.” April 4th, 1922.

that are discussed in this thesis, Graves gives a population breakdown and explains that there were about 80,000 Jews within Palestine. As an overall gauge of the temperament within Palestine, Graves states that the “Zionist believed that the British were Russian and the Arabs believed that they were Turk.”<sup>105</sup> The more articles that were published explored the fears of the Arab public during this time. Graves states on April 6th, 1922 that Arab propagandists believed that those Jews who immigrated into Palestine were arriving to form a “Zionist Army of Revolution.”<sup>106</sup> The Zionist Commission had a mission of “forming a link between the British authorities and the Jewish Population of Palestine, and to help in establishing friendly relations with the Arabs and other non-Jewish communities.”<sup>107</sup> Graves also discusses how the Moderate Zionists viewed the “political errors of the commission.”<sup>108</sup> Perhaps the article that gained Graves the most criticism was the one where he discussed how the British dealt with criticism from both the Arabs and the Jews. Some Zionists believed that they had created an “Arab Administration.”<sup>109</sup> Graves concludes his articles by stating that by supporting “Moderate Zionism, we shall gain a military asset, by supporting Political Zionism we gain a moral liability.”<sup>110</sup> This series of articles demonstrates that the British press was actively engaged with the Palestine Ques-

---

<sup>105</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine.” April 5th, 1922.

<sup>106</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine.” April 6th, 1922.

<sup>107</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine.” April 7th, 1922.

<sup>108</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine.” April 8th, 1922.

<sup>109</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine”, April 9th, 1922.

<sup>110</sup> *The Times*, “Some Truths About Palestine.” April 10th, 1922.

tion and that support for the Administration was criticized on both sides of the spectrum from both the Arab and the Jew.

Finally, West Riding Commander Denis Alfred Jex Buxton was the Honorary Treasurer and Secretary of the British Mandate Society. He was the Sheriff of Essex and also a military commander. His father was London City Council member Alfred Fowell Buxton, and once again is an example that these individuals were interconnected in not only international policy but domestic policy as well.<sup>111</sup>

In CO 733/186/2, a letter from the Palestine Mandate Society dated March 12, 1930, explains the rationale of pro-Zionist causes regarding the beginning of the Mandate. This group, based in London, explained its opposition to different instances of a militarized presence as well as those within the Administration being too aligned with a particular side of the cause. Ramsay MacDonald being named British Prime Minister in 1929 meant that he must abandon his membership within the society, so that public perception was not skewed towards the Zionist cause. In addition to MacDonald, many members of this group included vehement Zionists and support the assertion that the Mandate was incredibly Pro-Zionist.

The issue of Arab versus Jewish causes was, no doubt, highlighted by the Palestine Mandate Society. The Mandate society, in simple terms, stated that they believed the militarization of the Mandate would have a negative effect on all of the groups involved. By having many Zionists as members of the Palestine Mandate Society, they were able to exert their demands to accomplish their goals. At the time of the document in 1930, the

---

<sup>111</sup> Denis Alfred Jex Buxton, <http://www.thepeerage.com/p15213.htm>

Zionists within the Mandate Society were worried that the lack of immigration would leave the Jewish people at an economic disadvantage. Clearly, the policy that was implemented by the Administration shows that Jewish Zionists would begin to gain control within the Mandate in terms of both economic and social opportunity.

Throughout the twenty years after the release of the British White Paper of 1922 until the release of the updated white paper in 1939, MacDonald reviewed their actions during the time of the Mandate and how the future of the Mandate would look. To gaze forward, the Foreign Office of the British Government looked back and reminded the readers of the original intention of the Balfour Declaration and the outlined responsibilities they undertook during the previous two decades. Most importantly, the three obligations outlined within the 1939 White Paper were that their goal was to “place the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people.”<sup>112</sup> Continuing, they were to “facilitate Jewish Immigration under suitable conditions and to encourage, in cooperation with the Jewish Agency, close settlement by Jews on the land.”<sup>113</sup>

Second, they were also obligated to “safeguard the civil and religious rights of all inhabitants of Palestine irrespective of race and religion and whilst facilitating Jewish immigration and settlement to ensure that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced.”<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> British White Paper, 1939.

<sup>113</sup> Ibid, 1939.

<sup>114</sup> Ibid, 1939.



The final stated obligation was to “place the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions that will secure the development of self-governing institutions.”<sup>115</sup> These obligations helped create the greatest possible outcome for the Jewish people within Palestine in hopes of governing their own land cooperatively with the Arab Palestinians. This type of language used by the British Government was developed in the final stages of the Mandate, when it was recognized that the Arab Revolts had dramatically changed the overall landscape of Palestine. It was no longer simply a “home for the Jews.” A battle between the Arabs and Zionists was brewing.

Immigration was one of the most hotly contested aspects of the Administration of the British Mandate for Palestine. The man who began this precedent was Palestine Mandate Society member and the Minister of Migration under Sir Herbert Samuel, Albert Montefiorre Hyamson. The constant influx of Jewish immigrants into Palestine led to the distrust of the both the British and Zionists by the Arab population. They believed that the British government had intentionally undermined the stance that Palestine was to be a shared Mandate between the two groups. A statement on policy from Prime Minister MacDonald and the British Government highlighted the economic actions taken in order to fortify the Zionist cause within Palestine. Within the White Paper of 1939, they stated that the Arabs are “apprehensive” of the Zionist immigration and that the “influx will continue indefinitely until the Jewish population is in a position to dominate them.”<sup>116</sup> There

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid, 1939.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid, 1939.

was a steady increase in the number of Jews immigrating into Palestine following the Balfour Declaration.

There are three different periods of “Aliyah” or leaving to Palestine, which occurred during the time of the Mandate. They are the third, fourth, and fifth Aliyah which occurred in the twenty year period between 1919 and 1939. Most of the members of the yishuv that migrated to Palestine were from Eastern Europe and numbered 90,000 by the end of 1939. The third Aliyah saw 40,000 Jews come to Palestine.<sup>117</sup>

The fourth Aliyah, between 1924 and 1929, was mostly affected by the economic crisis that most of Eastern Europe faced during the late 1920s. During this period 82,000 Jews came into Palestine, and after they had solidified their personal finances, 23,000 left Palestine. Jewish labor, as well as the strengthening of Jewish towns and industry, was of the greatest benefit during this Migration period.<sup>118</sup>

The final Aliyah of consequence was considered the fifth and occurred in the long period of 1929 to 1939. The rise of Hitler and the National Socialist Party (Nazis) led to the dramatic increase of immigration into Palestine. The Arab Revolts of 1936 to 1939 would have very little effect on the migration of Jews into Palestine. By 1940 nearly 250,000 had arrived during the fifth aliyah with only 20,000 leaving. This would bring the grand total of the Jewish population within Palestine to 450,000.<sup>119</sup> MacDonald argued that Jewish immigration rendered the Palestine Exchequer obsolete, and “produced a

---

<sup>117</sup> The Third Aliyah, [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Immigration/Third\\_Aliyah.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Immigration/Third_Aliyah.html)

<sup>118</sup> The Fourth Aliyah, [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Immigration/Fourth\\_Aliyah.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Immigration/Fourth_Aliyah.html)

<sup>119</sup> The Fifth Aliyah. [http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Immigration/Fifth\\_Aliyah.html](http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Immigration/Fifth_Aliyah.html)

bitterness between the Arab and Jewish populations which is deplorable between citizens of the same country.”<sup>120</sup>

This is the main focus of the British White Paper of 1939, the fact that the British Government recognized that there was an issue between the Jewish and Arab populations and that the Administration was essentially powerless to control any of them. This paper was released following the Arab revolts between 1936 and 1939. It was during this time that the British Government recognized that they might be unable to create a cooperative and peaceful coalition as outlined within the Balfour Declaration and League of Nations Covenant. It is institutions such as the Palestine Mandate Society that claim to want to have a cooperative effort, while making sure that their goals for Zionism had been achieved. The British Government’s focus on the future of Palestine, by outlining the fact that given the current rate of growth the Jewish group would become one-third of the entire population of the Mandate, was an issue that struck fear into the Arabs who believed that eventually they would be totally overrun in Palestine by the Jews.

Perhaps the most obvious difference between the two different versions of the White Paper was the tone that they portrayed. Sir Winston Churchill had an increasingly positive view on the upcoming future that was the Mandate during the early 1920s. He argued that the coexistence between the Jews and the Arabs could be possible and that it was for the betterment of the Palestine Mandate. In defense of Churchill, he would be unable to predict all of the chaotic events that would occur during the seventeen-year gap between the two documents. Churchill’s White Paper was more of an ideal that focuses

---

<sup>120</sup> British White Paper, 1939.

on the concept of the Mandate. It highlights the British commitment to the Zionist cause and what the government would do to proliferate such a feat. Churchill backed the “maintenance of the fullest religious liberty in regard to Palestine and to maintain the scrupulous rights of each community.”<sup>121</sup>

In contrast to Churchill’s White Paper of 1922, Ramsay MacDonald’s White Paper of 1939 recognized the failures of the British Government since the Balfour Declaration, the release of the Churchill White Paper in 1922 and the events which had a dramatic impact on the perception of the Zionist cause within the Mandate against the Arabs. MacDonald’s White Paper was more factual and practical and planned for the future of the Mandate. Broken down into three sections regarding The Constitution, Immigration and Land, Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald laid out how the British Government had failed to provide unity and how they could focus their efforts on the future. The goal of the British White Paper of 1939 was to eventually have Palestine be a freestanding society without the help of His Majesty’s Government.

Like Churchill before him, MacDonald believed that cooperation between all three sides could occur. However, he realized that the hatred between the Jews and Arabs was uncontrollable and it had a negative impact of the Mandate as a whole. MacDonald focused on the future of the Mandate and how the government could end their nightmare in the Mandate. He believed that they should share governance as equally as possible, however when the government realized this impossible, Britain would abandon the Mandate because it became economically unstable and became more of a hindrance. Palestine

---

<sup>121</sup> British White Paper, 1922.

would be sent into chaos for the remaining years of the Mandate and would be a point of contention for decades to come.

These were crucial years within the Mandate, as the Society stated that in 1930, they were “concerned” with how Palestine was being administered. Malcolm MacDonald was the Under Secretary for the Colonies, Blanche Dugdale was related to Arthur James Balfour, and a close to friend to Chaim Weizmann. Ethel Snowden was the wife of Labour of the Exchequer Phillip Snowden. The Snowdens would become close friends with the Weizmanns. This evidence shows that the Palestine Mandate Society was incredibly influenced by the small circle of individuals that ran with each other in the society.<sup>122</sup> Ethel Snowden became a member of the Board of Governors with the British Broadcasting Corporation. She would use her influence with her husband as well as her own social views to champion causes she sought fit. The main causes of interest were Feminism and Zionism.

The issue of Arab versus Jewish causes is no doubt highlighted by the Palestine Mandate Society. The Mandate society in simple terms, states that they believe that the militarization of the Mandate would become a negative affect towards all of the groups involved. By having many Zionists be members of the Palestine Mandate Society, they were able to exert their demands to accomplish their goals. At the time of the document in 1930, the Zionists within the Mandate Society were worried that the lack of immigration would leave the Jewish people at an economic disadvantage. Clearly, policy that was

---

<sup>122</sup> Ethel Snowden, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48517?docPos=1>

then soon implemented by the Administration shows that Jewish Zionists would begin to gain control within the Mandate in terms of both economic and social opportunity.

Every member of the Palestine Mandate Society was a heavy hitter within the political circles of Great Britain. The policies that they asked the British government to instill within the Mandate would have a dramatic affect on how the history of the Mandate progressed. Other than the specific document referenced, the documents of the Palestine Mandate Society within the National Archives in London is nonexistent. The document however, is an important turning point within the Mandate for the Zionists. The policies that would be implemented by Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope who was the High Commissioner for Palestine between 1931 and 1937, would be referenced within. The fear within the document itself is that it would embarrass British Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald because as an Honorary President of the Palestine Mandate Society, his name would be published on any document publicly sent.

The establishment of the centralized Palestine government, mandated by the British was also one of the first steps. one High Commissioner would govern Palestine and Transjordan .<sup>123</sup> The San Remo Conference and the Treaty of Sevres would combine the two areas in order to more effectively govern. Secondary sources explore how Palestine was governed. Perhaps the most important distinction discussed is the separation from a Central government based in Jerusalem, which would in effect govern the larger cities such as Jerusalem, Jaffa and Hebron and the smaller localized governments run by the *Mukhtars* (village leaders) in the more rural regions of the Mandate. Assaf Likhovski

---

<sup>123</sup> United States Department of State, *Palestine Mandate*, (Documentary Publications: Salisbury, NC),3.

explores what issues the Arab people face in regards to a national identity with the constant interference from both the British and Arab forces. This disagreement is one of the main points that will doom the British government and their Administration of Palestine.<sup>124</sup>

In the rural regions of the Mandate, the Arab villagers were subject to law and order by their chosen leaders. However, an important distinction is that the third High Commissioner for Palestine, Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope ordered that there only be one elected “Mukhtar” per community, this was an opposition to the traditional two which dated back to the period of the Ottoman Empire. This itself is an example of British administration within the Mandate, the British government had used their influence to manipulate the system.<sup>125</sup> This is an example of how the British government and its policies disregarded the long held Ottoman traditions and believed that the centralized government would be able to more effectively govern the larger areas and yet remain some level of control of the rural villages. The reactions of how the Arab Palestinians dealt with both the British and the Zionist will be covered more extensively in the following chapter.

The Office of the High Commissioner for Palestine became the branch of the government with the greatest influence. In 1920, Sir Herbert Samuel was appointed the High Commissioner for Palestine. Between the end of the tenure of Samuel was Lord Plumer (who is not of major significance regarding Palestine), until Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope became High Commissioner in 1931. Samuel and Wauchope were the two most

---

<sup>124</sup> Assaf Likhovski, *Law and Identity in Mandate Palestine*.

<sup>125</sup> Joel Migdal, *Palestinian Society and Politics*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), 108.

instrumental governmental officials during the mandate. Samuel set a precedent that the Mandate of Palestine would attempted to be governed correctly. Samuel attempted to follow the Balfour Declaration to the best of his abilities. Publicly, the Declaration stated that it would remain impartial and not infringe upon the rights of any of the native population within Palestine. The Mandate was setup to be a cooperative effort between Jews and Arabs with the understanding that it would eventually lead to a separate Jewish State. The actions taken by the British government perpetuated the Zionist cause. The actions taken by the British government show that the Mandate was in no way impartial from its inception in 1920.

Herbert Samuel influenced and created the administrative government of the Mandate from its inception. Samuel was largely responsible for the implementation of the form that the government within the Mandate took. Huneidi references a speech given by Samuel on June 3rd, 1921.<sup>126</sup> Samuel attempted to interpret the Balfour Declaration in such a manner which gave support to a national home for the Jewish people. He said that it was a “unhappy misunderstanding” and reiterated that the Arab population would not be subjugated or disappear due to the increased support of the Jewish cause. The existing population however, would prove that it was in fact a form of suppression that they felt from the Mandate government. The commitment of the British government, specifically Prime Minister David Lloyd George, explains that the Empire has committed to the Jewish cause.

---

<sup>126</sup> Sahar Huneidi, *A Broken Trust*, (London, I.B. Tauris, 2001), 13.



British, Arab and Jewish groups all had agendas of what they wanted the Mandate to be and what they had hoped to accomplish. In a sense, the Mandate was being pulled into three different directions. At the beginning of the Administration of the Mandate, Huneidi argues that many within Palestine were hoping that the ruling within the Balfour Declaration could be reversed in order to defuse the volatile situation that was facing the British and the Jewish people within Palestine. Herbert Samuel's tenure during the Mandate was littered with issues. He was attempting to create an internal government under directions from those back in London. Samuel was also attempting to generate peace between the two groups, while protecting British interests of his own.

The British Mandate for Palestine eventually became an exercise in political chess. Each move was analyzed and then criticized by both sides, both Arab and Jew. The Foreign Office in London was responsible for dispersing the regulations and decisions to the Administrative government in Jerusalem. Huneidi states that the Zionist cause was able to directly influence the Administration government, The Colonial Office in London was strongly influenced by Richard Meinertzhagen. He demanded that any Anti-Zionist official in the department be removed and then stated that "Zionism has come to stay."<sup>127</sup> Subsequently, Samuel and Wauchope held strong Zionist beliefs which would dramatically affect how the Mandate was governed.

The initial start of the Mandate was problematic as previously mentioned. The British government struggled with starting a new nation. World Zionist leader, Chaim Weizmann was always aware of the political happenings within the Mandate. He was

---

<sup>127</sup> Huneidi, 50.

given early insight into how the government planned on expanding the original Jewish immigration wave into the Mandate. The relationship between Chaim Weizmann and the British government was on full display. Weizmann was always connected to the happenings within the Mandate. The pro-Zionist Administration was in jeopardy due to the fluctuation within the political circles in London. The shift between the Liberal and Labour Parties within Great Britain, threatened the consistency of the message being delivered by the British government. Following the defeat of Samuel in Parliament, there were individuals which stood up and continued his message. As previously mentioned Ramsay MacDonald also continued the precedent set by Sir David Lloyd George to be active in the proliferation of Zionist ideals within Palestine.

It is my belief that the administration of the Mandate failed due to the overwhelming support of the Zionist cause. Through the examination of the primary sources within the National Archives in London, it is my belief that this level of Zionist support caused the downfall of the British Government in Palestine. Primary Documents collected and examined during my research show that there were issues with how Britain administered the Mandate. Beyond the issues that they faced within Palestine, public perception back home caused trouble for the centralized administrative government.

Annual Reports for the Mandate provide a sense of what the Mandate was like during that period. Published by the British Government, it is heavy on empirical data which highlights statistics about race, gender, ethnicity and how these population groups are affecting one of the main problems of the mandate, immigration and labor. The issue with these documents is that while they attempted to provide the reader with a full picture

of the mandate that proved impossible. In any sense, it was meant to cast a positive light for the British Empire's control of the Mandate. This report, while it looks incredibly extensive, is made up of seemingly unimportant information. However this is not the case.

The first part of the Annual Report in 1934 discusses the decentralization of the department of Migration and Labor and how the British Government adapted to these changes through their workers. In the years leading up to the report of 1934, they saw a dramatic increase in not only travel to the mandate, but the amount of immigration that negatively affected the Mandate. As the Mandated home for the Zionist Jews, the most important statistic relevant to this document, is the sections in which the amount of Jewish immigration coming into Palestine dramatically increases. Specifically, these documents highlight where the origins of the immigrants are from. Clearly, during the period following World War I, the vast majority will be immigrating from within Europe. One interesting note is that the document states that Russia ceased being a country that had Jews immigrate from. Basic statistic bullet-points such as gender and age are also focused on in these reports. These reports are a prime example of how the Mandate was administered by the British government, it shows their policies and explains how they affected the population. The document which has been previously examined, gives credence to the concept that the demands from the Palestine Mandate Society to the Administration government were enacted, however, it showed that these policies were harmful to the overall well-being of the "cooperative" Mandate.

The effect of militarization on how the Mandate was administered was never questioned. The use of the British military caused tension that would be seen by the Arab

Palestinians are infringement upon their lands. Militarization occurred during and following the release of the MacDonald White Paper of 1939. The Arab Revolts of the late 1930s would provide the conflict necessary for Great Britain to eventually decide to abandon the Mandate. To examine the overall quandary of the Mandate, I attempted to look into documents which would debate the state of the Mandate as a whole.

Surprisingly, I arrived on a document which debated whether Palestine should become a full blown colony of the British Empire. Document FO 954/19A/23, a letter between Anthony Eden and Lord Zetland, offered an intriguing proposition for the future of the Mandate during the 1930s. Written in 1937, it begins rather innocuously discussing economic business matters within the Far East, specifically in Shanghai. However, the conversation turns quickly to the troubled Mandate, which at this time had seen years of economic struggles. The Aga Kahn in India believed that what happened in Palestine had repercussions throughout the rest of the world. Aga Kahn believed that Muslims in India would react negatively towards any news that cast Palestine in a negative light. Aga Kahn had discussed with the Iraqi and Iranian delegates at Geneva's League of Nations, who offered the possibility that Palestine should lose its Mandate status and be reinstated as a full blown colony. This argument by Aga Khan, shows that Anthony Eden and Lord Zetland were simply couriers of the British Government and their belief in the Mandate System at the time.

This concept is critical because it would provide both absolute military and economic support from the Crown. This move would also create a parliament within Palestine similar to Minister. This would be a dramatic change from the British government,

administering the mandate. It would become part of the British Empire. This raises questions of British Imperialism within the Twentieth century. This is a problem clearly recognized by Zetland, who quickly recognized that if the British government had done this, it might have been seen as an imperialistic overreach. Objections from the League of Nations exemplified why this would be a destructive move.

If Palestine had become a full blown British colony, with all of the protections of the Crown, its implications both economically and politically might have created an even greater firestorm than Palestine already was in its current state. The Administration of the British Mandate for Palestine was one fraught with problems and conflicts. The British Government struggled to balance out the two main groups within the Mandate that caused friction from both sides. This struggle was exacerbated because they were never truly impartial. Pressure from back home in Britain also showed that people within the Commonwealth cared. The Palestine Mandate Society would prove that the elite within Britain championed the Zionist cause. The Mandate is believed to have been a goal that could never be fully achieved. Under the leadership of Herbert Samuel and Arthur Grenfell Wauchope they intentionally and irrevocably changed the course of history within the Mandate by siding with the Zionists. By becoming too one sided towards a specific cause, this caused the Mandate to fail. It was no longer a joint effort between Arabs, Jews and Britons.

The Mandate failed to accomplish its goals set out by the League of Nations and, more importantly, became a precursor to conflict in the oncoming decades. This caused instability for the masses and political headaches for many. The abandonment of the

British Mandate for Palestine was seen as a way to totally extract the British from any of the happenings within Palestine. Ironically, even that action might have had a dramatically negative impact on the future of Palestine. As this thesis will cover within the next chapter, the Arab reactions to the Mandate led to the complete dissolution of the British Mandate for Palestine. The Mandate had become unworkable. Perhaps the most telling quote about Palestine during the Mandate period discovered in my research is this: At the end of the Mandate in May 1948, "Journalists asked Chief Secretary Sir Henry Gurney what would happen to the government in Palestine once the British left Jerusalem. Gurney replied that he would "leave the keys under the mat."<sup>128</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Fieldhouse, *Western Imperialism in the Middle East, 1914-1958*. 151.

#### **IV. LIVING WITHIN THE PALESTINE MANDATE: EXAMINING PALESTINIAN REACTIONS DURING THE PALESTINE MANDATE**

Throughout the previous chapters of the thesis, I discussed the creation of the British Mandate for Palestine and the Administration of the Mandate. What is yet to be discussed is how the Arab Palestinians reacted to being subjugated by the British and Zionists. The period between 1920 and 1940 was filled with turmoil and anger from both sides. It left the British in a quandary of what to do. Primary source material from this period explains the brutal actions that both Zionist and Arabs participated in, to attempt to accomplish their goals. Two cities: Jerusalem and Nablus explain how the Arab Palestinian movement grew throughout the time of the Mandate.

The religious and administrative capital of Palestine and the Holy Land, Jerusalem, fulfills an important function within the British Mandate for Palestine. Following World War I, Jerusalem was located in the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration South or (OETA South). This was a military occupation state ran by the British government, before the official establishment of the Mandate. Throughout the Military occupation, the three major parties within Jerusalem struggled to coexist. How the Palestinian population reacted and therefore coalesced in attempts to form an identity of their own is intriguing.

Jerusalem in 1920, at the beginning of the British occupation was still largely dominated in land size by the Jewish population. However, the Arab Palestinian popula-

tion was subjected to being relegated to the Southeast corner of the city known as the Old City. Which consisted of the Haram esh Shariff and many other holy sites. Only 13,000 Arabs lived within Jerusalem at the time of the 1922 Palestine Census. This shows that the Arab population was in a distinct disadvantage as compared to the Jewish population which was approximately 33,000 at the same time period. However, this census is seen as an incorrect estimation by the British authorities. The Nabi Musa riots by the Arabs within Palestine took place and eventually led to a complete shutdown of all protests against both the Zionist and British.

At the time of the Occupation in 1920, Nablus was seen as the rural lands of the Mandate. With an entirely dominant Arab population, this would be where the movement of the Palestinian National identity would have to move to following the dissolution of the Arab Higher Committee and other entities which were created for the Arab people following the 1929 Riots. Nablus is seen in 1920 as a place where nothing of consequence occurs, where rural arabs and Bedouins thrived. The British government underestimated the power that would eventually be held within the rural town. A shift from the Urban to the rural in regard to National Palestinian identity would occur, however it would be clear that even these two different locations would have differing views on how they should proceed to protest against the Jewish and British.

There are also four major points which highlight the overall problems that were faced by the Arabs during the Mandate. They are the 1920 Nabi Musa Riots, the 1921 Jaffa Riots, 1929 Riots, and the 1936 Arab Revolt. These events are seen as the major events that affected the creation of Palestinian identity during this time period. The pri-



mary source material will highlight the issues that occurred during this period. Much can be said of the secondary source material, which highlights how the British used economic and religious suppression in order to support the Zionist cause. The shift from Jerusalem and the urban core to the rural lands of Nablus, show how the Arab Palestinians attempted to accomplish their goals. Once they had to be subjected to the rural lands of Nablus, their movement was weak and without direction.

To understand the animosity between the Jews and Arabs, an examination of the events that are mentioned above is needed. The first to be examined is the 1920 Nabi Musa Riots, which occurred in Jerusalem on April 4th, 1920. It was not until after the Riots that the description of the events was published. Specifically, two articles in the *New York Times* and *The Times* both published on April 8, 1920 illustrate two different stories. In *The New York Times*, the article is titled “Riots in Jerusalem: Recent Disorders said to have been of an anti-Semitic Character.” The article claims that Muslims were celebrating the “Moussa” while the Jews were celebrating Passover and the Christians celebrating Easter. Using interviews from travelers they claimed that an “anti-Semitic feeling” has developed acutely recently among the Arabs, but that there was no show of hostility between the Moslems and Christians.”<sup>129</sup>

At the time of the Nabi Musa riot, there was no tension between the Christians and Muslims. However, the article states that the Muslims and Jews began their conflict upon the Muslim arrival at the Jaffa Gate. The Jews involved with the fighting shouted that they had “won the country by the sword and will keep it by the sword.” This led to a

---

<sup>129</sup> New York Times, April 8, 1920.

fight in which knives and stones were used. The British army was dispatched, however the fight seeped into other streets with Jews being attacked by Arabs. They were in the Arab sector of Jerusalem, the Old City. *The Times* article claims that those travelers believed that the “Arab feeling against the Jews is probably not realized in England.”<sup>130</sup> A direct contradiction to the previous statement is that the Muslims claimed “that they had won the country by the sword,” not the Jews.<sup>131</sup> The same article claims that the Muslims stated “The Jews are attacking us” and that this was heard from outside the Jaffa Gate on April 4th. Both articles claim that the fighting stopped once the British Army had arrived.

It was the actions following April 4th, which bring into question how large the fighting during the Nabi Musa Riot had grown. From April 5th to April 7th, Martial Law was declared by the British and an attempt to gain control of the situation occurred. Both *The Times* and *The New York Times* claimed that the situation was under control by the British Army. In an April 9th, 1920 article in *The Times* this was simply revealed as not the case. The article states that on April 6th, a group of Arabs attempting to enter Jerusalem through the Damascus gate were “fired on and that some houses were being burned.”<sup>132</sup> During the period of April 4th to 7th there were approximately 190 casualties combined. Ten of the casualties died and three British soldiers were proclaimed wounded during the Rioting. In this article “Origin of Jerusalem Riots” they claim that the original attack on April 4th occurred because the procession of the Nabi Musa had turned towards

---

<sup>130</sup> *The Times*, April 8, 1920.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>132</sup> *The Times*, April 9, 1920.

the Jaffa Gate and a member of that procession was “wildly brandishing a stick” and a Palestinian soldier hit him. The article claims that this led to the riot and Jewish shops were looted and the Jews generally attacked.<sup>133</sup>

The aftermath of the Nabi Musa Riots were just as succinct as the supposed actions taken on that day of April 4th. In a *Christian Science Monitor* article on May 1st, 1920 War Minister Winston Churchill proclaimed within the House of Commons that there were about 250 Military casualties in the recent rioting in Jerusalem. He claimed that the British military had found those responsible and convicted them. The most prominent individual within those put on trial was Vladimir Jabotinsky, the founder of the Jewish Legion who was sentenced to fifteen years for “presenting arms to, and inciting the populace.”<sup>134</sup>

The major events covered throughout this thesis, such as the Balfour Declaration and the San Remo Conference, provide the ammunition needed for the Arab Palestinians to take these types of dramatic actions. A constant ebb and flow occurs during the period of the Mandate in regard to violent actions such as protests and riots. The pattern is as follows: There is an event, such as the Nabi Musa riots between April 4th and 7th of 1920, followed by relative periods of calm, as the British government attempts to make sense of what happened in each instance, followed by another surge of violence. This is a pattern that is consistent during the British Mandate for Palestine. The next spark of violence that would occur did not take place within Jerusalem, and while it does not fall in

---

<sup>133</sup> Ibid.

<sup>134</sup> Christian Science Monitor, May 1, 1920.

either the context of Jerusalem or Nablus, it is necessary to discuss because it highlights many of the political issues that Arab Palestinians faced during the Jaffa Riots of 1921.

Arab Palestinians throughout the history of the Mandate felt that they needed to defend their home from all that threatened it. The threat from Jews in Jaffa towards Arabs came from a different source. The belligerents of the Jaffa Riots were Communist Jews who were immigrating from Russia to Palestine. The Jewish Communists set out to interrupt a Labour Meeting within Jaffa and were driven back into “the mixed Moslem Jewish quarter of the town.”<sup>135</sup> A *New York Times* article from the same day, proclaimed that the group immigrating into Palestine included a number of Bolshevist agents who “succeeded in stirring up serious trouble, leading to bloody fights involving émigrés, natives and British soldiers charged with maintaining order.”<sup>136</sup> The article claims that the rioters used Knives, Pistols and Rifles as their weapons of choice and that twenty-seven Jews were killed and 150 wounded. One of the main articles explaining the issues that the Arabs had during the riots can be found within a *New York Times* article on May 8th, 1921 which discusses how “Palestine Native Oppose Zionism” and explains that one of the major hurdles that the British face within the Mandate, is the prevalence of poverty within the Arab community as it exists in a stark contrast to the Zionists, who have succeeded in prosperity to as the article claims through the action of the Zionist Commission.<sup>137</sup> Perhaps the most intriguing point of how the Jaffa Riots occurred is that the entire Mandate

---

<sup>135</sup> The Times, May 4, 1921.

<sup>136</sup> New York Times, May 4, 1921.

<sup>137</sup> New York Times, May 8, 1921.

seemed to be at a boiling point. Any actions toward either a Jew or an Arab was construed as an attack to the populations as a whole. The institution of Martial Law in order to calm the masses was the preferred action taken by the British.

This however, would be seen by the Arabs as a form of suppression and would usually involve even greater outbursts of violence, thus making an event that should last perhaps only a few hours, go on for days with varying degrees of chaos. The Haycraft Commission Report states that the Riots in Jaffa occurred because “the “New” Jews associated within Zionist Immigration brought with them European habits of thought, are politically minded and...are advanced in their views on industrial matters.”<sup>138</sup> The report notes that “Arab discontent with Zionist manifestations and resentment against the new immigrants reached its climax that a demonstration of Bolshevik Jews became the occasion for a popular explosion. The appeal of a pamphlet circulated in Jaffa by the Bolsheviks” incited the working class to “civil war.”<sup>139</sup> This explains the notion that *The Times* had reported that Bolshevik agents were present within the May Day celebration and that their goal was to disrupt the fragile Palestine Mandate. Arab response to the attacks on the British by the Bolshevik Jews, only furthered the issues of mistrust among their local leaders with the Administrative government.

For each major event within the history of Palestine Mandate, a reaction occurs. Author Sahar Huneidi states that many within the British government recognized that events such as the Jaffa Riots occurred because of “special privileges accorded to the

---

<sup>138</sup> Haycraft Commission Report, May 7, 1921.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid.

Jews.”<sup>140</sup> By making Hebrew an official language, increasing the number of Jews immigrating into Palestine, the Arab Palestinian had no other feeling than that of betrayal and anger. The most obvious reaction to the Jaffa Riots in 1921 was the creation of the Supreme Muslim Council in 1922, in order to provide some equality to the Arabs on a political stage within Palestine. This Council would encounter issues such as fear of collaboration with the British, and threaten whether the true intentions of the Arab Palestinian would ever be successfully accomplished within the Mandate. A *New York Times* article dated on November 4, 1921 stated that an Arab delegation spoke in front of the House of Commons on the question of Palestine and recommended that the setting up of a “national government and a council, and the placing of the holy places in the guardianship of their respective religions.”<sup>141</sup>

Between 1922 and 1929, a few skirmishes littered the landscape of Palestine, mostly in Jerusalem and Tel Aviv as well as Nablus. However the Supreme Muslim Council and the Zionist Commission were walking a tightrope when it came to relations between the two. Even these “skirmishes” gave reason for each side to not trust the other. An attack in Jaffa in November of 1923 occurred because both Muslims and Christians were attempting to oppose an Electric Light Contract with a Jewish company. The article states that “there is considerable agitation owing to the action of the municipality in making a contract for the supply of electricity from the Rutenberg Installation.”<sup>142</sup> This is a

---

<sup>140</sup> Huneidi, *A Broken Trust*, 128.

<sup>141</sup> *New York Times*, November 4, 1921.

<sup>142</sup> *New York Times*, November 22, 1923.

clear example of Arabs reacted to some of the economic opportunities afforded to the Zionist during the time of the Mandate. It was their goal, to disrupt and destroy as much of Zionism as they could within Palestine. This same article raises a point, which became more prominent as the Mandate progressed. The point being that there was a factional break between Arabs themselves. “The Arab executive in Jerusalem published a violently worded proclamation against the new National Arab Party, accusing it of splitting the Arab solidarity, of abetting the Jewish settlement, and of aiding the Mandatory Government.”<sup>143</sup> This type of factionalism is discussed with greater detail with authors such as Richard Kimmerling and Joel Migdal following the collapse of the Arab national identity movement during the Arab Revolts of 1936-1939.

The fear of economic failure did not simply lay with the Arabs. As a direct reaction to having Arabs work in the orange groves of Petakh Tikvah, unemployed Jews “attempted to prevent imported Arab orange pickers from working the orange groves.”<sup>144</sup> This incident occurred at the largest Jewish colony within Palestine and resulted in the wounding of fifteen Jewish workers. Twenty arrests were also made by the British. This type of simple spark to a seemingly simple action was the prime example of Arab reactions during the Mandate. When they attempted to stop the Zionists from advancing their agenda or exercise their political and economic prowess, they were attacked by the Zionist and punished by the British. In this instance, Arabs attempted to exercise their economic rights by working within an orange grove. The result being that they were attacked

---

<sup>143</sup> Ibid.

<sup>144</sup> New York Times, December 19, 1927.

by Jewish unemployed laborers who believed that they were taking their jobs. This simple action could cause an uproar from both sides in the tinderbox that was Mandatory Palestine.

At the end of the 1920s, Palestine remains fragile. What peace that can be garnered by the British is done so through dramatic political maneuvering in hopes of keeping the peace that the Balfour Declaration insisted on creating. The dramatic events of the final week in August 1929, would forever shape how Arab Palestinians would react to the Zionist and the British for decades. The level of mistrust that the Arabs shared reached an all-time high, and will force the Palestinian National Identity into the shadows of the rural lands such as Nablus. The 1929 Western Wall Uprising contained all of the elements which made the British Mandate for Palestine a nightmare. Two peoples, two religions both claiming a particular Holy site for pilgrimage.

The final week of August saw some of the most horrific clashes between Jews and Arabs, as they both attempted to claim the Wailing Wall. The Jewish believe that the Wailing Wall is where prayers are answered, by placing a slip into the wall and exercising your devotion to the Jewish faith. Arabs believe that one part of the wall the Haram Al Sharf is sacred to the Muslim religion. The Jews believe that the Temple Mount is one of the holiest sites in Judaism. The Wailing Wall would be used by some Zionist in a nationalistic capacity in order to raise their profile within the Mandate. This is where the conflict with the Arabs occurred. Throughout the events covered so far, The Nabi Musa Riots, the Jaffa Riots, and the minor altercations which occurred within Palestine, one thing is clear. Arab reaction to Zionist was twofold: Brutal and powerful. Brutal in the sense



that much of the attacks were used with stones and sticks while the Zionists controlled guns and more powerful ammunition. Powerful in the sense that the Arab Palestinian had a driving cause for their reactions during the time of the Mandate. They were protecting their homelands at any cost.

The riots at the Wailing Wall were no different. One of the first reports of the rioting within Jerusalem's Old City comes in the form of an article from the *Chicago Daily Tribune* on August 25th, 1929. Its title proclaims that "50 Slain in Riots in Jerusalem, Jews attacked by Moslems at Wailing Wall." The article also states that rioting though contained within Jerusalem by British Troops, had spread to suburbs such as Sephardim and Petakh Tivkah, that same colony which was famous for its orange groves as previously mentioned. This supports evidence to the fact that what began in the major cities such as Jerusalem, had an impact on neighboring communities as well.

A *Los Angeles Times* article from the day prior, states that once more a communist Zionist faction within Palestine was responsible for instigating the chaos. A proclamation was found from the communists stating that "all Palestine to break down British Imperialism."<sup>145</sup> Newspaper accounts estimate the casualties as nine Jews and three Arabs as well as one hundred and ten other casualties on just the first day of the conflict.<sup>146</sup> The situation in the Old City sector of Jerusalem was exacerbated by the Moslem Committee for the Defense of the Wailing Wall by claiming that the entirety of the responsibility for the fighting rests with the Jews. They claimed that the Jews "seek to extend their rights at

---

<sup>145</sup> Los Angeles Times, August 24, 1929.

<sup>146</sup> The Washington Post, August 24, 1929.

the wall...this is dangerous and impermissible.”<sup>147</sup> Fighting would continue throughout the week with mounting casualties on both sides. Par for the course, the British response was to declare Martial Law as well as impose press censorship and militarize the Mandate.<sup>148</sup> The actual cause of the fighting of the 1929 riots can be questioned.

On the 25th, the *New York Times* also reported that “Jews allege Arabs desecrate wall.”<sup>149</sup> Their allegation was that the fighting occurred because the Muslims did not follow the regulations set upon them by the British government that their construction on a portion of the Wall connected to the Temple Mount, not interfere with the prayer services which are held at the wall. The Jews retaliated to this news, as once again it illustrates the fine line that the British walked between the Zionist and Arabs throughout the period of the Mandate. Again, it gave the Arabs the reasoning necessary to prove that they were simply trying to construct their portion of the wall, the same as the Jews did. Therefore, they would be afforded the same rights as the Jews, but once more as with the incident in Petkah Tivkah, they were not allowed even these basic rights.

As the week progressed, the number injured on both sides soared into the hundreds. The fighting spread into towns such as Jaffa and Sephardim. But there was one final stand that would take place within these 1929 Riots, Safed. Arabs would respond at the end of these riots by burning the ancient Jewish town of Safed to the ground, sparing only government buildings. The *New York Times* article from August 31st, claims that

---

<sup>147</sup> Los Angeles Times, August 24, 1929.

<sup>148</sup> New York Times, August 25, 1929.

<sup>149</sup> New York, Times, August 25, 1929.

Balfour will continue to support the Zionist cause despite the issues that have arisen to this point. One intriguing note is that the question of Abandonment of the Mandate under Ramsay MacDonald is first mentioned within these publications. As the previous chapter in this thesis stated, the incoming High Commissioner Arthur Wauchope will fully back the Zionist cause, only adding to the ire of the Arabs. The result of the 1929 Wailing Wall Riots was that of complete and utter destruction. Any hope that cooperation between Jews and Arabs were completely thrown by the wayside and suddenly the Arabs were put on the defensive.

As with Nabi Musa and Jaffa before it, the British government called for a commission to discover what exactly happened that week within Jerusalem. The Shaw Commission stated that hostility towards the Jews occurred because “Jewish enterprise and Jewish immigration, when not in excess of the absorptive capacity of the country, have conferred with material benefits upon Palestine...Arabs will in time be deprived of their livelihood and pass under the political domination of the Jews.”<sup>150</sup> Also similar to the other commission reports, the punishments delivered by the British were harsh. Many believed that the Arabs were solely responsible for the Wailing Wall riots, however there was a small number of individuals such as those quoted in the Shaw Commission that stated that while their actions were inexcusable, it is understandable how they felt as though their lives and their overall well-being was being threatened by Zionism. The Wailing Wall riot simply did not resemble their ability to build within the Old City, but it

---

<sup>150</sup> Shaw Commission.

was an attempt by the Zionist to marginalize their religious standing within Palestine, and question their devotion to one of the holy sites that they claim.

The number of those prosecuted for the attacks within that week in August, were overwhelmingly Arab. The British Government, attempted to find a leader to make an example out of, they chose the Grand Mufti. They believed that his influence within the Arab community sparked the violence along the Western Wall. The claim of the government was that he remained silent during the rioting and that if he had talked to the masses within his sector of the city, as his residence is directly under the Damascus Gate, would have prevented some of the outbreak of violence. An article within the *New York Times* on November 1st, 1929, stated that during the inquiry Sir Boyd Merriman argue for the Jewish cause stating that the “Grand Mufti in order to secure his position desired to play the role of defender of the Moslem holy shrines and therefore caused rumors to be spread that the Jews had attacked the Mosque of Omar.”<sup>151</sup>

Merriman also stated that the government failed because they “created the impression that the Arabs could have any of their demands fulfilled by merely insisting on them.” Therefore it is simply no the blame of the Arabs, but the British as well. The same councillor argued that the Jews should be afforded protections from this type of incident ever occurring within Palestine. Once again, the Zionist cause is portrayed as the victim which needs to be protected by the Administrative government.

The punishment handed out by the British was not equal. It highly favored the Zionists, despite the fact that many instances during this week were intentionally exacer-

---

<sup>151</sup> New York Times, Nov 1, 1929.

bated. This provides evidence to the argument that the relationship between the Arabs and their leaders were fragile. The Grand Mufti would not necessarily represent the true feelings of the Arab population within Palestine and the failure of the British to recognize that only added to the issues that the three groups felt within the Mandate. An Article within the *New York Times* on November 4th, 1929 states that “Never in the history of the Holy Land have they [the Arabs] displayed such a nationalistic spirit and united front.”<sup>152</sup> The reaction from the Arab population was to align themselves with the Christian population, as they believed that they presented the best opportunity for a successful relationship within the Mandate.

The period between the 1929 Wailing Wall Riots and the 1936 Arab Revolts saw yet again another period in which concessions were made to the Arabs as a direct reaction to the Mandate. The Arabs felt betrayed and unable to exercise basic rights such as religious freedoms and economic development. The establishment of groups such as the Arab Higher Committee and the Supreme Muslim Council within Palestine, led to political structures which attempted to rectify the issues of the Mandate. This wouldn't be possible as many Arabs were asking for a complete abolishment of the Balfour Declaration.

Perhaps one of the greatest “Broken Promises” is that there would be an establishment of the Jewish national home without infringing upon the rights of any population which existed within Palestine. The main issue with the 1936-1939 Arab Revolts was the sheer number Jews immigrating into the Mandate during that time. Arabs believed that this was the ultimate battle that needed to be won, and that the 1936 Revolts would

---

<sup>152</sup> *New York Times*, Nov 4, 1929.

be their final stands, as the National movement had gained enough strength to coalesce with Christians, in order to finally rid Palestine of Zionism.

The importance of Nablus to the Palestinian National Identity movement would begin to take hold here. Up to this point, Jerusalem was the main epicenter for the issues that arose during the protests of the Mandate, and then would seep into the suburbs of Tel Aviv, Jaffa and the like. The division between Arabs themselves, the well-educated urban core based in the city, was accused by some within the rural lands of collaboration with the British and did not fully represent the attitude that most Arabs had regarding the Mandate. These debates are prevalent in two works: *Law and Identity in Mandatory Palestine* by Assaf Likhovski and *Palestinians: The Making of a people* by Baruch Kimmerling and Joel Migdal. The primary newspapers, are the main key to understanding the issues that were presented during these latter years of the Mandate. The three events before it all focused on the relative “new-ness” of the Mandate, however by this point within the Mandate, it was nearly two decades old. Two decades full of trials and tribulations which hard fought battles occurred in order for the most basic of rights.

Similar to the Nabi Musa riots of 1920, the beginning of the 1936 Arab Revolt occurs within April, its symbolism running in parallel with the other religions in Palestine, cannot be understated. An *Austin Statesman* article from April 20th, 1936, claims that “Jews and Arabs in New Battles.” The fighting began in the suburbs of Tel Aviv and Jaffa when Jews attacked Arabs in Tel Aviv. Once the “news had reached Jaffa, Arabs

closed their shops and attacked Jews.”<sup>153</sup> Arabs within Nablus demanded that Jewish immigration into Palestine be stopped.

The Revolt of 1936, with all of the battles and bloodshed that was stereotypical for events within Mandatory Palestine. The plan for the 1936 Revolt however, was one of a financial action. Arabs called for a general strike in order to get their point across to the British to stop Jewish Immigration. An article from the *New York Times* on the 21st stated that the General strike that the Arabs would attempt to impose would be similar to the strike bought against the French in Syria. “It is a challenge no less to the Mandatory power.”<sup>154</sup> As the strike progressed throughout the weeks from April into May, violent clashes with Jews always occurred. In an article on May 15th, it is announced that “Arabs began civil disobedience.”<sup>155</sup> They refused to pay taxes as a challenge to the increasing amount of Jewish immigration in Palestine.

Once again, Arabs reacted in a strong and harsh fashion, in order to get their point noticed. Much like the Jaffa Riots before it, the British response was swift and militarized. A curfew was put in place, but in this case the Arabs were not backing down. Attacks continued on both Jewish and British individuals who they deemed were a hindrance to their cause. Thousands of Arabs were detained as a result of these riots and the Nationalistic movement was stifled. The General Strike ended on October 15th, 1936 un-

---

<sup>153</sup> Austin Statesman, April 20th, 1936.

<sup>154</sup> New York Times, April 21, 1936.

<sup>155</sup> New York Times, May 15, 1936.

der the support from the Arab Kings of Iraq, Yemen and Saudi Arabia as well as the Emir of Transjordan.<sup>156</sup>

The Palestine Royal Commission, also known as the Peel Commission of 1937, would begin the process to partition the Mandate. The result of the Commission had decided that the Mandate had become unworkable for the Jews, Arabs and British. The Arabs would not accept calls for a partitioning of Palestine because they disagreed with the notion that the Jews would be awarded any territory, and that Palestine was their home and they must continue to defend it. Once again, the pattern followed, and a British inquiry discussing the previous events and recommendations was issued. This time there was no other solution than to dissolve the Mandate. “For Partition means that neither will get all it wants. It means that the Arabs must acquiesce in the exclusion from their sovereignty of a piece of territory, long occupied and once ruled by them. It means that the Jews must be content with less than the Land of Israel they once ruled and have hoped to rule again...it offers neither party all it wants, it offers each what it wants most, namely freedom and security.”<sup>157</sup>

The partition plan did not resolve the issues that the Arabs had with the Mandate. The resolve of the Arabs was too strong. The power of the National movement shifted from the official sanctioned urban centers of Jerusalem, under the guidance of the Arab Higher Committee, into the rural lands of Nablus and local village leaders who continued to fight. These groups were disbanded as a result of them rejecting the recommendations

---

<sup>156</sup> New York Times, October 15, 1936.

<sup>157</sup> Peel Commission (Palestine Royal Commission 1937)



of the Peel Commission. The Grand Mufti Haj Amin Al-Husseini was removed from power and eventually fled from the Mandate and responsibility of the movement shifted to rebel leaders, who would continue their fight despite the demands of the British.

## **V. CONCLUSION: BROKEN PROMISES: THE AFTERMATH OF THE ZIONIST AND BRITISH CONTROLLED PALESTINE**

Throughout the historiography and the examination of Primary sources, one word keeps coming up on a consistent basis. "Promise." This why the main title of my thesis has the term "Broken Promises" in it. The Balfour Declaration of 1917, promised that Palestine would become a home for the Jewish People. However, one of the most important promises that was also included was that it would not infringe on the rights of any other group which currently lived within Palestine. This caveat was directly intended to protect the Arab Palestinian population that was the overwhelming population at that time.

Zionism has always had a direct pull to finding a national home for the Jews. However, it was not until Dr. Chaim Weizmann, a Russian born Jew, and highly developed political figure within Great Britain. Under his direction, the Zionist cause found a home that they had been hoping for. It took the convincing of key figures within the Political spheres, such as Woodrow Wilson and David Lloyd George. Weizmann met with individuals beyond these giants, those that essentially acted as gatekeepers to these men. For Lloyd George, it was Arthur James Balfour, the author of the Declaration which bears his name. His influence within Westminster and throughout British politics, allowed Weizmann to gain a foothold within that circle and began to convince them that the Jewish people deserved a national home and that it should indeed be their ancestral home:

Palestine. For Woodrow Wilson, Weizmann used his personal relationship with Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, and the strong relationship that is shared between the United States and the Jewish cause. Through the King Crane Commission, the native population within the Ottoman Empire or in this specific case the Palestinian population, preferred that the United States would be in control of the Mandate. However, political issues within the United States Congress showed that this would be an impossibility.

Throughout the creation of the League of Nations and the Palestine Mandate, the world's political leaders made many promises to many groups of people. To the Jewish, to the Palestinian, to the German, their goals were to rid the world of the problems of the Great War. To argue however that these promises were "broken" is subjective. The argument can be made that the viewpoint an individual shares would determine their understanding of an intense subject like the Palestine question. For example, a Zionist Jew might believe that their promises were broken by Balfour and the British by not allowing them to have everything that individuals within the Palestine Mandate Society desired. Their purpose was to proliferate Zionism for Palestine, and constantly being demanding of the desires of immigration and economic well-being, in addition these political heavyweights essentially made the argument that if Palestine was controlled by the British and the Jews, it would have an overall positive impact for the Empire. The members of the Palestine Mandate Society were under the belief that a strong relationship between British and the Zionist, would be a force for good in the Europe and worldwide.

This society was comprised of the most influential members in British political circles. Balfour, Lloyd-George, MacDonald all men who were at the top of the hierarchy

of the British government. They are all interconnected to each other and along with others such as Josiah Wedgwood, Wyndham Deedes, Edgar Dugdale and others, they gave a false impression to the British public by claiming that the Balfour declaration and the British Mandate for Palestine, would acknowledge the rights of the Arab Palestinians. This is also the message that the British government portrayed within the Mandate. However, it is clear that their intentions misled the Arab population and a portion of the British public. The Palestine Mandate Society had made a conscious decision to proliferate their views for what they believed was the just cause. Zionism was to have a home in Palestine and the relationship between the Jews and Great Britain, was a necessity that needed to remain strong.

Therefore, the British Mandate for Palestine is a “Broken Promise” simply because the British Government did not follow what they were saying in the public sphere. It was these “Broken Promises” that led to the overall chaos and volatile nature following the end of the British Mandate. The British had run a deficit so large, they realized that it was no longer a viable option to have it remain part of the empire. They opted for independence but supported the Zionist cause to an even greater extreme, an extreme that would see violence off and on for years. The resulting departure of the British led Chaim Weizmann and the Zionists to create the national state of Israel, one that would provide even greater protection to the Jewish people. But it is the constant struggle between the Jews and the Arab Palestinians, which would be the most prominent problem that the region would deal with for the oncoming decades. Constant turmoil and despair, and the struggle of two different cultures, two different peoples, trying to claim what they believe

is theirs. The Promise from the League of Nations was that it was going to fix what ailed the world following the Great War. All it truly did was create a division between two societies that are strong in their beliefs. What was supposed to be a joint effort between the British, Jews and Arabs only ended up being “broken.”

## APPENDIX SECTION

### Timeline of Events

February 1896	<i>Der Judenstaat</i> written by Theodor Herzl
November 2, 1917	Balfour Declaration signed
November 11, 1918	Armistice ending World War I
January 18, 1919	Start of Paris Peace Conference
June 28, 1919	Signing of the Treaty of Versailles
April 19-26, 1920	San Remo Conference
April 4, 1920	Start of the Nabi Musa Riots within Jerusalem
April 25, 1920	Mandate assigned for Palestine using Great Britain as power
August 10, 1920	Signing of the Treaty of Sèvres
May 1, 1921	Start of the Jaffa Riots
June 3, 1922	Churchill British White Paper
December 3, 1922	Release of King Crane Commission within <i>New York Times</i>
September 29, 1923	Official Ratification of the British Mandate for Palestine
October 15, 1926	Start of 1926 Imperial Conference
November 15, 1926	Reissuing of Balfour Declaration
August 23, 1929	Start of the Wailing Wall Riots
November 1, 1936	Start of the Arab Revolt
July 7, 1937	Peel Commission (Palestine Royal Commission)

May 23, 1939      Macdonald British White Paper

May 14, 1948      Creation of the State of Israel

## LITERATURE CITED

### II. Establishing the Mandate: American Involvement within the League of Nations and the Creation of the Palestine Mandate

Avalon Project, 'President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points,' Yale Law School, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/wilson14.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp) (accessed April 2, 2012).

Andelman, David. *A Shattered Peace Versailles 1919 And The Price We Pay Today*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, 2008.

Brandeis, Louis. *The Curse of Bigness. Miscellaneous Papers of Louis D. Brandeis*. New York: Viking Press, 1935.

Christian Science Monitor. *President Wilson and Jewish Rights*. Jan 20, 1919.

Definition of Tanzimat. <http://www.britannica.com/event/Tanzimat>

Ingrams, Doreen. *Palestine Papers 1917-1922 Seeds of Conflict*. New York: George Braziller, 1972.

*King-Crane Commission*. UNISPAL Website.

Link, Arthur S., ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. vol. 53, November 8, 1918-January 11, 1919. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Link, Arthur S., ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. vol. 54, January 11- February 7, 1919. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Manela, Erez. *The Wilsonian Moment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Reinharz, Jehuda ed. *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann*. Series A Letters vol. IX October 1918-July 1920. Rutgers: Transaction Books, 1977.

United States, Department of State. *The Palestine Mandate*. Salisbury: Documentary Publications, 1977.

United States, Department of State. *Papers relating to the foreign relations of the United*



*States the Paris Peace Conference, 1919.* Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1942-47.

Wall Street Journal. *Versailles Revelations.* Nov 14, 1924.

Wasserstein, Bernard ed. *The Letters and Papers of Chaim Weizmann.* Series A Letters vol. X July 1920-December 1921. Rutgers: Transaction Books, 1977.

Wilson, Woodrow. *Woodrow Wilson's Case for the League of Nations.* Compiled by Hamilton Foley. Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1967.

Weizmann, Chaim. *Trial and Error The Autobiography of Chaim Weizmann.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1949.

### **III. Administration of the Mandate: An Examination of a British Controlled Palestine and the Palestine Mandate Society**

#### **Primary Sources**

##### **Official Archival Documents**

British Policy towards Palestine, 1918-1947: Official Documents, Government Papers, Great Britain, United Kingdom.

Department of Migration Annual Report 1934: Overview of the Mandate. British Government Document. The National Archives, London. England, United Kingdom, CO 733/329/15.

Palestine Mandate Society, British Government Document, The National Archives, London, England, United Kingdom, CO 733/186/2.

Link, Arthur S., ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. vol. 53, November 8, 1918-January 11, 1919, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

MacDonald White Paper of 1939, [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/brwh1939.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/brwh1939.asp)

A letter from Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope to the Dormant Commission, British Government Document, The National Archives, London, England, United Kingdom, CO 733/350/12.

*Report of the Palestine Royal Commission*, Parliamentary Papers, The National Archives, London, England, United Kingdom, CO 793/25.

*The Times*, "Some Truths About Palestine", Philip Graves, April 3rd-10th, 1922.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies and The Peerage.

Colonel James Buchan, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32145?docPos=1>

Denis Alfred Jex Buxton, <http://www.thepeerage.com/p15213.htm>

Sir Wyndham Deedes, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32768>

Viscount Robert Cecil of Chelwood, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/32335>

Blanche Dugdale, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/62138>

Lieutenant General Sir George Macdonogh,

<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38446>

Sir Herbert Sidebotham, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36084>

Ethel Snowden, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/48517?docPos=1>

### **Secondary Sources**

Ayerst, David. *The Manchester Guardian: Biography of a Newspaper*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1971.

Cohen, Michael J., Kolinsky, Martin eds. *Britain and the Middle East in the 1930s: Security Problems, 1935-1939*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Macmillan, 1992.

Davis, Robert. *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Fieldhouse, D.K. *Western Imperialism in the Middle East, 1914-1948*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Huneidi, Sahar. *A Broken Trust: Herbert Samuel, Zionism and the Palestinians*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Hyamson, Albert Monfieur. *Palestine: A Policy*. London: Meuthen Press, 1942.

Hyamson, Albert Monfieur. *Palestine under the Mandate, 1920-1948*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1976.

- Likhovski, Assaf. *Law and Identity In Mandate Palestine*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.
- Lewis, Bernard. *The Middle East And The West*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Louis, William Roger. *The British Empire in the Middle East, 1945-1951: Arab Nationalism, The United States and Postwar Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Marlowe, John. *Arab Nationalism and British Imperialism, A study In Power Politics*. London: Cresset Press, 1961.
- McCarthy, Justin. *The Population of Palestine: Population History and Statistics of the Late Ottoman Period and the Mandate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Migdal, Joel S. *Palestinian Society and Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Miller, Rory ed. *Britain, Palestine And Empire: The Mandate Years*. Burlington,VT: Ashgate, 2010.
- Mills, William Haslam. *The Manchester Guardian: A Century of History*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1972.
- Sherman, A.J. *Mandate Days: British Lives in Palestine, 1918-1948*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1998.
- Sidebotham, Herbert. *England and Palestine*. London: Constable and Company, 1918.
- Sidebotham, Herbert. *Great Britain and Palestine*. London: Macmillan and Co, 1937.

Wedgwood, Josiah Clement. *The Seventh Dominion*. London: Labour Publishing, 1928.

## **IV. Living within the Palestine Mandate: Examining Palestinian Reactions During The Palestine Mandate**

### **Primary Sources**

#### **Official Archival Documents**

British Policy towards Palestine, 1918-1947: Official Documents, Government Papers, Great Britain, United Kingdom.

Department of Migration Annual Report 1934: Overview of the Mandate. British Government Document. The National Archives, London. England, United Kingdom, CO 733/329/15.

Palestine Mandate Society, British Government Document, The National Archives, London, England, United Kingdom, CO 733/186/2.

Link, Arthur S., ed. *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*. vol. 53, November 8, 1918-January 11, 1919, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

A letter from Sir Arthur Grenfell Wauchope to the Palestine Mandate Society, British Government Document, The National Archives, London, England, United Kingdom, CO 733/350/12.

*Report of the Palestine Royal Commission*, Parliamentary Papers, The National Archives, London, England, United Kingdom, CO 793/25.

Israel State Archives

#### **Newspapers**

*Al-Huquq*

*London Evening Standard.*

*The Palestine Post*

### **Secondary Sources**

Cohen, Michael J., Kolinsky, Martin eds. *Britain and the Middle East in the 1930s: Security Problems, 1935-1939*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Macmillan, 1992.

Divine, Donna Robinson. *Exiled In The Homeland: Zionism And Return To The Mandate Palestine*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2009.

Fieldhouse, D.K. *Western Imperialism in the Middle East, 1914-1948*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Huneidi, Sahar. *A Broken Trust: Herbert Samuel, Zionism and the Palestinians*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2001.

Hurewitz, J.C. *The Struggle for Palestine*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.

Khalidi, Rashid. *Palestinian Identity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Khalidi, Rashid. *The Origins of Arab Nationalism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.

Kimmerling, Baruch, Migdal, Joel. *Palestinians: The Making of A People*, New York: Free Press, 1993.

Koestler, Arthur. *Promise And Fulfillment; Palestine 1917-1949*. New York: Macmillan, 1949.

Likhovski, Assaf. *Law and Identity In Mandate Palestine*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

- Lewis, Bernard. *The Middle East And The West*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1964.
- Louis, William Roger. *The British Empire in the Middle East, 1945-1951: Arab Nationalism, The United States and Postwar Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Marlowe, John. *Arab Nationalism and British Imperialism, A study In Power Politics*. London: Cresset Press, 1961.
- McCarthy, Justin. *The Population of Palestine: Population History and Statistics of the Late Ottoman Period and the Mandate*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
- Migdal, Joel S. *Palestinian Society and Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Miller, Rory ed. *Britain, Palestine And Empire: The Mandate Years*. Burlington,VT: Ashgate, 2010.
- Rouhana, Nadim. *Palestinian Citizens in an Ethnic Jewish State*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Sherman, A.J. *Mandate Days: British Lives in Palestine, 1918-1948*. New York: Thames and Hudson, 1998.