

an 'Irāqī-Yamanī Treaty of Friendship on the 11th May, 1931.¹ The exchange of ratifications of this treaty was made the occasion for a return visit on the part of a Yamanī delegation to 'Irāq in the spring of 1932.²

It remains to record the dealings of the 'Irāqī Government with the private oil interests, which were greater Powers in the world of the day than any of the *états limitrophes*.

In a previous volume,³ the history of the foreign oil concessions in those Ottoman territories which were eventually included within the frontiers of the Kingdom of 'Irāq has been carried down to the signature, on the 14th March, 1925, of a convention⁴ between the 'Irāqī Government and the Turkish Petroleum Company⁵ (a concern which changed its name to 'the 'Irāq Petroleum Company' in 1929). The concession thereby granted to the 'Irāq Petroleum Company covered⁶ the whole territory of the Kingdom with the two exceptions of the former vilāyet of Basrah and the territories which had been transferred to Turkey from Persia in 1913. (A concession for the development of the oil resources in the Transferred Territories was already held by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and was confirmed by the Ottoman and the 'Irāqī Governments successively.) Thereafter, the 'Irāqī Government revised their existing agreements with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and the 'Irāq Petroleum Company, and also entered into an agreement with a third concern called the British Oil Development Company.

On the 30th August, 1925, an agreement was concluded between the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and the 'Irāqī Government providing for:

- (a) the formation of a subsidiary company to operate within 'Irāq.
- (b) the erection of a refinery to refine oil products for consumption within 'Irāq.
- (c) the transit of oil won either in the Transferred Territories or in Persia through 'Irāq to a seaboard.

On the 24th May, 1926, a further agreement between the company and the 'Irāqī Government was concluded to provide for:

- (a) a fixed royalty per ton in replacement of the royalty on a profit-sharing basis given by the original concession.

¹ Text in *op. cit.*, Appendix O.

² The Yamanī mission travelled to Basrah on board a Soviet Russian steamer (*Report 1932*, p. 17).

³ *The Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, Section (xi): *Note on Oil*.

⁴ Text in *Special Report, 1920-31*, Appendix L (1).

⁵ For the interests represented in the Turkish Petroleum Company see the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, *loc. cit.*

⁶ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

(b) the sale of oil products throughout 'Irāq at prices considerably below those then in force.

(c) the extension of the period of the original concession by a period of thirty-five years.¹

The subsidiary company, contemplated in the first of these two agreements, was duly formed under the name of 'the Khānaqīn Oil Company'; the construction of a refinery in the Transferred Territories, near Khānaqīn, was completed in May 1927; and thereafter the company 'distributed and marketed oil-products throughout 'Irāq under a price-formula approved by the Government', with the result that oil prices in 'Irāq 'were considerably reduced'.²

The area of the Khānaqīn Oil Company's concession was, of course, very small compared with that of the 'Irāq Petroleum Company's. This latter concession, however, did not cover the whole of the vast area over which it was spread, but was confined to twenty-four rectangular plots of eight square miles each,³ which were 'to be chosen by the company after they had had an opportunity to test the whole concession area'—whereafter, 'the remaining areas were . . . to be divided into similar plots to be put up for public auction'.⁴ This arrangement was the company's own choice; for they had been deterred, by American insistence upon the maintenance of the 'open door' in 'Irāq, from applying for exclusive exploitation rights throughout the area over which their concession extended, and at the same time they were unwilling to 'run the risk of choosing outright, without prior survey and test,⁵ a definite area', within the original area of the concession, 'which might not turn out to contain the best structures'.⁶

Under this agreement, the company began to prospect; and on the 14th October, 1927, a gigantic gusher was struck at Baba Gurgur, near Kirkūk. The company did not find itself ready, however, to select its plots on the 14th September of that year, which was the date ('thirty-two months after the date of this convention') on which the selection had to be made according to the terms of the convention (Art. 5); and the 'Irāqī Government refused to extend the period beyond the 29th November, 1929. The company appear to have had a good case for representing that they had been carrying out

¹ *Special Report 1920-31*, p. 222.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 223.

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, *loc. cit.*

⁴ *Special Report 1920-31*, p. 219. The proceeds of these auctions went to the 'Irāq Petroleum Company.

⁵ 'No geological survey existed; and very little was known of the type, depth or conformation of the structures which might have to be drilled' (*op. cit.*, p. 219).

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 218.

their survey and tests with all reasonable diligence; that the time allowed in the agreement was insufficient; and that their survey work had been hindered to some extent by political disturbances in certain districts.¹ On the other hand, the 'Irāqī Government may have suspected that the company were, to say the least, not sorry to see the execution of the convention delayed, since the oil-fields under the control of the participating interests in other parts of the world, which were already going concerns, appeared to be more than sufficient to meet the world-demand for many years to come; and, on this showing, it was presumably in the company's interest to hold the oil resources of 'Irāq in reserve—refraining from drawing upon them on their own account so long as they were able to prevent them from being tapped by their competitors. Whatever the reasons for the delay² in the opening-up of the 'Irāq oil-fields by the 'Irāq Petroleum Company may have been, this delay was clearly contrary to the interests of the 'Irāqī Government, which had consented to take its share of the profits in the shape of a royalty on a tonnage basis, and which was thus being deprived, by the delay, of revenue which was urgently needed for setting the new Kingdom on its feet.

This delay came under the consideration of the Mandates Commission at their sixteenth session in November 1929, and again at their nineteenth session in November 1930, and on the second occasion they reported on the matter, in strong terms, to the Council of the League.³ Meanwhile, towards the end of the year 1929, negotiations

¹ The Company's case is ably set forth in the British Government's *Special Report 1920-31*, pp. 219-21.

² There was incontestably a delay in the sense of an inability, on the Company's part, to keep up to the time-table of its original agreement with the 'Irāqī Government. The Company contended that, considering the magnitude of the task of 'proving' the existence of reserves of oil in the vast, remote and uncharted area within which it was to select its plots, it had carried out the necessary operations with unprecedented rapidity, and it estimated that by the 30th September, 1929, it had drilled 105,744 feet in 'Irāq, which was more than five and a half times as much as its contractual obligation of 18,500 feet. There is no reason for supposing that this contention was not made *bona fide* or that it was not justified by the facts. At the same time, the 'Irāqīs' suspiciousness and anxiety were not unnatural in view of some of the chapters in the past history of the relations between non-Western Governments and Western 'Big Business'.

³ The passage in the Permanent Mandates Commission's report on its nineteenth session (Minutes of the Nineteenth Session, p. 208) is to the following effect:

'In its report to the Council on its sixteenth session, the Commission made a recommendation regarding oil production. It expressed the hope that the authorities, realizing the importance of the exploitation of this natural wealth as a factor in the country's prosperity, would see their way, should any fresh concessions be granted, to impose on the companies to which they are granted

were entered into, between the Government and the Company, for a revision of the 1925 convention; and these resulted, on the 24th March, 1931, in the signature of a new agreement,¹ which came into force on the 21st May after its ratification by the Parliament at Baghdad on the 18th of that month.

The provisions of this agreement may conveniently be presented here in the terms of the summary of them which was communicated to the Mandates Commission by the Mandatory Power.²

The company are given exclusive exploitation rights over all lands situated in the vilāyets of Baghdad and Mosul which are bounded by the east bank of the River Tigris, by the 'Irāqī-Turkish frontier, and by the 'Irāqī-Persian frontier, excepting the Transferred Territories. . . . They relinquish all rights to the remaining areas in the two vilāyets, of which the Government are free to dispose at will. The 'plot' system of the 1925 convention is thus abandoned.

The company undertake to complete before the 31st December, 1935, a pipe-line system to the Mediterranean of a combined capacity of not less than 3,000,000 tons per annum. Provision is made for one pipe-line which is to carry³ at least 50 per cent. of the oil to reach the sea at a terminal on the Bay of Acre, while a second pipe-line may be constructed under certain conditions at the discretion of the company to another terminal through Syrian territory.

The company undertake to pay to the 'Irāqī Government forthwith, and until regular export from the Mediterranean seaboard begins, a sum of £400,000 annually. Of this sum £200,000 is an advance against royalties, recoverable (without interest) by the company from future royalties when they exceed a minimum figure, and £200,000 is dead rent not recoverable by the company.

The company guarantee a royalty payment at 4 shillings a ton on a minimum production of 2,000,000 tons for a period of twenty years after the pipe-line is opened.

The company undertake to procure reductions in the price of oil products in 'Irāq representing a total decrease of about £120,000 in the present total annual turn-over. The greatest cut, one of 33½ per cent., is in fuel oil.

conditions which will ensure the due development of the 'Irāq oil industry. The Permanent Mandates Commission was unable to obtain precise information from the accredited representative as to the circumstances delaying the exploitation of the oil deposits existing in 'Irāq. It hopes to find particulars on this point in the next annual report. The Commission trusts that the Mandatory Power will see that the competent authorities pursue a policy entirely in conformity with the territory's interests, not only in the event of new concessions being applied for, but also in case it should be necessary to interpret the agreements concluded with existing concessionaire companies.'

¹ Text in *Special Report 1920-31*, Appendix L (2).

² British Government's *Special Report 1920-31*, pp. 221-2.

³ This phrase 'which is to carry' does not perhaps exactly represent the terms of the agreement, in which the words used are: 'of a carrying capacity of'.—A. J. T.

In execution of the financial provisions of this agreement, the company made their first annual payment to the Government in May 1931.¹ When the second payment fell due—after the fall of the Pound Sterling from its gold parity—on the 1st January, 1932, 'a dispute arose as to the meaning of the provision in the company's convention for payment in gold; and the company proposed to pay in sterling. In February, however, as the result of discussions in London between the Prime Minister, Nūrī Pasha as-Sa'id, and the Company, they paid, without prejudice to either party, the sum of £578,000 in full settlement. When the next instalment fell due on the 1st January, 1933, the company paid the 'Irāqī Government the full amounts due in sterling at the current price of gold.'²

In execution of the constructional provisions, a pipe-line system from the Baba Gurgur field was carried across the Tigris at Bayjī and across the Euphrates at Hadithah, and was led thence, in a bifurcation, across Transjordan to the Palestinian port of Haifa in the one direction and across Syria to the Lebanese port of Tarabulus (Tripoli) in the other.³ The first delivery of oil was received at Tarabulus on the 14th July, 1934, and at Haifa on the 14th October of the same year;⁴ and the whole pipe-line system was officially opened on the 14th January, 1935, by King Ghāzi at Kirkūk. Inaugural ceremonies were also held at Damascus on the 17th, at Tarabulus on the 19th, at Haifa on the 22nd and at 'Ammān on the 24th.

In pursuance of Article 14 of the convention of the 24th March, 1931, the 'Irāq Petroleum Company formed a marketing company, called 'the Rafidain Oil Company', to supply the petroleum requirements of 'Irāq; and in May 1932 the Khānaqīn Oil Company made over to the Rafidain Oil Company that portion of their business which was concerned with the marketing of oil products in 'Irāq.⁵ Certain reservations, in regard to this arrangement between the oil interests, were made by the 'Irāqī Government.⁶

After the conclusion of their agreement of the 24th March, 1931, with the 'Irāq Petroleum Company, the 'Irāqī Government, on the 23rd June, 1931, issued an official *communiqué*⁷ inviting applications

¹ *Report 1931*, p. 60.

² *Report 1932*, p. 38.

³ A telephone-line was simultaneously installed along the route of the pipe-line.

⁴ By this time, the 'Irāq Petroleum Company had already spent between £15,000,000 and £16,000,000 sterling, of which about £9,500,000 was accounted for by the cost of the pipe-line system.

⁵ The Khānaqīn Oil Company continued to carry on their producing and refining activities in the Transferred Territories.

⁶ For details see *Report 1932*, p. 40.

⁷ Text in *Report 1931*, p. 59.

for the grant of an oil concession or concessions for the whole, or any portion, of 'Irāq which the existing agreements with the 'Irāq Petroleum Company and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company did not cover. In October 1931, the Government considered the applications received, and decided to enter into negotiations with one applicant only, 'the British Oil Development Company Ltd., in the first instance'. These negotiations resulted, on the 20th April, 1932, in the signature of a convention¹ whereby the British Oil Development Company secured exclusive oil rights for seventy-five years over 'all the lands of 'Irāq situated west of the Tigris River and north of the thirty-third parallel of latitude'. On their part, the Company undertook, *inter alia*,

(a) to export a million tons a year within seven-and-a-half years, provided this quantity of petroleum can 'with reasonable diligence' be made available from the Concession area;

(b) to pay the Government annual dead rent until regular export begins as follows:

	£ (gold)
1st January, 1933	100,000
1st January, 1934	125,000
1st January, 1935	150,000
1st January, 1936	175,000

and 1st January, 1937, and subsequent years, £200,000 (gold);

(c) to pay the Government a royalty of four shillings (gold) per ton for twenty years after regular export begins, and thereafter, subject to revision on the basis of the Company's profits, such royalty for the first twenty years not to be less than £200,000 (gold) provided that the oil resources of the concession area permit of the production of a million tons a year with reasonable diligence on the part of the company;

(d) to allot to the Government free of cost at well-head 20 per cent. of the oil extracted and to purchase this oil from the Government, if required to do so, at a definite rate.²

This convention was confirmed by special law on the 29th May, 1932.

These negotiations with the private capitalists of the Western World for the economic exploitation of the principal natural product of the country were perhaps as formidable, and certainly as momentous for the future of the Kingdom, as the negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain and of the *états limitrophes*.³ It will be seen that, by the time when 'Irāq started on her career as a fully

¹ Text in *Report 1932*, Appendix A.

² *Report 1932*, pp. 39-40.

³ The advantageous terms which 'Irāq obtained from the oil interests were said to have been due in large measure to the personal part that was taken by King Faysal in these negotiations.

sovereign and independent state, upon the extinction of the mandatory régime on the 3rd October, 1932, she had gone far to establish her position in the economic, as well as in the political, structure of the Great Society of which she had now officially become a member.

(d) THE ADMISSION OF THE KINGDOM OF 'IRĀQ TO
MEMBERSHIP OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

(1). *The Determination of the General Conditions which must be fulfilled in order to bring to an End the Mandatory Régime in any Country under a Mandate*

Of the fourteen territories that were placed under the newly devised mandatory régime in the Peace Settlement after the General War of 1914-18, 'Irāq was the first to be emancipated; and accordingly two distinct questions were raised when the emancipation of 'Irāq became 'practical politics'. Besides the question of the special conditions applying to the case of 'Irāq, there was the prior general question of the conditions to be fulfilled in order to bring the mandatory régime to an end in any country under mandate. The event which brought both these questions on to the agenda of the League Council was the British Government's notification,¹ on the 4th November, 1929, of their intention to recommend 'Irāq for admission to membership of the League in 1932; for while the exact relation between admission to membership and emancipation from mandatory tutelage remained to be decided, it was evident that admission implied emancipation, whether previous or simultaneous. In dealing with the history of these two questions from the time when they were both raised by the action of the British Government, it will be convenient to keep them distinct, as they actually were kept distinct by the League Council.

On the 13th January, 1930, the Council, after a discussion on the ultimate entry of 'Irāq into the League of Nations, approved of the following resolution:

Being anxious to determine what general conditions must be fulfilled before the mandate régime can be brought to an end in respect of a country placed under that régime, and with a view to such decisions as it may be called upon to take on this matter, the Council, subject to any other inquiries it may think necessary, requests the Mandates Commission to submit any suggestions that may assist the Council in coming to a conclusion.²

¹ See the *Survey for 1930*, p. 321.

² Minutes of the Eighteenth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 170.

When this resolution came on to the agenda for the Mandates Commission's eighteenth session, the Vice-Chairman, Monsieur Van Rees, who was at that time Acting Chairman in the Marquis Theodoli's absence, circulated a memorandum¹ to the Commission in which he discussed the question with reference to the concrete case of 'Irāq; in the course of the session, which was held in June 1930, the Commission referred the question to a sub-committee; and this sub-committee's *rapporteur*, Count de Penha Garcia, in a report² submitted to the Commission at its nineteenth session in November 1930, took the view that the Council was not at present asking the Commission to pronounce on the case of 'Irāq, and drafted his observations on the basis of this interpretation. The Commission asked the Council for a further ruling, and on the 22nd January, 1931, the Council confirmed the interpretation of its wishes which Count de Penha Garcia had tentatively adopted. On the same occasion, the Council made it clear that it did not expect the Commission to offer suggestions as to the conditions that might be imposed for the admission of a state formerly under mandate to membership of the League. Thereupon, the general question was discussed by the Commission during its twentieth session in June 1931, and its conclusions were presented to the Council in its report on the work of the session.

In this report the Commission expressed the opinion that the emancipation of a territory under the mandatory régime should be made dependent on two classes of preliminary conditions:

(1) The existence in the territory concerned of *de facto* conditions which justify the presumption that the country has reached the stage of development at which a people has become able, in the words of Article 22 of the Covenant, 'to stand by itself under the strenuous conditions of the modern world';

(2) Certain guarantees to be furnished by the territory desirous of emancipation to the satisfaction of the League of Nations, in whose name the mandate was conferred and has been exercised by the Mandatory.³

In regard to the first of these classes of conditions, the Commission submitted that 'whether a people which' had 'hitherto been under tutelage' had 'become fit to stand alone without the advice and assistance of a mandatory' was 'a question of fact and not of principle.

¹ Minutes of the Eighteenth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, Annex 3.

² Minutes of the Nineteenth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, Annex 8.

³ Minutes of the Twentieth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, Annex 16.

It' could 'only be settled by careful observation of the political, social and economic development of each territory. This observation must be continued over a sufficient period for the conclusion to be drawn that the spirit of civic responsibility and social conditions' had 'so far progressed as to enable the essential machinery of a state to operate and to ensure political liberty. There' were, 'however, certain conditions the presence of which' would 'in any case indicate the ability of a political community to stand alone and maintain its own existence as an independent state.

'Subject to these general considerations, the Commission' suggested 'that the following conditions must be fulfilled before a mandated territory' could 'be released from the mandatory régime—conditions which must apply to the whole of the territory and its population:

- (a) It must have a settled Government and an administration capable of maintaining the regular operation of essential Government services;
- (b) It must be capable of maintaining its territorial integrity and political independence;
- (c) It must be able to maintain public peace throughout the whole territory;
- (d) It must have at its disposal adequate financial resources to provide regularly for normal Government requirements;
- (e) It must possess laws and a judicial organization which will afford equal and regular justice to all.¹

In regard to the second class of conditions, the Commission suggested 'that the guarantees to be furnished by the new state before the mandate' could 'be brought to an end should take the form of a declaration binding the new state to the League of Nations, or of a treaty or a convention or of some instrument formally accepted by the Council of the League as equivalent to such an undertaking'.

The Commission went on to suggest 'that, without prejudice to any supplementary guarantees which might be justified by the special circumstances of certain territories or their recent history, the undertakings of the new state should ensure and guarantee:

- (a) The effective protection of racial, linguistic and religious minorities;
- (b) The privileges and immunities of foreigners (in the Near Eastern territories), including consular jurisdiction and protection as formerly practised in the Ottoman Empire in virtue of the capitulations and usages, unless any other arrangement on the subject has been previously approved by the Council of the League of Nations in concert with the Powers concerned;

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 228-9.

(c) The interests of foreigners in judicial, civil and criminal cases, in so far as these interests are not guaranteed by the capitulations;

(d) Freedom of conscience and public worship and the free exercise of the religious, educational and medical activities of religious missions of all denominations, subject to such measures as may be indispensable for the maintenance of public order, morality and effective administration;

(e) The financial obligations regularly assumed by the former Mandatory Power;

(f) Rights of every kind legally acquired under the mandate régime;

(g) The maintenance in force for their respective duration, and subject to the right of denunciation by the parties concerned, of the international conventions, both general and special, to which, during the mandate, the Mandatory Power acceded on behalf of the mandated territory.

'In addition to the foregoing essential clauses,' the Permanent Mandates Commission considered 'that it would be desirable that the new state, if hitherto subject to the Economic Equality Clause, should consent to secure to all States Members of the League of Nations the most-favoured-nation treatment as a transitory measure on condition of reciprocity.'¹

This important report, which had been evoked indirectly by the prospect of the emancipation of 'Irāq, had of course a close bearing upon the liquidation of the mandatory régime in that country as well as in other countries in which the same constitutional development might eventually take place.

The report came before the League Council on the 4th September, 1931; and, after a discussion in which the Italian representative, Signor Grandi, took the lead, the Council duly took note of the report and adopted a resolution to the effect that

in view of the responsibilities devolving upon the League of Nations, the Council decides that the degree of maturity of mandated territories which it may in future be proposed to emancipate shall be determined in the light of the principles thus laid down, though only after a searching investigation of each particular case. The Council will naturally have to examine with the utmost care all undertakings given by the countries under mandate to the Mandatory Power in order to satisfy itself that they are compatible with the status of an independent state and, more particularly, that the principle of economic equality is safeguarded in accordance with the spirit of the Covenant and with the recommendations of the Mandates Commission.

The Mandates Commission's report was also discussed, in the course of the same month, in the Sixth Committee of the League Assembly; and on the 23rd September, 1931, the Assembly itself, on its Sixth Committee's recommendation, endorsed the action of the Council.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 229.

(2). *The Determination of the Special Conditions which must be fulfilled in order to bring to an End the Mandatory Régime in 'Irāq*

The task of advising the League Council in regard to the general conditions which ought to be fulfilled in order to bring to an end the mandatory régime in any country under a mandate was not so difficult for the Permanent Mandates Commission to perform as was its task of giving the corresponding advice in concrete terms with reference to the particular case of 'Irāq. In this case, the heart of the difficulty was that the Commission as a whole, and its members individually, were debarred *de facto*—by a constitutional convention which had governed their proceedings since the beginning—from informing themselves at first hand by visiting the mandated territories and studying conditions on the spot. Owing to this convention, any departure from which would undoubtedly have been resisted by the Mandatory Powers, the Commission's sole source of information was the printed word, apart from their official colloquies with the accredited representatives of the Mandatory Powers who attended the sessions of the Commission at Geneva, and occasional private interviews, at the same place, with petitioners. This was a serious handicap to the Commission in the performance of its work—a handicap which was mitigated, but not counteracted, by the fact that the majority of the members of the Commission were retired colonial administrators who, in the light of their own past experience, could presumably obtain more illumination than mere laymen were likely to obtain from an interview or a document. The Commission was perpetually conscious of the handicap and was frequently irked by it, as the minutes of the Commission's proceedings show; and it was particularly embarrassed when, under these hampering conditions, it was called upon to advise the Council on so serious a matter as the liquidation of the mandatory régime in a particular mandated territory.

It addressed itself, however, to the task as soon as the British Government's notification of the 4th November, 1929, came to its notice during its sixteenth session, which opened at Geneva on the 6th of the same month. With reference to this notification, the Commission's report to the Council on its sixteenth session contained the following passage:

The Commission realizes the extreme importance of this communication. It would welcome the entry of 'Irāq into the League of Nations if and when certain conditions were fulfilled, in particular that it becomes apparent that 'Irāq is able to stand alone, and that effective guarantees be secured for the observance of all treaty obligations in 'Irāq for the benefit of racial and religious minorities and of the States Members of

the League of Nations. The Commission considers, however, that it would be premature to express any opinion at the present time on the proposal of the Mandatory Power, which will not take effect until 1932. In the meantime it has taken the opportunity, while examining the report for 1928—and will do so in examining subsequent reports—to ask the accredited representative such questions as relate to the two foregoing conditions. Its questions therefore deal particularly with 'Irāq's ability effectively to govern itself, with its relations with States Members of the League of Nations, as, for instance, the position of foreign nationals, as regards judicial matters, religious liberty and economic equality; and also with the guarantees of the rights of racial and religious minorities.¹

It has been mentioned already² that the Vice-Chairman of the Commission, Monsieur Van Rees, took the particular case of 'Irāq as his text in the memorandum which he circulated to his colleagues at the eighteenth session of the Commission, in June 1930, in regard to the Council's inquiry of the 13th January, 1930, about the general conditions for the liquidation of mandates. At its nineteenth session, in November 1930, the Commission examined the Mandatory Power's report for 1929 and questioned its accredited representative at Geneva 'with a view to ascertaining the progress made by 'Irāq towards political maturity'; and it reported to the Council that it did not feel that it had 'yet obtained sufficient information to begin to formulate an opinion on the progress achieved by 'Irāq as a result of eight years under the mandate régime'.³ At a meeting of the Council on the 22nd January, 1931, at which this report was considered, the British representative announced that 'the British Government would . . . at once take steps to prepare a comprehensive report containing a review of the progress made in 'Irāq under the mandatory régime, a general *exposé* of the existing situation, and all the information which it considered likely that the Commission would wish to possess;' and the outcome was a *Special Report on the Progress of 'Irāq during the Period 1920-31*.⁴ This report was duly examined by the Commission in June 1931, during its twentieth session; and 'this examination was of particular interest, inasmuch as the Commission enjoyed the help of Sir Francis Humphrys, the High Commissioner, and his chief assistant, Major H. W. Young, who gave very valuable particulars supplementary to those contained in the report'.⁵ In consequence, in its report to the Council on the work

¹ Minutes of the Sixteenth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 203.

² On p. 195, above.

³ Minutes of the Nineteenth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 207.

⁴ British Parliamentary Paper Colonial No. 58 of 1931.

⁵ Minutes of the Twentieth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 233.

of the session, the Commission was able to make the following announcement:

So far as its normal sources of information permit, the Commission is . . . now in a position, to the extent compatible with the nature of its functions and its procedure, and subject to the information which has been promised to it, to express its views of the Mandatory Power's proposal for the termination of the 'Irāq mandate. As soon as the Council has reached a decision as to the general conditions which must be fulfilled before a mandate can be brought to an end, the Commission will be ready to submit to the Council its opinion on the British proposal regarding 'Irāq, after examining that proposal in the light of the Council's resolution.¹

At a meeting of the Council on the 4th September, 1931, this announcement, on the Commission's part, was welcomed by the British representative; and thereupon, at the same meeting, the Council requested the Commission

to submit its opinion on the proposal of the British Government for the emancipation of 'Irāq after consideration of the same in the light of the resolution of the Council of the 4th September, 1931, with regard to the general conditions to be fulfilled before a mandate can be brought to an end.

Accordingly, at its twenty-first session, in October and November 1931, the Commission drew up a special report to the Council in which its opinion on the question of the emancipation of 'Irāq was presented within the framework of its previous report on the general conditions for emancipation (this previous report of the Commission being the basis of the Council's resolution of the 4th September, 1931, on general conditions).²

This special report of November 1931 reflected the difficulties which the Commission had encountered and the apprehensions which it had felt in coming to grips with the problem of the emancipation of 'Irāq during the two years that had passed since the Commission had first been seised of the question through the British Government's notification of the 4th November, 1929. The Commission evidently felt special concern over three points: first, the independence of 'Irāq if and when the Anglo-'Irāqī treaty of the 30th June, 1930,³ were brought into force by the termination of the mandatory régime; second, the protection of foreign residents and foreign interests in 'Irāq after the termination of the mandatory régime; and, third, the protection of minorities. A perusal of the minutes

¹ *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

² See p. 197, above.

³ For the terms of this treaty see the *Survey for 1930*, Part III, section (vi).

of the meetings of the Commission during those two years gives the impression that, on any one of these heads, the Commission would have been inclined to pronounce that the necessary conditions for a liquidation of the mandatory régime in 'Irāq were unlikely, in its opinion, to be fulfilled by the year 1932—supposing that the Commission had been compelled to take the whole responsibility for advising the Council on the basis of the imperfect evidence that was at the Commission's disposal. Such an adverse verdict, however, would have involved the Commission in a direct opposition to the considered opinion of the Mandatory Power—a party which did possess that first-hand knowledge of the situation on the spot which the Commission was so acutely conscious of not possessing. The Commission thus found itself in a dilemma from which it was only released by the solemn declaration which was made to it on the 19th June, 1931, on behalf of the British Government, by Sir Francis Humphrys, the British Government's accredited representative at Geneva and High Commissioner at Baghdad.¹ This was the background of the Commission's special report of November 1931, from which we must be content to quote a few passages:²

The Commission desires to point out that it has had no opportunity of observing at first hand the moral condition and internal policy of 'Irāq, the degree of efficiency reached by its administrative organization, the spirit in which its laws are applied and in which its institutions function. In judging the actual situation in 'Irāq, the Commission can therefore only endeavour to reach a conclusion on the basis of the annual reports of the Mandatory Power and the special report entitled *Progress of 'Irāq during the Period 1920-31*, together with the explanations furnished year by year by the accredited representatives of the Mandatory Power during the examination of these reports and the numerous petitions addressed to the League of Nations by inhabitants of 'Irāq or by third parties with the observations of the Mandatory Power upon them. The views of the British Government as to the political maturity of 'Irāq are the views of the guide who has constantly seen and directed the rapid progress made by that country during the mandatory régime. The full significance of these views is recognized when they are considered in conjunction with the declaration made by the accredited representative of that Government at the twentieth session of the Mandates Commission—the great importance of which the Council will certainly have appreciated—to the effect that:

'His Majesty's Government fully realizes its responsibility in recom-

¹ For this declaration and Lord Hailsham's subsequent interpretation of it see pp. 148-9, above. For its effect on the Commission's action see the passage quoted on this page and the next from their special report of November 1931.

² The full text will be found in the Minutes of the Twenty-First Session of the Commission, Annex 22, pp. 221-5.

mending that 'Irāq should be admitted to the League, which is, in its view, the only legal way of terminating the mandate. Should 'Irāq prove herself unworthy of the confidence which had been placed in her, the moral responsibility must rest with His Majesty's Government. . . .¹

Had it not been for this declaration, the Commission would, for its part, have been unable to contemplate the termination of a régime which appeared some years ago to be necessary in the interest of all sections of the population.

In the report on the *Progress of 'Irāq during the Period 1920-31*, the Permanent Mandates Commission noted the following passage:

'They (His Majesty's Government) have never regarded the attainment of an ideal standard of administrative efficiency and stability as a necessary condition either of the termination of the mandatory régime or of the admission of 'Irāq to membership of the League of Nations. Nor has it been their conception that 'Irāq should from the first be able to challenge comparison with the most highly developed and civilized nations in the modern world.'²

This conception of the requirements which must be insisted upon in emancipating a country hitherto under mandate has appeared to the Commission to be sound.

This was the point of view from which the Commission proceeded when formulating in the present report its opinion as to the existence in 'Irāq of *de facto* conditions which satisfy the general conditions contained in the Council resolution of the 4th September, 1931.

The Commission then recapitulated the five conditions³ which it had laid down in its report on the general problem of liquidating mandates which the Council had taken note of in its resolution of the 4th September, 1931, on that subject. The Commission now proceeded to deal with the question 'whether these conditions really existed in 'Irāq'; and it reported that it had arrived at the following opinion, based on the accompanying considerations:

(a) The accredited representative, while not claiming that the administration of 'Irāq had attained perfection, stated on behalf of the British Government that the first condition was fulfilled in 'Irāq. As the Commission has no information which would justify a contrary opinion, it considers that the assumption may be accepted that 'Irāq now possesses a settled Government and an administration capable of maintaining the regular operation of essential Government services.

(b) The present military establishment of 'Irāq is not such that this country can be regarded as capable of maintaining its territorial integrity and political independence against a foreign aggressor by means of its own national forces. On the other hand, if 'Irāq should be admitted to the League of Nations, it would enjoy the guarantees of security

¹ See Minutes of the Twentieth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 134.

² See *Special Report 1920-31*, pp. 10 and 11.

³ For the text of these conditions see p. 196, above.

which all the States Members of the League derive from the Covenant. In the same eventuality the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty of Alliance of the 30th June, 1930, would automatically come into force, and under Article 4 of this treaty the contracting parties are bound to afford each other mutual and immediate help in case of war. In these circumstances, and if the termination of the mandatory régime is accompanied by the admission of 'Irāq to the League of Nations, the Commission considers that 'Irāq fulfils the second condition, interpreted in the sense attached to it by the Commission itself.

(c) During the present session, the accredited representative of the Mandatory Power also stated that the 'Irāq Army and Police would be sufficient to cope with anything that could be reasonably foreseen. The Commission accepts this judgement, having no information to the contrary. It expresses the opinion that the present situation in 'Irāq justifies the acceptance of the assumption that the Government is able to maintain the public peace throughout the whole territory.

(d) The Commission does not propose to express an opinion on the solidity of the financial system of a state whose credit has not yet been tested and whose national currency has not yet been put into circulation. The present financial situation of 'Irāq is undoubtedly sound, and the latent resources of the country are considerable. Furthermore, the Commission found nothing in the information supplied by the Mandatory Power which might lead it to suppose that 'Irāq, provided that the public revenues continue to be prudently managed and that steps are taken to encourage economic development, will not have at its disposal adequate financial resources to provide regularly for normal Government requirements.

(e) The Commission is of opinion that 'Irāq possesses laws and a judicial organization which, subject to certain readjustment and improvements, the necessity of which was recognized by the accredited representative of the Mandatory Power, and provided that at least the same guarantees be assured as [in] the Anglo-'Irāqī Judicial Agreement of the 4th March, 1931,¹ will afford uniform justice to all.

The Commission then went on to recapitulate the seven points² which—without prejudice to any special supplementary guarantees—should be ensured and guaranteed by the undertakings that ought to be required of any state under mandate, upon its emancipation from the mandatory régime, in the Commission's opinion as expressed in its previous report on the general problem. The Commission's application of these seven points to the particular question of the undertakings that ought to be required of 'Irāq need not be recorded here, since the Commission's recommendations were substantially embodied in the terms of the undertakings which were duly entered into by the 'Irāqī Government in the event, as is recorded below.

¹ For this agreement see the *Survey for 1930*, Part III, section (vii).

² For the text of these points see pp. 196-7, above.

The report concluded as follows:

Except as regards protection of minorities, for which the procedure is provided above, the Commission recommends that 'Irāq should be requested to accept that any difference of opinion arising between 'Irāq and any Member of the League of Nations relating to the interpretation or the execution of the undertakings assumed before the Council may, by an application by such Member, be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Finally the Commission, in conformity with the Council's resolution of the 4th September, 1931, examined the undertakings entered into by 'Irāq with Great Britain from the point of view of their compatibility with the status of an independent state. After having carefully considered the text of these undertakings and having heard the explanations and information on the subject from the accredited representative, the Commission came to the conclusion that, although certain of the provisions of the Treaty of Alliance of the 30th June, 1930, were somewhat unusual in treaties of this kind, the obligations entered into by 'Irāq towards Great Britain did not explicitly infringe the independence of the new state.

In the light of this special report from the Mandates Commission, the Council adopted the following resolution on the 28th January, 1932:

The Council,

Having to consider the special case of the termination of the mandate for 'Irāq:

(1) Notes the opinion formulated, at its request, by the Permanent Mandates Commission on the proposal of the British Government;

(2) Considers that the information available is sufficient to show that 'Irāq satisfies, generally speaking, the *de facto* conditions enumerated in the Annex¹ to the Council resolution of the 4th September, 1931;

(3) Declares itself prepared, in principle, to pronounce the termination of the mandatory régime in 'Irāq, when that state shall have entered into undertakings before the Council in conformity with the suggestions contained in the report of the Permanent Mandates Commission, it being understood that the right to apply to the Permanent Court of International Justice may only be exercised by Members of the League represented on the Council;

(4) Accordingly requests its rapporteurs for minorities questions, questions of international law and mandates, and the representative of the United Kingdom on the Council, to prepare, in consultation with the representative of the 'Irāqī Government, and, if necessary, with a representative of the Permanent Mandates Commission, a draft Declaration covering the various guarantees recommended in the report of the Permanent Mandates Commission, and to submit that draft to the Council at its next session;

(5) Decides that, should the Council, after examining the undertakings

¹ This Annex was, of course, the Commission's report on general conditions.

which would be entered into by the 'Irāqī Government, pronounce the termination of the mandatory régime over that territory, such decision shall become effective only as from the date on which 'Irāq has been admitted to the League of Nations.

The Committee which was thus constituted started work at once and reported to the Council on the 9th May, 1932.¹ The report covered the text of a draft declaration² to be subscribed to by the 'Irāqī Government, which, in the Committee's opinion, was 'such as to satisfy the conditions laid down by the Council . . . and the recommendations contained in the special report of the Permanent Mandates Commission,' while at the same time the Committee was able to forecast that the draft 'would in every way prove acceptable to 'Irāq' since it had been discussed with the Prime Minister of 'Irāq and took full account of the wishes expressed by him.

The draft declaration embraced all the subjects on which the Commission had recommended that undertakings should be asked for, and it divided these subjects into two chapters. 'The first chapter' was 'exclusively devoted to the protection of minorities. The second chapter' contained 'provisions relating to the most-favoured-nation clause, the situation of foreigners in the judicial sphere, international conventions, acquired rights and the financial obligations contracted by the Mandatory Power, freedom of conscience and the activities of religious missions, and the procedure of appeal'. The minorities protection chapter consisted mainly of 'provisions of a general character contained in the treaties or declarations already in force in a certain number of countries'—the Albanian Declaration³ serving, as a rule, as a model for the text. Since this common form of minorities protection clauses has already been dealt with in this series,⁴ the relevant articles of the draft 'Irāqī Declaration need not be analysed here. At the same time, the Committee considered it necessary to insert in the 'Irāqī Declaration two special clauses: one (Article 6) relating to the personal status and family law of non-Muslim minorities, and the other (Article 9) taking into account the situation of the Kurdish minority. The texts of these two articles ran as follows:

Article 6. The 'Irāqī Government undertakes to take as regards non-Muslim minorities, in so far as concerns their family law and personal status, measures permitting the settlement of these questions in

¹ Text of its report in *League of Nations Official Journal*, July 1932, Annex 1373, pp. 1342-7.

² Text in *op. cit.*, pp. 1347-50.

³ See the *History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, vol. vi, p. 572.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (i).

accordance with the customs and usage of the communities to which those minorities belong. The 'Irāqī Government will communicate to the Council of the League of Nations information regarding the manner in which these measures have been executed.

Article 9. 1. 'Irāq undertakes that, in the liwās of Mosul, Arbīl, Kirkūk and Sulaymānīyah, the official language, side by side with Arabic, shall be Kurdish in the qadās in which the population is predominantly of Kurdish race. In the qadās of Kifrī and Kirkūk, however, in the liwā of Kirkūk, where a considerable part of the population is of Türkmen race, the official language, side by side with Arabic, shall be either Kurdish or Turkish.

2. 'Irāq undertakes that, in the said qadās the officials shall, subject to justifiable exceptions, have a competent knowledge of Kurdish or Turkish, as the case may be.

3. Although in these qadās the criterion for the choice of officials will be, as in the rest of 'Irāq, efficiency and knowledge of the language, rather than race, 'Irāq undertakes that the officials shall, as hitherto, be selected, so far as possible, from among 'Irāqīs from one or other of these qadās.

In the drafting of the second chapter of the declaration, the most contentious passage was the most-favoured-nation clause.¹ The draft finally agreed upon was that

Subject to reciprocity, 'Irāq undertakes to grant to Members of the League most-favoured-nation treatment for a period of ten years from the date of its admission to membership of the League of Nations.

This undertaking, however, was hedged about with qualifications which were designed to provide fair safeguards for 'Irāq's legitimate interests.

The draft article on judicial organization ran as follows:

A uniform system of justice shall be applicable to all, 'Irāqīs and foreigners alike. It shall be such as effectively to ensure the protection and full exercise of their rights both to foreigners and to nationals. The judicial system at present in force, and based on Articles 2, 3 and 4 of the Agreement between the Mandatory Power and 'Irāq, signed on the 4th March, 1931, shall be maintained for a period of ten years from the date of the admission of 'Irāq to membership of the League of Nations. Appointments to the posts reserved for foreign jurists by Article 2 of the said Agreement shall be made by the 'Irāqī Government. Their holders shall be foreigners, but selected without distinction of nationality; they must be fully qualified.

¹ The principal original purpose of this clause may have been to safeguard the interests of third parties against the possibility of the establishment of anything in the nature of a British monopoly of 'Irāq's foreign trade. At the same time, 'Irāq herself was concerned to secure herself against being compelled to start life as a politically independent state under an onerous economic servitude either to Great Britain or to any other foreign country.

The Anglo-'Irāqī Judicial Agreement of the 4th March, 1931, had been approved both by the Council of the League and by the fourteen Powers whose nationals had enjoyed capitulatory rights in the former Ottoman Empire; but the Anglo-'Irāqī Agreement itself, and, with it, the acquiescence of the *ci-devant* capitulatory Powers in the suspension of their capitulatory rights, 'was only valid for the duration of the mandatory régime in 'Irāq', and therefore 'the capitulation system would automatically come into force again on the expiration of the mandatory régime, unless explicitly renounced by the Powers in question. Hence, the Committee first of all considered referring expressly, in the draft Declaration, to the rights of those Powers. It refrained from doing so, however, on the assumption that the Mandatory Power would succeed in obtaining the consent of the Governments concerned before the decision putting an end to the mandate for 'Irāq' became 'effective. In order to facilitate the Mandatory Power's task in this connexion, the Committee . . . recommended to the Council to ask the Powers in question to renounce on behalf of their nationals, before 'Irāq's admission as a Member of the League of Nations, the former jurisdictional privileges which would no longer be justified under the judicial system proposed for 'Irāq.' The likelihood that the capitulatory Powers would accept Article 12 of the draft 'Irāqī Declaration, as they had already accepted the Anglo-'Irāqī Agreement of the 4th March, 1931, was manifestly increased by the fact that the one substantial difference between the terms of the Agreement and those of the Declaration was a change which might be to these Powers' advantage. In the Agreement it was stipulated that the nine foreign jurists who were to be included in the 'Irāqī magistrature should all be of British nationality; in the Declaration, this British monopoly was struck out.

Article 15 of the draft Declaration, safe-guarding freedom of conscience, was inserted because it covered a considerably wider field than Article 2 in the minorities protection chapter.

In the final clause (Article 16), the Committee followed the Council's ruling on the only point in which it had departed from the recommendations of the Mandates Commission. The draft of this article ran as follows:

The provisions of the present chapter constitute obligations of international concern. Any Member of the League of Nations may call the attention of the Council to any infraction of these provisions. They may not be modified except by agreement between 'Irāq and the Council of the League of Nations acting by a majority vote. Any difference of opinion which may arise between 'Irāq and any Member of the League

of Nations, represented on the Council, with regard to the interpretation or the execution of the said provisions, shall, by an application by such Member, be submitted for decision to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The right of recourse to the Permanent Court, which was thus confined to States Members of the League which were represented on the Council, was to have been given, according to the Mandates Commission's recommendation, to all States Members without this limitation.

This draft 'Irāqī Declaration, together with the covering report of the Council's Committee, was approved by the Council itself on the 19th May, 1932, in a resolution in which the Council also recommended the capitulatory Powers to renounce their capitulatory rights before the admission of 'Irāq to membership of the League. On the 13th July, the Secretary-General was able to inform the Council that the Declaration had been duly signed and ratified by the 'Irāqī Government; and on the 21st September the British Government were able to report that all the fourteen capitulatory Powers had followed the Council's recommendation. The way was now clear for taking the last step in a long process; and at a meeting of the League Assembly at Geneva on the 3rd October, 1932, 'Irāq was admitted to membership by the unanimous vote of fifty-two states.

Would the new member of the League of Nations prove capable of living up to the status that had now been conferred upon her? This was an important question, not only on account of its bearing upon the welfare of some millions of people in 'Irāq itself and in the countries with which she was in political, financial and geographical relations, but also because the emancipation of 'Irāq from the mandatory régime was the first concrete test of a post-War international institution which was evidently susceptible of wide application if it were to prove a success, while, if it broke down at this first essay, it might be discredited without there being any alternative to introduce in its place. In the case of 'Irāq, the crux was evidently the problem of minorities; for the Kurdish minority, which had been associated with the Arab majority through the assignment to 'Irāq of the Mosul vilāyet,¹ was formidably numerous, backward and turbulent, while the Assyrian minority, though smaller in numbers, was not less turbulent and was perhaps less tractable.²

The paramount importance of this minorities problem in 'Irāq was recognized by the Council's Committee when, in drafting the

¹ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (xi); and sub-section (b) (2), above.

² See sub-section (b) (3), above.

'Irāqī Declaration, it gave the protection of minorities a chapter to itself. In the section dealing with this chapter in the accompanying report, the Committee made the following observations:

As regards the substantive provisions, the Committee desires, first, to emphasize the satisfaction with which it has noted that many of the constitutional and legislative provisions of 'Irāq are based on a very liberal conception of the rights to be accorded to racial, linguistic or religious minorities. It is happy to recall the fact that, during the course of the proceedings, the Prime Minister made it clear that that conception has as its starting-point the idea that all 'Irāqī nationals, irrespective of race, language or religion, form part, on a footing of equality, of the body of the state. . . .

Furthermore, the Committee noted with satisfaction the statement made by Sir Francis Humphrys at the twenty-first session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, to the effect that the laws concerning the Councils of the Jewish and Armenian communities had been drawn in consultation with the lay and spiritual advisers of the parties and had given general satisfaction. The Committee is confident that the laws regarding the councils of the other religious communities will be drawn up in the same spirit.

The minorities problem was referred to with equal emphasis, though perhaps with less optimism, by the French and Norwegian representatives on the Council when the Committee's report was discussed on the 19th May, 1932.

As 'Irāq was one of those countries of the Near East where autonomy was based on traditional ideas, the French representative wondered whether it would not have been possible—in the case where the living conditions of the populations permitted it—to institute the minority system in the form of an administrative autonomy. . . .

With regard to [the] duty of supervision, the Council Committee had confined itself to embodying in its text the general guarantee clause laid down in the minority treaties; but it had stated in the report containing its comments on the declaration that it had not gone further, as invited by the Mandates Commission, because this clause was 'sufficiently elastic to be adjusted in practice to the special circumstances of 'Irāq'. Monsieur Paul-Boncour desired note to be taken of this observation, which made clear the meaning of Article 10 of the declaration drawn up for 'Irāq. The Council could not fail to observe that the methods which the very general terms of the guarantee clause entitled it to adopt were not necessarily the same in every case. They must, on the contrary, vary in accordance with the concrete problems to be solved. Obviously the Council would take a very different view of the matter in the case of a well-developed state with established traditions, where the minority clauses met the need for adapting circumstances to territorial changes, and of a state which, under the collective responsibility of the Council, was being trained for political freedom. It was therefore legitimate, and even essential, to indicate clearly that the Council had special

responsibilities in the latter case, that it must avail itself of every means of fulfilling its obligations, and that any decisions it might be called upon to take must not create any precedent which might affect the jurisprudence of the protection of minorities in its application to the states he had just mentioned.

Monsieur Andvord desired most emphatically to endorse the French representative's observations concerning the protection of minorities in 'Irāq—one of the subjects of the draft Declaration before the Council.

These warnings at the eleventh hour were echoes of apprehensions that had been repeatedly expressed, since the beginning of the year 1930,¹ on the Council and on the Mandates Commission of the League, in the French, Italian and British Press, and in the Parliament at Westminster. Such forebodings were unhappily justified, after the event, by the tragic history—which has been dealt with already by anticipation²—of the relations of the 'Irāqī Government with the Assyrian minority in 1933. Yet, in any attempt to appraise the extent to which the newly emancipated Arab Kingdom fell short of living up to the standards which she had undertaken to maintain, the observer must be on his guard against being unduly influenced in his judgment by the pitifulness of the Assyrians' fate and by the blackness of the massacre of Sīmel.³ The Assyrian problem in 'Irāq was in several ways peculiar and indeed unique. The greater part of this Assyrian minority were not natives of 'Irāq but strangers within her gates; the Assyrians were self-willed and pugnacious by tradition; and since their expulsion from their ancestral home in Hakkīyārī during the War of 1914–18, they had also become partly demoralized by being maintained on a dole as refugees, and partly spoilt by being taken into the military service of their English fellow foreigners and fellow Christians who had entered 'Irāq at the same moment as the Assyrians, but entered as conquerors and not as exiles. If, after the emancipation of 'Irāq from the mandatory régime, the relations between these Assyrian immigrants and the young Arab state went wrong, this was largely the fault of the Assyrians themselves, and still more the fault of the British, who were blameworthy on two distinct counts: first for having compromised the Assyrians' relations with the Arabs by taking the Assyrians into British military service to suit British convenience,⁴ and in the second place for having prematurely sought and obtained release from their mandatory responsibilities in 'Irāq—again, to suit British convenience

¹ See the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 326–7.

² In sub-section (b) (3), above.

³ See pp. 162–5, above.

⁴ On this point see the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, p. 21, and the present volume, pp. 136–7, 138n., above.

—with the result that the Arabs and Assyrians, after having thus been embroiled with one another, were now left to settle accounts between themselves as best they could. Of the three parties to the tragedy of 1933, the 'Irāqī Arab Government were assuredly the least to blame; and it is noteworthy that, while the Assyrian trouble quickly took its disastrous turn, there were no comparable contemporary upheavals in the relations of the 'Irāqī Government either with the other non-Arab minorities¹ or with foreign residents and interests. In fact, apart from the Assyrian tragedy, there was no suggestion that 'Irāq had either failed to carry out her undertakings to the League Council or proved not to pass muster under the test of the five conditions² of fitness for sovereign independence which the Mandates Commission had laid down. Certainly an impartial critic would not absolve the 'Irāqī Government from reproach for the elements of incompetence, ill will and brutality which were unhappily displayed by a certain number of 'Irāqī soldiers and other public servants in the handling of the Assyrian difficulty after the restraints of the mandatory régime had been removed;³ but the critic would equally not forbear to point out that it was a formidable ordeal for a newly fledged state to start life with such a difficult and unusual problem on its hands, and that, whatever may be thought of the 'Irāqī Government's response to this challenge, it must at any rate be conceded that the Government did not allow the Assyrian trouble to overwhelm them, but managed to carry on their administration creditably in other parts of the field.

ADDITIONAL NOTES

(1) *King Faysal as a Political Factor in the Emancipation of 'Irāq from the Mandatory Régime*

The extent of the loss which 'Irāq suffered by King Faysal's death could hardly be exaggerated. If ever a man was irreplaceable it was he; for he alone in Baghdad understood the tribal mentality and could attempt to bridge the wide gap between townsman and tribesman. The problem of the Middle Euphrates constituted an even greater danger to 'Irāq than that of the Kurds; for the Kurds were not united and they were lightly

¹ For the 'Irāqī Government's subsequent troubles with the Shī'ī Arab tribesmen on the Middle Euphrates, see Additional Note 2, below.

² See p. 196, above.

³ It was a tragic misfortune, for all concerned, that King Faysal died suddenly and unexpectedly on the 8th September, 1933, on the morrow of the Assyrian catastrophe. For an estimate of the effect of King Faysal's personality as a guiding and moderating influence upon the Government of the infant kingdom of 'Irāq, see Additional Note 1, below.

taxed; and, moreover, the Baghdad Government intended to leave them alone as much as possible so that even the stupidest Kurd, though he might dislike the Arab, could hardly help seeing how much better off he was in 'Irāq than in Turkey or Persia.

Faysal's path, though he achieved his great ambition of being King of an independent 'Irāq, was far from easy. In the first place he was a foreigner and a Sunnī in a country where the great majority of Arabs were Shī'īs—and the religious differences between Sunnī and Shī'ah were still acute. It is true that his money (obtained from Britain) was one of the inducements to the tribes to revolt in 1920, but he personally was almost unknown. It is also true that, while his election as King was on paper almost unanimous in Southern 'Irāq, the majority of the Arab tribes actually consulted their British advisers before voting for him; and when Major Philby, then adviser to the Ministry of Interior, wanted the election to be actually free, he was forced to resign.

Faysal's first task, then, was to build up a party of his own. He was accompanied or shortly followed to Baghdad by certain Baghdādī officers (mainly of comparatively obscure origin) who had served in the Turkish Army and then with him in the Hijāz. The chiefs were Nūrī Pasha and Ja'far Pasha al-'Askarī. He was also accompanied by certain Syrian Arabs, such as Rustam Haydar and Tahsīn Qādirī. Towards these last, to whom Faysal always remained loyal, a good deal of jealousy was felt by others, notably by Rashīd 'Alī Beg al-Gilānī, a real Baghdādī; Hikmat Beg Sulaymān (brother of Shafkat Beg of the Committee of Union and Progress), who was more a Turk than an Arab; and, most important of all, by Yāsīn Pasha al-Hāshimī. Yāsīn Pasha was by origin a Baghdādī of not particularly distinguished birth. During the War of 1914-18 he did not desert the Turks but rose to be a General and gained not a few successes against the British troops in Transjordan.

Faysal had above all things to hold the balance between the British and his nationalist extremists. He had the political sense to realize that without British support 'Irāq would be badly off in face of hostile neighbours, while he also realized, unlike most 'Irāqīs, that Great Britain did in fact intend to give up her mandate sooner or later and that then he would have no High Commissioner to fall back on in respect of internal affairs. He fully understood the importance of the Middle Euphrates, and with some success attempted to conciliate the tribes. He made mistakes, as was inevitable. At times he allowed political considerations too much weight in administrative affairs. His attempts to acquire land for himself—for he had no private fortune—laid him open to criticism. He was almost certainly not guiltless of intrigues against Ibn Sa'ūd, in company with his brother, the Amīr 'Abdu'llāh of Transjordan. But his devotion to his adopted country was undoubted; and, despite occasional lapses, he did 'hitch his wagon to a star'. His personal charm was invaluable, no less with the wild tribesman than with the highest in the land in England. There can be no doubt that, but for him, 'Irāq would still have been awaiting her independence at the time of writing in 1935.

And yet his end was unhappy. During his state visit to England in the summer of 1933, which in itself was a great success, the Assyrian troubles came to a head; and here it should be mentioned that during the

foregoing year he had done his utmost to bring about a satisfactory solution. He attempted to intervene from England and only succeeded in irritating his Cabinet in Baghdad. Though a sick man, he broke off his cure in Switzerland and returned to Baghdad at the end of July; but he was too late to influence the situation or to stop the Army, which had by now decided on an Assyrian massacre. He was indeed still suspect to the 'Irāqī Ministers and others on account of his supposed pro-British feelings; and, during the tumultuous reception given to the troops on their return to Mosul and Baghdad after their crushing of the so-called revolt, his name was seldom acclaimed. Indeed it was even hinted that his abdication was forthcoming. He left Baghdad disillusioned and almost unnoticed on the 31st August, 1933, and he died in Geneva eight days later. He was succeeded by his only son Ghāzi, aged 21, who had been educated at Harrow and at the 'Irāqī Military College.

(2) *The Middle Euphrates District of 'Irāq*

The Middle Euphrates area was practically all contained in the Dīwānīyah Liwā, which was the most important and—from the point of view of administration—the most difficult province of 'Irāq. The district began a little way south-east of the Hindīyah barrage and ran to Samāwāh, a distance, as the crow flies, of about sixty miles. In this area the Euphrates poured its waters into a series of marshes and the main stream was lost. The various streams united again a little way above Samāwāh. These marshes were sown with rice as the waters receded after the annual rise of the river (about May). On the edges of the marshes there were many groves of date palms. During the period of the flood the country was impassable except for one or two recently constructed roads, while throughout the year communications were difficult. Apart from the marsh area, which included the qadās (sub-districts) of Shāmīyah and Abu Sak-hayr, there were in the Dīwānīyah Liwā two other important areas (1) the Dagharrāh canal in Afaj Qadā (some fifty miles to the east of the marsh area) and (2) Rumaythah, some fifteen miles north-west of Samāwāh, to which qadā it belonged. At the end of the War of 1914-18 these two areas were mainly derelict, as the canals which irrigated them had been neglected. After the building of the Dagharrāh barrage in 1926, however, there was an improvement. This barrage controlled the waters of the Hillah canal, which, after taking off from the Euphrates at the Hindīyah barrage, itself divided into the Afaj and Dīwānīyah branches at the Dagharrāh barrage. The Dīwānīyah branch watered the Rumaythah area. The key to most of the problems in Dīwānīyah Liwā was water.

The Baghdad-Basrah railway ran from Hillah to Dīwānīyah and thence to Rumaythah, Samāwāh, Ur (near Nāsiriyyah).

During Turkish times the whole of the liwā, and in particular the marsh area, had been out of control. One of the main reasons was the lack of communications. The tribes, the most important of which were the Fatlah and the Khazayl, apart from their natural independence of spirit, were greatly under the influence of the Holy Cities of Karbalā and Najaf. These places were, of course, Shī'ī, whereas the Turks were Sunnīs, while the religious leaders (known as *mujtahidīn*) were mainly of Persian origin. During the War almost complete anarchy ruled here. The tribes saw

little or nothing of the War, as no British troops passed this way. Indeed, a Turkish officer actually held out at Hillah until the Armistice. This was of importance, as the Euphrates tribes, unlike those on the Tigris, saw nothing of the strength of British arms.

A start was made with administering the area in 1919, and fair progress was achieved, but in 1920 the Arab Revolt broke out. It actually started at Rumaythah and spread rapidly all over the Middle Euphrates and thence to other places in 'Irāq. The causes of the revolt were (1) the restiveness of the tribes against being brought under control; (2) religious propaganda from the Holy Cities; (3) Faysal's (or his followers') propaganda and money (the latter supplied by the British) from Syria. Nearly all the tribes took part, but the leader was 'Abdu'l-Wahīd al-Hajjī Sikkār of the Fatlah, while Sayyid Nūr (of religious sanctity) supplied much of the funds. (Sayyid Nūr, who was an uxorious old man with a host of sons, afterwards lost importance owing to quarrels among his sons.)

The revolt was crushed not without difficulty and not without setbacks—notably a reverse sustained by a column operating near Abu Sukhayr in which a large number of men of the Manchester Regiment were killed or taken prisoner. 'Abdu'l-Wahīd was condemned to death by court martial but soon received a free pardon.

In 1921 another start was made with the administration of this area, and despite many difficulties much progress was achieved once again. Fortified Government posts were built at several places: e.g. Shāmīyah, Faysaliyah, Ghammās, Rumaythah and Afaj; and a few roads were made. In due course land revenue began to be collected and Diwāniyah became the richest land revenue producing area in 'Irāq—mainly from the rice crops.

Apart from the water questions, the chief difficulties were the innumerable and intricate land disputes. These disputes were between the tribes and within the tribes—mainly about boundaries. They were extraordinarily difficult to solve, and though two British Administrative Inspectors, G. C. Kitching and A. H. Ditchburn, did excellent work in this connexion, much remained to be settled when the mandate ended in 1932.

Gradually political feeling in this area ceased to be directed against the British and began to be directed instead against the 'Irāqī Government in Baghdad. The main grievances of the tribes were: (1) corruption in the administration (there was one notoriously corrupt Mutasarrif); (2) interference by Baghdādīs in the settlement of land cases for reasons of political or private gain (even when cases were justly settled, one party always felt aggrieved); (3) dislike of the idea of conscription (a conscription law was eventually passed in 1934); (4) a feeling that, though they had borne the brunt of the 1920 rebellion, it was the Baghdādī politicians who were the only gainers; (5) a feeling that the tribes were not adequately represented in parliament.¹

King Faysal fully realized the danger from the Middle Euphrates and did his best to conciliate tribal opinion. On the whole he was fairly successful. For instance, a tour which he made in the marsh area in the spring of 1933 won them over from a sullen indifference to a genuine

¹ Elections in 'Irāq, though nominally free, were not so in fact. The secondary electors—the elections were in two stages—were simply told by the local government official whom they had to vote for.

enthusiasm. Unfortunately, after his death, there was no one left in Baghdad who would take the trouble to try to understand the tribes. Trouble threatened in the summer of 1933 when Faysal was away in England, and possibly it was only averted by the Assyrian troubles in the north. Thereafter, the discontent went on simmering, and it boiled over in 1935. The Government would have been faced by an impossible situation if only the tribes had been united and had risen simultaneously, but they did not. At the end of March 1935, 'Abdu'l-Wahīd of the Fatlah and Sha'lan al-'Atīyah on the Dagharrāh Canal gave trouble. 'Abdu'l-Wahīd was by far the cleverest tribal politician in 'Irāq, but he was distrusted by the majority of the tribes. He was extremely ambitious, and was definitely aiming at the establishment of tribal supremacy in 'Irāq. He cut the roads in the marsh area, besieged (though he did not actually attack) the police in several places, and generally defied the Government. Incidentally, no land revenue was paid in this area for months. Sha'lan al-'Atīyah was a different character—honest and religious—and for many years he had had little to do with Baghdad. Faysal, who knew of his influence, induced him to become a member of parliament in Baghdad; but before he consented he consulted the *mujtahidīn* in Karbalā to ascertain whether it was or was not *haram* (forbidden) to serve a Sunnī Government. His main grievances were water and land disputes. A notoriously unjust decision in an important land case in 1933 had effectively destroyed the trust of the tribes in the justice of the Government. He seized the Dagharrāh barrage which controlled the waters of the Afaj and Diwāniyah canals. At first it was intended to crush the rising by force; but, perhaps fortunately, it was suspected that the Army was unreliable and, as a result, a compromise was patched up. 'Abdu'l-Wahīd and Sha'lan came up to Baghdad to pay their respects to the King; but they came with 180 cars full of armed tribesmen, which hardly suggested that they were either unsuspecting or entirely submissive.

The next trouble occurred in the Rumaythah area. Here the tribes, notably the turbulent Dhawahīn, having seen the partial success of 'Abdu'l-Wahīd and Sha'lan, thought that they might be able to obtain something for themselves. They cut the railway and the telegraph. Unfortunately for themselves their revolt was unconsolidated and isolated, and the Government were able to deal with it fairly easily, by the use of aeroplanes which dropped bombs somewhat indiscriminately. Incidentally a British R.A.F. aeroplane was shot down by mistake. The tribesmen apologized and declared that they had no quarrel with the British. (It was a very serious mistake to allow a British aeroplane to fly over a disturbed area.)

The revolt appears to have spread to the Muntafiq further down the Euphrates. This *liwā*, too, had given much trouble to the Turks, but had been fairly peaceful since. Here the trouble was purely agrarian—disputes between absentee landlords (the Sa'dūn family) and the Shaykhs, and between the Shaykhs themselves and the cultivators. This trouble started as a result of the Turks' policy of *divide et impera* when they gave all the tribal lands to an alien though powerful family. Little progress was made in the solution of this big question, and a land settlement commission, consisting entirely of 'Irāqīs, failed badly in 1931-2.

The situation in this Middle Euphrates area, as it was developing in 1935, threatened to become of international importance in as much as this area was traversed not only by the railway between Baghdad and Basrah but also by the air route between England and India.

(iii) The Admission of Turkey and Afghanistan to Membership of the League of Nations, and the Election of Turkey to a Seat on the Council (1932-4)

In the original membership of the League, in which the states of Europe, Latin America and the Far East were already represented in force, the sole representative of the Islamic World was Persia. At the moment when the League officially came into existence with the coming into force of the Peace Treaty of Versailles on the 10th January, 1920, the Hijāz, which had ranked during the War of 1914-18 and at the Peace Conference of Paris as one of the Allied Powers, failed to qualify for membership of the League owing to King Husayn's refusal to ratify the Treaty, in which the Covenant was included;¹ Turkey—or at any rate the Turkish Nationalists under the leadership of Mustafā Kemāl Pasha—had taken up arms again against the Allies;² Syria, under the leadership of the Amīr Faysal b. Husayn, was preparing to resist a French attack;³ Afghanistan was still smarting under the failure of her recent attack upon the British Indian Empire,⁴ and Egypt under the failure of her recent insurrection against a British domination;⁵ the Imām Yahyā of San'ā had never accepted the armistice with Great Britain to which his Turkish suzerains and comrades-in-arms had momentarily been compelled to subscribe;⁶ the Imām 'Abdu'l-'Azīz b. Sa'ūd of the Najd was bound by a treaty which placed the control of his foreign policy in the British Government's hands,⁷ and his political horizon did not yet extend beyond the interior of the Arabian Peninsula. This was the situation at the opening of the year 1920; but fifteen years later, at the opening of the year 1935, the political landscape in the Middle East wore an extraordinarily different appearance. By that date, Turkey, 'Irāq and Afghanistan were members of the League; and it was now manifestly only a question of time for the accomplished fact of the emancipation of 'Irāq from the British mandatory régime to be

¹ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 293-6.

² See the *History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, vol. vi, Chapter I, Parts I B and II.

³ *Op. cit.*, vol. vi, Part III B.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, pp. 376-85.

⁵ See the *History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, vol. vi, Part IV.

⁶ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 320-1.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 282-3.

followed by the emancipation of Syria from the French mandate¹ and the emancipation of Egypt from the remaining British liens upon her sovereign independence.² Meanwhile, the Sa'ūdī Dual Monarchy of Najd-Hijāz and the Zaydī Power in the Yaman had divided the greater part of Arabia between them and had settled their relations with one another.³ The time could now be foreseen when at least eight Islamic countries of the Middle East would be playing an active part, as fully qualified members, in the international comity of states.

A long step in this direction was taken during the period under review, when Turkey, 'Irāq and Afghanistan were successively admitted to membership of the League. The admission of 'Irāq is recorded in another chapter in the present part of this volume.⁴ The admission of Turkey and Afghanistan remains to be recorded in this place.

The entry of these two last-mentioned countries into the League was of special significance because of its bearing on the foreign policy of Russia. Feelings of hostility and suspicion towards the Western Powers continued to animate Turkey and Afghanistan—and likewise Persia—even after they had each emerged from the mêlée of the War of 1914-18 and the early post-war years; and this more or less uniform state of mind had the identical effect, which has been described in an earlier volume,⁵ of driving all three countries into the arms of the Soviet Union. Thereafter, their association with their gigantic northern neighbour gradually became less close, or at any rate less exclusive, as their passions cooled and their relations with other neighbours improved; yet they all remained chary of taking any step which would have involved a serious divergence of their foreign policy from that of Moscow. Accordingly, their foreign policy continued to be strongly influenced by that attitude of aloofness from the League of Nations which was one of the leading features in the policy of the Soviet Government from the time of the inauguration of the League until the Japanese outbreak in the Far East in the autumn of 1931. This consideration did not so much affect Persia, who had already joined the League before entering into her *entente* with the Soviet Union in 1921; but it did, no doubt, considerably affect Turkey and Afghanistan; and, in this light, the respective

¹ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (vii); the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (vii); the *Survey for 1930*, Part III, section (iv); the present volume, section (vii) of this part.

² See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (i); the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (i); and the *Survey for 1930*, Part III, section (ii).

³ See section (xii) of this part of the present volume.

⁴ See section (ii) (d) of this part above.

⁵ The *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (xiii), pp. 358-74.

dates of their entry into the League assume a certain significance. Turkey's admission to membership of the League, on the 18th July, 1932, took place less than a year after the introduction of the militant Japanese policy in the Far East; and this Japanese policy was one of the main factors¹ in bringing about that change in Russian policy which culminated in the Soviet Union's own entry into the League on the 18th September, 1934.² This latter event, in its turn, was immediately followed by Afghanistan's entry into the League on the 27th September, 1934. Thus Turkey's entry may be regarded as a prelude, and Afghanistan's as a sequel, to that of Russia.

Apart from their response to Russian influence, the Turks had their own ideas about the League, and their conversion to a belief in the value of the League was a slow process. To begin with, the Middle Eastern peoples were inclined to fight shy of the League on the ground that it was a hypocritically camouflaged instrument of Western Imperialism; and it was not unnatural that the League should appear in this unfavourable light from a Middle Eastern angle of vision, in which the League looked like a device of the victorious Allied and Associated Powers for cloaking their imperialistic designs upon the conquered Arabic provinces of the Ottoman Empire under the specious guise of mandates.

The original policy of Mustafā Kemāl and his companions in Turkey was to adopt the social and mental apparatus of the Western World wholesale in order the better to hold their own against Western Imperialism. And this policy did not change at once after the conclusion of peace, on the Turks' own terms, between Turkey and the Allied Powers in 1923-4. It was only gradually that the soreness in Turkish minds was assuaged by the settlement in 1926 of the Turco-British controversy over the Turco-Iraqi frontier³ and the settlement in 1929 of the Turco-French controversy over the Turco-Syrian frontier⁴ and the settlement in 1930 of all the out-

¹ There were, of course, also other powerful factors at work. The ground had been prepared for this change in Russian foreign policy by the victory of Stalin, in 1927, over Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev in the internal struggle between these latter advocates of a policy of world-revolution and their opponents who advocated a policy of good-neighbourliness with the Capitalist Powers for the purpose of consolidating the gains of the Communist Revolution within the Union's own borders (see the *Survey for 1927*, Part II E, section (i), pp. 248-56). Again, the effect of the Japanese outbreak in the Far East upon Russian foreign policy was subsequently reinforced by the effect of the National-Socialist Revolution in Germany.

² See the present volume, Part III B, section (i).

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (xi).

⁴ See the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (viii); and the *Survey for 1930*, Part III, section (v).

standing controversies between Turkey and Greece;¹ and even then, when the general improvement in Turkey's relations with her neighbours began to have its effect upon the Turkish attitude towards the League, this attitude remained, at first, rather high and mighty.

The Turkish Government appear to have intimated at one stage that Turkey would be willing to join the League on condition of being assured of a permanent seat on the Council; later, Turkey seems to have reduced her claim to a demand for a 'semi-permanent' seat;² but her entry into the League did not become practical politics till she waived all special stipulations except a request that, on the precedent already set in the admission of Mexico,³ the initiative should take the form of an invitation from Geneva and not of an application from Angora. On this basis, on the 1st July, 1932, when the Assembly of the League was sitting in extraordinary session on account of the Sino-Japanese dispute,⁴ a resolution, declaring that Turkey fulfilled the general conditions laid down in Article 1 of the Covenant for a state to become a member of the League, and proposing to the Assembly that Turkey should be invited to enter the League, was moved by Señor de Madariaga (Spain) and seconded by Monsieur Mikhalakópoulos (Greece), with the support of the representatives of twenty-seven other countries. On the 6th July, the Assembly itself adopted a resolution in this sense; this resolution was immediately communicated to the Turkish Government; and on the 9th July the Turkish Government addressed a note⁵ to the Secretary-General, informing him that Turkey was prepared to become a member of the League 'and that obligations assumed by' her 'under the treaties concluded hitherto, including those concluded with states non-members of the League,' were 'in no way incompatible with the duties of a member of the League'. In the same note the Turkish Government referred to Turkey's special position resulting from 'military obligations ensuing from the conventions signed at Lausanne on the 24th July, 1923',⁶ and to the correspondence on the interpretation of Article 16 of the Covenant⁷ which had

¹ See the *Survey for 1930*, Part II B, section (iii).

² For the nature of the 'semi-permanent' seats on the League Council, and the circumstances of their invention, see the *Survey for 1926*, Part I A, section (i).

³ See the *Survey for 1933*, p. 330.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1932*, Part V, section (iv) (c) (2).

⁵ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 102, pp. 21-2.

⁶ See the *History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, vol. vi, Chapter I, Part II. The subsequent Turkish demand for the abrogation of the Straits Convention will be dealt with in a later volume.

⁷ Text in the *Survey for 1925*, vol. ii, p. 451; see also the *Survey for 1926*, p. 8.

passed, on the 1st December, 1925, and the 8th February, 1926, between the German Government and the other parties to the negotiations that eventually resulted in the Locarno Pact. On the 18th July, when this Turkish note was communicated to the Assembly, Turkey was admitted forthwith to membership of the League by a unanimous vote of the forty-three states that were represented on this occasion.

In September 1934, at the fifteenth ordinary meeting of the League Assembly, the 'semi-permanent' seat on the Council which had been reserved for an Asiatic country fell to be re-allotted by a new election. The first candidate to challenge the re-election of China, who was then in occupation of the seat, was Persia; but Persia withdrew her candidature upon the announcement that Turkey was standing. When the votes were taken on the 17th September, China failed to secure the two-thirds majority which was required to render her re-eligible, and Turkey was elected to fill the vacant Asiatic seat. Her candidature had been actively supported by her close friend Greece, and her success was hailed in the Greek press with warm expressions of satisfaction.

As for Afghanistan, her entry into the League was perhaps retarded by the rather erratic course of her post-war history, in which King Amānu'llāh's furore of 'Westernization' had evoked a correspondingly violent reaction.¹ In the same precipitate manner, Afghanistan eventually applied for admission to the League, in September 1934, by telegram. The Assembly good-humouredly responded in the same vein; and the receipt of the Afghan telegram on the 25th September was followed by the admission of Afghanistan to membership on the 27th, on the unanimous vote of the forty-seven countries which were represented at the sitting.

The entry of Turkey and Afghanistan into a wider circle of international relations was not offset by any weakening of their existing ties with their neighbours. On the 28th July, 1930, ratifications were exchanged of a protocol which had been signed on the 17th December, 1929, for the prolongation of the Turco-Russian treaty of friendship of the 17th December, 1925;² and a pair of Turco-Persian treaties, to replace the treaty of the 22nd April, 1926,³ were signed at Angora on the 5th November, 1932.⁴

These new treaties set the seal upon a recent substantial improvement in Turco-Persian relations, which had hitherto been troubled

¹ See the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 182-8.

² See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, p. 525.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 545-6.

⁴ Texts in *Oriente Moderno*, January 1933, pp. 22-4.

by the unsettled state of the Turco-Persian frontier.¹ On the ethnographical map, this frontier was merely one of several arbitrary political lines of division partitioning Kurdistan;² and the long-sustained resistance of the Kurds on the Turkish side of the line to the new Turkish Republic's policy of 'Turcification', in the intolerant manner of Western Nationalism, had exacerbated certain long-standing boundary-disputes between the Turkish and the Persian Governments.³ A Turco-Persian agreement, definitively settling the boundary, was signed at Tihirān on the 23rd January, 1932, simultaneously with an arbitration and conciliation treaty. And it was the ratification of these instruments by the Great National Assembly at Angora on the 18th June, 1932, that opened the way for the conclusion of the new Turco-Persian treaty of friendship on the following 5th November. This improvement in Turco-Persian relations was symbolized in a visit which was paid to Turkey by Rizā Shāh Pahlawī in June 1934—an historic occasion, since this was the first time in his life that Rizā Shāh had ever gone abroad. On another frontier, Turkey's relations with a neighbour were improved by the signature, on the 27th October, 1932, of a Turco-French agreement⁴ for the working of the Baghdad Railway, whose track was so awkwardly interlaced with the line of the Turco-Syrian frontier.⁵ Similarly, as between Afghanistan and her neighbours, the Afghan-British treaty of the 22nd November, 1921,⁶ was confirmed in 1930⁷ on behalf of King Muhammad Nādir Shāh (*regnabat* 1929-33),⁸ while the Afghan-Russian treaties of the 28th February, 1921,⁹ and the 31st August, 1926,¹⁰ were reinforced by the signature of a new Afghan-Russian treaty¹¹ of neutrality and reciprocal non-aggression on the 24th June, 1931.

(iv) The Dispute between Persia and Great Britain over Bahrayn (1927-34)

The Bahrayn group of islands—situated in the Persian Gulf off the coast of continental Arabia, in the bay between the province of

¹ See the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 373-4.

² For the 'Irāqī aspect of the Kurdish problem see section (ii) (b) above.

³ See the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 372-3; the *Survey for 1930*, p. 171.

⁴ Text in *Oriente Moderno*, January 1933, pp. 20-2.

⁵ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, p. 457; and the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 332-3.

⁶ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, pp. 383-4.

⁷ *The Times*, 7th May, 1930.

⁸ King Nādir was assassinated on the 8th November, 1933, and was succeeded by his son Muhammad Zāhir Shāh.

⁹ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, pp. 385-6.

¹⁰ See the *Survey for 1926*, p. 362.

¹¹ Text in *Oriente Moderno*, September 1931, pp. 430-1.

Hasā and the peninsula of Qatar—had long been celebrated for their pearl-fisheries and were found, during the period under review, to possess a second and hitherto unsuspected source of wealth in the shape of oil-deposits. The inhabitants were Arabs, and so were the reigning family—the Āl Khalifah of the 'Utūbī tribe; for the 'Utūbīs had come over in or about A.D. 1783 from the Arabian mainland and had conquered Bahrayn from the Persian Government, which had held the islands intermittently during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (between 1622 and 1783) by right of conquest from the Portuguese, who had held them in the sixteenth century (1507–1622). Between 1783 and 1816, the possession of Bahrayn was disputed between the 'Utūbīs, the Sultans of Maskat, and the Wahhābīs; but in 1816 the 'Utūbīs finally asserted a dominion which they never ceased to retain thereafter down to the time of writing. It was in 1820, four years after their definitive acquisition of the islands, that the Āl Khalifah dynasty first entered into treaty relations with the British (i.e., at that date, with the British East India Company). This treaty of 1820 was followed by others concluded in 1847, 1856, 1861, 1880 and 1892 with the East India Company and its successor Her Majesty's Government in India; and the effect of these successive arrangements was to give the British Government an exclusive and far-reaching control over the foreign relations of the Shaykh of Bahrayn, while leaving him nominally independent and actually autonomous.¹

On several occasions between 1820 and 1927, and in particular in 1869, the Persian Government had demurred to the British Government's treaty relations with the Shaykh of Bahrayn, on the ground that the Shah was the lawful sovereign of the islands; and this Persian claim and protest was renewed in 1927—this time on account of a reference to Bahrayn in a treaty which the British Government had just concluded with Ibn Sa'ūd.

The Anglo-Sa'ūdī treaties of the 26th December, 1915, and the 20th May, 1927, have been noticed in earlier volumes of this series.²

¹ For the modern history of Bahrayn down to A.D. 1927, see the British Admiralty: *A Handbook of Arabia*, vol. i (London, no date, H.M. Stationery Office); Sir A. T. Wilson: *The Persian Gulf* (Oxford, 1928, Clarendon Press); the Persian Government's note of the 22nd November, 1927, and the British Government's note of the 18th January, 1928, in *League of Nations Official Journal*, May 1928, pp. 605–7; the Persian Government's note of the 2nd August, 1928, in *League of Nations Official Journal*, September 1928, pp. 1360–3; the British Government's note of the 18th February, 1929, in *League of Nations Official Journal*, May 1929, pp. 790–3.

² In the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 282–3; and the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 285–8.

In the sixth article of each of these treaties, Ibn Sa'ūd undertook to refrain from interfering with a number of 'Gulf Chiefs' in treaty relations with the British Government, whose territories were mentioned by name; and one of the names on both lists was Bahrayn.

Accordingly, on the 22nd November, 1927, the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs at Tih-rān addressed to the British Government a protest against the Anglo-Sa'ūdī treaty of the 20th May, 1927, Article 6, in which he declared that the Persian claim to the sovereignty over Bahrayn had been recognized by Lord Clarendon in a communication which had been addressed to the Persian Government on the 29th April, 1869. This Persian note of the 22nd November, 1927, was circulated to all states members of the League of Nations, at the Persian Government's request, *à propos* of Article 10 of the Covenant. The British Government replied in a note of the 18th January, 1928 (which was likewise circulated), by refusing to accept either the Persian claim in itself or the Persian contention that this claim had ever been admitted by the British Government—either in the communication referred to or on any other occasion.¹

This incident occurred at a time when the British and Persian Governments were already in controversy over a number of other questions—the Persian Government's attitude toward the Kingdom of 'Irāq² and treatment of the *ci-devant* Shaykh of Muhammarah;³ the Persian Government's desire to secure the abrogation of the Capitulations; and the British Government's desire to obtain a settlement of debt-claims and a right of way across Persia for an air-route which the British Imperial Airways Company was seeking to open from England to India. A number of the outstanding Anglo-Persian controversies were settled by negotiation in the course of the year 1928;⁴ but the Bahrayn controversy was not among them; and on the 28th August, 1928, the Persian Government addressed a fresh protest⁵ to the British Government on the question of sovereignty, and another⁶ on the 5th January, 1929, against a newly introduced regulation by which any Persian subjects visiting the islands were now required, by the Shaykh's Government, to produce passports, such as they would have to produce in order to visit any foreign country, instead of being allowed to visit Bahrayn on the strength of permits, entitling them to travel from one Persian port to another,

¹ Text of correspondence in *League of Nations Official Journal*, May 1928, pp. 605–7.

² See the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 342–6.

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 539–43; and the *Survey for 1928*, p. 353.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 351–5.

⁵ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, September 1928, pp. 1360–3.

⁶ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, March 1929, p. 351.

which had been customarily issued by the Persian authorities, and accepted by the Bahraynī authorities, in the case of Persian visitors to Bahrayn. The Persian note of the 2nd August, 1928, was replied to in a long British note of the 18th February, 1929,¹ in which the juridical, as well as the historical, arguments in the Persian note were combated in detail.

Yet another protest from the Persian Government to the British Government was elicited, on the 23rd July, 1930,² by a statement, which had appeared in the Press in the June of that year, that the Shaykh of Bahrayn had granted to a British syndicate a concession for exploiting the possible oil-resources of the islands; and this was followed up, on the 22nd May, 1934, by a similar protest³—addressed in this case to the United States Government—against a new report that the Shaykh of Bahrayn had granted a concession to the Standard Oil Company of California. This latter report proved to be correct. Not only had the concession to the Standard Oil Company of California already been granted, but oil had already been struck⁴ by the subsidiary Bahrein Petroleum Company which had been formed, for exploiting the concession, by the concessionaires; and a first shipment of Bahrayn oil to Japan arrived at Yokohama in July 1934.⁵

This discovery of a new source of wealth in Bahrayn was, no doubt, tantalizing for the Persian Government, yet a Persian claim to sovereignty over an Arab island could not be defended on the principle of nationality; and the historical and juridical arguments on the Persian side would perhaps hardly convince a neutral observer, any more than they convinced either the Shaykh of Bahrayn or his British allies.

(v) **The Dispute between Persia and Great Britain over the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's Concession in Persia (1932-3)**

The dispute over the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's concession in Persia, which came to a head in 1932 and was settled in 1933, was not surprising in itself, considering the vast difference in accomplishments, aims and outlook that divided the parties.

The notable features of the affair—by contrast with the usual history of similar disputes between Westerners and Orientals over

¹ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, May 1929, pp. 790-3.

² Text of the Persian Government's note in *League of Nations Official Journal*, September 1930, p. 1083.

³ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, August 1934, p. 968.

⁴ *The Observer*, 15th April, 1934.

⁵ *The Japan Chronicle*, 19th July, 1934.

similar matters in the recent past—were the eventual settlement of this dispute by agreement, and the fact that, in so far as the outcome was influenced by high-handed action, the high-handedness was displayed by the Oriental party. This was particularly remarkable in the case of Persia, considering the extremeness of the degree to which the Persians had been intimidated by Russian and British imperialism during the fifteen years ending in 1921;¹ for, in 1932-3, the disparity of physical strength between Great Britain and Persia, in Great Britain's favour, was not appreciably smaller than it had been in the first and second decades of the twentieth century; and, in that recent past, Great Britain—like any other Western Great Power of the day—would almost certainly have taken advantage of her overwhelming superiority in physical force in order to dictate the terms of settlement in a dispute of this kind, in which a valuable British commercial interest was at stake. If the Anglo-Persian dispute of 1932-3 was settled, as it was, in the forum of the League of Nations and not in the traditional manner, this striking change of method was mainly due to a profound change of outlook which had transformed British public opinion and public policy since the General War of 1914-18. On this occasion a Western Great Power did forgo the employment of a traditional means of asserting its will by force—when this force was still at its command—in order to submit its case, and subordinate its nationals' immediate material interests, to the post-war collective system of international law and order.

The difference in accomplishments between the two parties in this case might be apprehended at a glance by any one whose eye happened to fall upon a Persian-made carpet displayed side by side with an English-made carpet in an English shop-window, or again by any passenger on board a ship in the Shattu'l-'Arab who beheld the forest of palm trees, at which he had been gazing all day, give way, for an instant, as his steamer glided along, to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's wharves and refineries at Ābādān.² The difference in aim and outlook is exemplified in the difference of the use that was made of the mineral-oil deposits in Persia by Persian and by British enterprise. For more than two thousand years before Mr. D'Arcy obtained his concession, from the Persian Government of the day, in A.D. 1901, it had been known to the native inhabitants of certain parts of the

¹ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 534-5.

² For the impression made upon a traveller by this astonishing spectacle, see, for example, A. J. Toynbee: *A Journey to China* (London, 1931, Constable), pp. 107-8.

Iranian World¹ that there were reservoirs of natural gas and mineral oil below the surface, and that this gaseous and liquid treasure of the sub-soil was an admirable fuel and medicament. The phenomenon had intrigued the ancient Iranians and had stimulated them to action, as it intrigued and stimulated the millionaire from Queensland many centuries later; but the Iranians had applied their ingenuity to their discovery of this natural resource in a manner which many Westerners of Mr. D'Arcy's generation would have regarded as fantastic. The ancient Iranians imprisoned the escaping gas-fumes of the Apsheron Peninsula in towers, in order that the jet might feed a perpetual flame at the summit and thereby minister to the glory of God, whose nature was symbolized by fire in the imagery of the Zoroastrian religion.² The Anglo-Persian Oil Company, which was a later arrival on the scene, was as impressive an organization in its own way as the Zoroastrian Church; but its application of ingenuity to oil was directed to the quite different purpose of turning Nature to economic account.

Such differences in outlook and aim and accomplishment would have been sufficient in themselves to produce misunderstandings between people of these diverse social heritages when they were brought into relations with one another by the world-wide material expansion of the Western Civilization. But the opportunity for misunderstandings is only half explained when the differences are thus crudely formulated. The observer who seeks to probe deeper must bear it in mind that a Persian official or minister of state who had been sheltered by his native cultural tradition from the danger of acquiring a predominantly economic outlook on the World might yet not be proof against succumbing, when temptation came his way, to a greed and a dishonesty—on his country's account, if not on his own—which would shock and disgust an upright English business man. Conversely, an English *homo economicus*, whose life was officially dedicated to a law-abiding but absorbing service of Mam-

¹ Using the term to cover a rather larger area than the territory of Persia within the frontiers of 1934, and to include, in particular, the former Khanate of Baku, a dependency of the Persian Crown which had been annexed to the Russian Empire in A.D. 1813 and which constituted, in 1934, the Azerbaijan Republic within the Transcaucasian Federal Republic within the U.S.S.R.

² See A. J. Toynbee: *A Study of History*, vol. ii (London, 1934, Milford), pp. 278-9. For an account of the Zoroastrian temples on the Apsheron Peninsula with their perpetually burning jets of natural gas, see Ch. Marvin: *The Region of the Eternal Fire* (London, 1884, Allen), chap. xi; and J. D. Henry: *Baku, an Eventful History* (London, 1906, Constable), chap. ii. The earliest certain notice of the commercial export of petroleum from Baku seems to be Marco Polo's (Marvin, *op. cit.*, p. 168).

mon, might in practice be inspired not only by a dutiful concern for the legitimate interests of shareholders and employees, but also by ideals which were not at first sight obvious in a balance sheet: for example, a disinterested delight in the adventurous and skilful assertion of Man's mastery over an untamed natural force.

It will be seen that there were plentiful occasions for mutual misunderstanding between those Persians and Englishmen who were brought into contact by Persian oil deposits during the thirty-one years that elapsed between the granting of the D'Arcy Concession in 1901 and the revocation of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's Concession in 1932.¹

Mr. W. K. D'Arcy was a Queenslander, born in Devonshire, who had already made a fortune—not out of his practice as a solicitor in Rockhampton, but out of the Mount Morgan gold mine—before he turned his attention to the possibilities of mineral oil development in the Middle East.² By an agreement³ between Mr. D'Arcy and the Persian Government which was signed at Tih-rān on the 28th May, 1901, the Shah granted to the concessionaire 'a special and exclusive privilege to search for, obtain, exploit, develop, render suitable for trade, carry away and sell natural gas, petroleum, asphalt and ozokerite for a term of sixty years throughout the Persian Empire' (Art. 1), with the exception of the five northern provinces of Azerbaijan, Gilān, Māzandarān, Astarābād and Khurāsān (Art. 6), but with an exclusive right of constructing pipe-lines from any part of Persia—not excluding these five provinces—to the southern rivers or to the south coast (Art. 6). The Persian Government bound themselves 'to take all and any necessary measures to secure the safety and the carrying out of the object of this concession, of the plant and the apparatuses, . . . and to protect the representatives, agents and servants of the company' that was to be formed (Art. 14). In return, the Persian Government were to receive 'annually a sum equal to 16 per cent. of the annual net profits of any company or

¹ For the history of the relations between the parties during these thirty-one years, see the *communiqué* from the Board of Directors of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company to the stockholders, which was published in the English Press on the 7th December, 1932; the British Government's memorandum of the 19th December, 1932, in *League of Nations Official Journal*, December 1932, pp. 2298-305; and the Persian Government's memorandum of the 18th January, 1933, in *League of Nations Official Journal*, February 1933, pp. 289-95.

² See the picturesque account of Mr. D'Arcy's career in *The Evening Standard*, 11th December, 1932.

³ English translation of original French text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, December 1932, pp. 2305-7.

companies that ' might be formed ' for the working of the concession ' (Arts. 9 and 10); and the workmen employed, except the technical staff, were to be Persian subjects (Art. 12). The seventeenth article of the agreement was an arbitration clause in the following terms:

In the event of there arising between the parties to the present concession any dispute or difference in respect of its interpretation or the rights or responsibilities of one or the other of the parties therefrom resulting, such dispute or difference shall be submitted to two arbitrators at Tihrañ, one of whom shall be named by each of the parties, and to an umpire who shall be appointed by the arbitrators before they proceed to arbitrate. The decision of the arbitrators or, in the event of the latter disagreeing, that of the umpire shall be final.

Under this agreement, ' Mr. D'Arcy and his associates spent some seven years prospecting the territory covered by the concession, and expended thereon some hundreds of thousands of pounds before the existence of oil in commercial quantities was proved. The Persian Government were not asked to take, and, in fact, did not take, any part of the risk involved in thus proving and developing the oil resources of Persia, and . . . at no time furnished any part of the capital required.¹ When oil in commercial quantities was eventually discovered in the concession area in 1908, and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was registered, on the 14th April, 1909, for the purpose of taking the D'Arcy Concession over, it might have appeared as though the Persian Government, with their assured percentage of net profits, were receiving substantial consideration for the geographical accident that the oil-deposits which British enterprise had discovered and British skill had tapped happened to lie beneath the soil of the Persian Empire. There were, however, certain latent obstacles to the operation of the beneficial provisions of the agreement, and certain latent dangers in the corresponding obligations which Persia had assumed; and these flies in the ointment came to the surface with the precious fluid in which they were embalmed.

For example, on the 20th May, 1914, within about two years of the date which had seen the beginning of the production of Persian oil on a commercial scale from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's concession, the Government of the United Kingdom acquired,²

¹ *British Memorandum*, following *Company's Communiqué*.

² This investment was made on the initiative, not of the Government, but of the Company. The Company's purpose was to ensure that fresh subscriptions of capital in the open market should not result in the Company's coming under non-British control. The British Government's purpose in acquiring a controlling interest in the Company was not to intervene in the commercial management but to place themselves in a position to ensure that the Company's contract with the British Admiralty should be duly carried out.

and thereafter retained, an interest amounting to approximately £2,000,000 in the Company's stock¹ for the express purpose of ensuring a Persian supply of oil-fuel for the British Navy under a contract which was made between the Company and the British Admiralty. The Persian Government had no legal *locus standi*, and no actual voice, in these transactions between the British Government and the Company.² Legally, they were simply business transactions which fell exclusively within the Company's competence and from which the Persian Government incidentally stood to gain commercially in virtue of their 16 per cent. share in the Company's net profits from the working of the D'Arcy Concession; yet the British Government's contract with the Company for supplying oil fuel to the British Navy had an important effect upon Persia's political life and fortunes; for the pipe-lines which the Company had by then constructed from the oil-fields which they had opened up in the Persian province of Khūzistān to their oil-port at Ābādān, on the Persian shore of the Shattu'l-'Arab, were in close proximity to the Perso-Turkish frontier; and, when, on the 29th October, 1914, Turkey intervened in the General War of 1914-18 on the opposite side to Great Britain, and the latter Power thereupon declared war upon Turkey on the 5th November, 1914, it became one of the important military objectives of Turkey to attack, and of Great Britain to defend, this Persian source of the British Navy's oil fuel supplies. In February 1915, the pipe-lines were successfully cut by Persian tribesmen who had been instigated by Turkish propaganda; and, from the Persian standpoint, it was an aggravation of an unforeseen and most unwelcome anxiety when the Company proceeded to claim damages from the Persian Government under Article 14 of the D'Arcy Concession and temporarily withheld the payment of its dues³ to the Persian Government, pending a settlement of the Company's claim.⁴

¹ The nature and extent of this interest at the time of writing may be seen from the following table of the Company's capital in 1935, and the British Government's holdings of it:

Category	Amount held by British Government	Amount held by others	Total
First Preference Stock	£1,000	£7,231,838	£7,232,838
Second Preference Stock	—	£5,743,414	£5,743,414
Ordinary Stock	£7,500,000	£5,925,000	£13,425,000

² The Persian Government were, however, informed of the transaction; and there does not appear to be any record of their having lodged an objection.

³ In the course of the years 1914-19, payments amounting in all to £325,000 were made by the Company to the Government, on account of royalty, from first to last.

See *Persian Memorandum*, with Appendices I and II.

To Persian eyes, these transactions appeared, in retrospect, in the following light:

The Company claimed from us the losses due to the fact that, during the War, the pipe-lines were cut in certain places by armed bands,¹ acting on the instigation of the belligerent Powers, who had violated our neutrality. I will mention no names, but almost all our neighbours fought on our territory. Our neutrality was violated by the Company, and perhaps by the Government of the United Kingdom;² whereupon other belligerents came and organized armed bands, and it was these which cut the pipe-lines. And we were expected to pay for it! We could not do so, since the losses sustained were due to the War and to acts at variance with Persian neutrality. According to one expert—and I am happy to have heard the United Kingdom representative say that he is above suspicion—the losses caused amounted to £20,000.³ The Company claimed for £600,000. What did the Persian Government do? It asked the Company to submit the question to arbitration; but the Company replied, 'No. We will not allow the principle of your liability to be submitted to arbitration,⁴ but, if you are willing to discuss the

¹ Of Persian tribesmen acting under Turkish instigation (see p. 229, above)—A. J. T.

² The fact seems to be that, *after* the cutting of the pipe-lines by Persian tribesmen acting under Turkish instigation, the British Government stationed British troops on Persian soil for the protection of the Company's installations. In taking this action the British Government claimed to be justified by the Persian Government's failure to prevent their own nationals on their own territory from wilfully damaging British property which was entitled to protection at the Persian Government's hands. The outbreak of war in 1914 between two neighbours—each of them more powerful than Persia herself—in the immediate proximity of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's field of operations did, indeed, expose the inability of the Persian Government to carry out their obligations under Article 14 of the D'Arcy Concession (see p. 227, above). They found themselves unable even to keep order inside their own frontiers, and *a fortiori* unable to protect their neutrality against either the Turks or the British. Persia's experience in this case indicates that it is unwise for any Government to develop natural resources that excite the covetousness of their neighbours until they have made themselves effectively master in their own house. But this is manifestly a counsel of perfection, for even a Government with greater knowledge of the world than the Persian Government possessed at the opening of the twentieth century might be pardoned for having failed to foresee in the spring of 1901 (when the D'Arcy Concession was signed) the situation that was to arise in the autumn of 1914.—A. J. T.

³ £26,000 appears to have been the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's estimate of the net cost of oil lost. The £600,000 included consequential losses arising from the interruption of all oil supplies to the refinery, breaking of contracts, and so on.—A. J. T.

⁴ This allegation was denied by the Company. They maintained that they had merely refused to accept certain particular conditions for an arbitration process which the Persian Government had put forward. The matter was eventually disposed of as part of the Armitage-Smith settlement (see pp. 232-3, below), in which the Company waived its own claims against the Persian Government under this head, while paying a round sum of £1,000,000 in settlement of the various claims of the Persian Government.—A. J. T.

figures, we will ask experts to go into the matter.' In the Company's eyes we were liable,¹ and it set itself up as both judge and plaintiff.²

While Article 14 of the D'Arcy Concession was thus turning out to be unexpectedly formidable for Persia, the lucrativeness of Article 10 was found to be affected, in a way that the Persian Government do not appear to have anticipated, by the vagueness with which this article had been drafted. 'While Article 10 of the concession provided that there was to be paid to the Persian Government annually a sum equal to 16 per cent. of the annual net profits of any company or companies that might be formed in accordance with the terms of the concession to operate the same, it did not attempt to define the basis on which the annual net profits of any such company were to be arrived at in calculating the Persian Government's royalty. It is obvious that the phrase "net profits" is open to various interpretations, and when, after some fifteen years' work on the concession, profits were first derived from it, questions soon arose between the Persian Government and the Company as to the manner in which the "net profits" on which the Persian Government were to receive their 16 per cent. ought to be calculated. That such questions should have arisen was not a matter for surprise, having regard, on the one hand, to the lack of precise definition within the body of the D'Arcy Concession agreement, and, on the other, to the steady expansion in all directions of the Company's business relations and to the inevitably increasing complexity of its financial and accounting arrangements.'³ Like other contemporary Western men of business on a large scale, those who had taken up the D'Arcy Concession found it convenient to divide the conduct of their business between a number of companies—each concerned with some particular phase or process of the business, or with its conduct in some particular region—which were juridically separate but financially interdependent; and the method of accounting, as between these many-in-one companies or one-in-many, might conceivably make all the difference to the calculation of the 'net profits' of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company on which the Persian Government were entitled to their percentage.

¹ According to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company's own records the Persian Government's liability was admitted in February 1915 in a conversation between the Persian Minister for Foreign Affairs and a representative of the Company. It was arranged that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs should discuss with the Ministers of War and the Interior some ways and means of effectively protecting the Company's installations; but nothing appears to have come of this.—A. J. T.

² Statement by the representative of Persia, Monsieur Davar, before the Council of the League of Nations on the 26th January, 1933.

³ *British Memorandum, amplifying Company's Communiqué.*

'After lengthy but unfruitful negotiations, the Persian Government formally appointed, in August 1920, the late Sir Sydney Armitage-Smith—then their Financial Adviser—as their representative to adjust finally all questions in dispute between the Persian Government and the Company, either by an amicable arrangement or, if that were not possible, by arbitration. . . . The Company met the Persian Government's representative, both parties having the assistance of legal and accountancy advisers; and on the 22nd December, 1920, an agreement was signed on behalf of the Persian Government and of the Company, setting out the basis upon which the Company's profits were to be calculated for the future in ascertaining the royalty to be paid to the Persian Government under Article 10 of the D'Arcy Concession. At the same time, a collateral agreement was signed between the Persian Government's representative and the Chairman of the Company, by which the Company agreed to pay to the Persian Government in final settlement of the outstanding questions between the Government and the Company a sum of £1,000,000 sterling. This settlement covered all claims of the Persian Government in respect of unpaid royalties up to the 31st March, 1919.¹ In a legal opinion² which was given to the Persian Government on the 27th July, 1921, by a London firm of solicitors, Messrs. Lumley and Lumley, the Persian Government were advised that the new settlement certainly required ratification to make it binding; that Sir Sydney Armitage-Smith had possibly exceeded his powers in entering into it, in as much as it altered, rather than interpreted, the terms of the D'Arcy agreement in several important respects; and that the apparent effect of these alterations was to make the new agreement less favourable than the D'Arcy agreement to Persian interests. In the opinion of these legal advisers, the Persian Government were then still at liberty not to adopt Sir Sydney Armitage-Smith's settlement; but they also advised that, if it was intended to repudiate the agreement, steps should be taken to do so as promptly and with as little delay as possible. In the event, the Persian Government, in their dealings with the Company, do not appear to have challenged the validity of this Armitage-Smith settlement until the 25th April, 1928;³ and in the meantime they not only accepted the £1,000,000

¹ *British Memorandum*, following *Company's Communiqué*. The Persian Government's own expert appears to have advised them that £535,402 10s. 3d. represented 'every claim which could have been put forward on behalf of the Government, some of which would probably have been decided in favour of the Company'.

² Text in Appendix III to the *Persian Memorandum*.

³ See *Persian Memorandum*, Appendix IV.

tendered to them under the collateral agreement, but they also concurred, year by year, 'from 1920 till about 1928',¹ in the adoption of the Armitage-Smith settlement, *de facto*, as the basis for the calculation of their annual percentage of net profits. On the other hand, they refrained from submitting the Armitage-Smith settlement to the Majlis at Tih-rān for ratification.

From 1920 to 1928 the only overt differences between the Persian Government and the Company were differences between the two parties' respective accountants over the interpretation of the D'Arcy agreement and the Armitage-Smith settlement; and the only reservations which the Persian Government made, in taking payment of the royalties, were in regard to such of these differences as remained outstanding. From 1928 onwards, however, negotiations for revising the whole or part of the D'Arcy Concession itself were opened on three successive occasions.

The restiveness on the Persian side which declared itself in 1928 and culminated in a unilateral cancellation of the D'Arcy Concession on the 27th November, 1932, can be traced to the combined operation of a number of distinct causes.

One cause was the rapid progress in the apprenticeship of the Persians, *pari passu* with other civilized non-Western peoples, in the ways of the Western World. In 1901, and even as late as 1920, there were perhaps few Persians—or, at any rate, few Persians in high places—who had either the technical knowledge or the practical experience required for driving a hard commercial bargain in the Western style, or for appreciating the fine points in the execution of a commercial agreement which was already a *fait accompli*. By 1928 both the Persian Government and the Persian public had become more acutely aware of the ways in which it was possible for a party in Persia's position to be exploited by, and to exploit, a party in the position of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company; and they were not now afraid of acting upon their greater knowledge; for, under Rizā Shāh's régime, the Persian people, who had previously been paralysed by an overwhelming sense of helplessness in the face of an intimidatingly potent Russian and British imperialism, had recovered the hardihood to fight once more for their own hand. In these circumstances the Persians were perhaps prone to nurse suspicions against Western business concerns which might have been dissipated by a closer knowledge of their actual practice; to assume that all was fair in warfare against a formidable adversary whom they saw in this suspicious light; and to take the British Government's recourse to

¹ *British Memorandum*.

the Covenant of the League of Nations, in lieu of naval or military self-help, as a confession of weakness, instead of recognizing in it the reflection of a change of outlook and policy which was both genuine and voluntary.

The Persians were also keeping an eye on the fortunes of their neighbours who (as they saw it) were fighting the same battle against similar opponents; and their growing desire to secure a revision of the D'Arcy Concession was undoubtedly fortified by the example of the 'Irāqīs—a newly fledged Middle-Eastern nation who had succeeded in negotiating, in 1931, a revision of the concession of the 'Irāq Petroleum Company (a Western business concern which was closely allied with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company).¹ A point in the new agreement of the 24th March, 1931, between the 'Irāqī Government and the 'Irāq Petroleum Company which seems to have made a particularly strong impression on Persian minds was the assurance which the 'Irāqī Government had received of a large regular minimum annual revenue from the commercial exploitation of the oil resources of their country by Western capitalists.² For Governments which were as poor as those of 'Irāq and Persia, the new oil revenues were the most important single item in the national budget; effective budgeting was rendered extraordinarily difficult if so important an item of revenue as this were liable to violent annual fluctuations;³ and this difficulty was especially irksome for a Government who were in need of the largest possible revenue in order to recondition the national life of their country on a Western standard, in addition to carrying on their routine activities. In the nine financial years 1919–20 to 1927–8 inclusive, the Persian Government's annual royalties from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company had been at the average rate of £708,667 sterling per annum; but the actual annual receipts had

¹ For the history of the relations between the 'Irāqī Government and the 'Irāq Petroleum Company see pp. 188–93, above.

² The 'Irāq Petroleum Company were able to give this assurance at this date because, by this time, they had ascertained the potentialities of the oil-field, which they had discovered in the Kirkūk district, sufficiently closely to be able to estimate what the royalties accruing to 'Irāq would amount to when the projected pipe-line system was constructed and in operation. It was the company's explorations rather than any pressure on the Government's part that led up to the revision of the original concession on terms that were not unacceptable to either party. This is shown by the fact that the guaranteed minimum annual payment, which was assured to the Government in the revised agreement, had not been extorted by the Government but had been offered by the Company itself.

³ In Persia, however, the royalty receipts from the Anglo-Persian Oil Company appear to have been excluded from the ordinary budget and to have been reserved for special purposes.

varied from £411,000 in 1923–4 to £1,400,000 in 1926–7; and this latter figure—which was the highest of all the nine annual figures in question—had been followed immediately, in 1927–8, by a figure of £502,000, which was the lowest figure but two out of the nine.¹

The Persian resentment at these fluctuations, when they happened to be in a downward direction, was sharpened by the belief that they were to a large extent arbitrary; for, apart from the wide possible latitude in the method of accounting, which was a matter in which the Persian Government themselves had a voice, it was open to the Anglo-Persian Oil Company to increase or diminish its production from its Persian fields in any given year without the Persian Government having a *locus standi* for intervention. As a business concern which had to take a world-wide view of its business and which was in intimate relations—both of consultation and of competition—with other oil companies whose interests were likewise ubiquitous, the Anglo-Persian Oil Company might desire to restrict its Persian output at any time when it might be seeking, in collaboration with its peers, to restrict the output of oil all over the World in the hope of maintaining economic prices. During the years between the restoration of peace and the onset of the World Economic Crisis, the world production of oil had been making such enormous strides—even by comparison with the increase in the world demand—that the oil industry found itself hard hit when the crisis came. Throughout the year 1932 the newspapers were full of reports, or rumours, of attempts to arrive at an arrangement between the principal oil interests of the World for a general restriction of output on an agreed ratio; and, as far as the Anglo-Persian Oil Company was concerned, the Chairman told the shareholders on the 17th June, 1932, at the twenty-third ordinary general meeting, that the company had 'for several years past deliberately controlled its output with the object of producing no more than could be disposed of through its established markets, thereby making an exemplary contribution to economic stability in the oil world'. To this the Persians retorted that a policy which might count for righteousness in the mineral kingdom might work out unfairly for the Empire of Iran; and they were not convinced by Sir John Simon's argument² that in this matter the interests of the Persian Government, as a royalty owner (in virtue of their title to a percentage of net profits), were identical with those of the concessionaire, on the ground that the Government

¹ These figures were given by Sir John Simon in his speech before the League Council on the 26th January, 1933.

² In his speech of the 26th January, 1933.

would stand to lose *pari passu* with the Company if a reckless over-production were to break the world market and bring down prices with a run. The Persian answer to this¹ was that, in any assessment, by quotas, of a reduction of total output as between the several sources of supply, the Persian fields were entitled to specially lenient treatment, because the oil industry had had difficult times only in recent years, whereas the Anglo-Persian Oil Company had been working in Persia for a long time.² It was also represented on the Persian side³ 'that, even in years of depression, the company' had 'considerably extended its operations outside Persia'.⁴

It was against a mental background of considerations such as these that negotiations between the Persian Government and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company were now taken up on three successive occasions: once in 1928 and twice in 1931. The two earlier of these three

¹ See Monsieur Davar's speech of the 26th January, 1933, in reply to Sir John Simon.

² This argument may have had abstract justice on its side, and the Persian Government might perhaps reasonably have urged it if the reduction of the total world output of oil had been under the control of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company exclusively. Actually, the reduction depended upon agreement between the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and several other great companies—of which two, at least, were older and perhaps more powerful. Manifestly, these other companies had no motive, either of interest or of sentiment, for granting an exceptionally favourable quota of production to the Persian fields. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company claimed that it had fought consistently for a place for Persian oil within the limits of what was possible, and that Persian oil had in fact won its way to the markets of the World in a very favourable ratio, having regard to the limited expansion of world consumption. The output of Persian oil had increased from 1,106,000 tons in 1919 to 5,939,000 in 1930, which was an increase of 537 per cent. against a world increase of 206 per cent. To have forced the pace of production still further would have led to a dangerous accentuation of all the difficulties associated with world over-production, which at that time was threatening to have catastrophic repercussions on the economic stability of the whole industry.

³ See Monsieur Davar in *loc. cit.*

⁴ The word 'operations' was ambiguous. If these operations consisted in opening up non-Persian sources of production for the purpose of supplying the world market, then the Persian Government might have a legitimate grievance on this head. On the other hand, the operations might have been limited to opening up non-Persian sources of production for the purpose of supplying a local market only (e.g. in the Transferred Territories of 'Iraq or in Argentina), or to increasing the Company's tanker-fleet, refineries, selling organizations, and other apparatus, outside Persia, for marketing the Persian product. Perhaps, in this passage, Monsieur Davar was alluding to the large interest which the Anglo-Persian Oil Company had acquired in the 'Iraq Petroleum Company, which was, of course, intending to produce for the world market. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company would probably have replied that, in obtaining a voice in the management of a concern whose product would be in direct competition with the Persian product, it was taking a common-sense step for the safeguarding of its own interests and the Persian Government's.

sets of negotiations were mainly concerned with 'the nature and extent of the increased participation which the Persian Government desired to receive';¹ and they both broke down over the Company's unwillingness to meet the Persian Government's desires for a modification of the Concession, on this point, to the measure of the Persian Government's demands.² The third set of negotiations, which began towards the end of the year 1931, were concerned with the narrower question—previously dealt with in the Armitage-Smith settlement of 1920—of the method of calculating the Company's net profits, to 16 per cent. of which the Persian Government were entitled under the agreement as it stood; and these negotiations were successfully carried through to the verge of completion. A preliminary agreement between the Persian Minister of the Court, Taymūr Tāsh Khān, and the Chairman of the Company, Sir John Cadman, was approved in February 1932 by the Council of Ministers in Tih-rān; and a draft royalty agreement, worked out by the two parties' respective lawyers and accountants in order to embody the preliminary agreement with certain changes in the Persian Government's favour, was duly initialled by the parties' representatives in London and was then transmitted, for ratification by the Persian Government, to Tih-rān, where the document arrived on the 29th May, 1932. At this moment, however, a new and disturbing factor entered into the situation.

On the 3rd June, 1932, the Company's accounts for the year 1931 were completed; and the provisional figures for the 16 per cent. of the Company's net profits, as they worked out on the Company's showing—subject to subsequent examination of the accounts on the Persian Government's part—amounted to no more than £306,872, as contrasted with £1,288,312 for 1930 and £1,437,000 (the highest figure yet attained) for 1929.³

¹ *Company's Communiqué.*

² In the Company's opinion some of these demands could only have been conceded at the price of making it impossible for the Company to carry on its business, and these particular demands were not conceded in the eventual settlement in 1933. In the Company's opinion the Persian demands did not allow properly for the unstable character of the oil industry (which was forcefully illustrated by subsequent events), nor for the extent to which the Company's profits, and its position in the world market, were dependent on circumstances which had nothing to do with the actual winning of crude oil and which were external to the obligations and rights established by the D'Arcy Concession. The minimum annual payment which was asked for on the Persian side in the earlier of the two sets of negotiations in 1931 would have resulted, in the year 1931 itself, in the Company's paying to the Persian Government the whole of its profits—from whatever source derived—leaving no return at all for some 52,000 shareholders and nothing for allocation to reserves.

³ The low royalty for 1931 was a reflection of a low level of profits which was due, in its turn, to the extremely depressed state of the industry itself.

Thereupon, the Persian Government took several steps. First, they called for an interpretation and re-edition, in more comprehensible language, of the initialled agreement on royalties which had been received at Tih-rān on the 29th May. Next, on the 29th June, they refused to accept the royalty for 1931 which was payable to them on the terms of the agreements as they then existed. In the third place, in the first week in July, they informed the Company's representative in Tih-rān that, while the draft royalty agreement was still being examined, tentative proposals to the Company on an entirely different basis were under consideration. On the 16th November, 1932, the Minister of Finance at Tih-rān told the Company's representative that these proposals were almost complete; and the Company's representative was still awaiting them when, on the 27th November, 1932, he received from the Minister of Finance a communication¹ giving him notice that, as from that date, the Ministry, 'in accordance with the decision of the Persian Government', had 'cancelled the D'Arcy Concession and' would 'consider it void'.² The communication added that

at the same time, as the Persian Government has no other intention except to safeguard Persian interests, should the Anglo-Persian Oil Company be prepared, contrary to the past, to safeguard Persian interests, in accordance with the views of the Persian Government, on the basis of equity and justice, with the necessary security for safeguarding those interests, the Persian Government will not, in principle, refuse to grant a new concession to that Company.

On the 28th the Company replied³ by declining, in courteous language, to admit the legality of the Persian Government's act of cancellation, and asking for an immediate withdrawal of the announcement. The Persian Minister of Finance counter-replied⁴ by informing the Company that his communication of the 27th November had conveyed the Persian Government's final decision. Meanwhile, the Persian Government's announcement of their action had been celebrated in Tih-rān, by order, with public rejoicings; and the act of cancellation was ratified by the Majlis on the 20th December. On the other side, the Company's case was promptly taken up by the

¹ Text in *Company's Communiqué* and in *British Memorandum*.

² This notification was the more surprising to the Company inasmuch as their Resident Director at Tih-rān had been informed, as lately as the end of August 1932, by an authoritative spokesman of the Persian Government, that the validity of the D'Arcy Concession was held by the Government to be unquestionable.

³ Text of reply in *Company's Communiqué* and in *British Memorandum*.

⁴ Text of counter-reply in *Company's Communiqué* and in *British Memorandum*.

British Government at Westminster—not in their capacity as the principal shareholder in the Company, but 'in exercise of' their 'rights to protect a British national when injured by acts, contrary to international law, committed by another state, and to ensure in the person of their nationals respect for the rules of international law'.¹

On the 2nd December, 1932, the British Government presented a sharply worded note² to the Persian Government, expressing the opinion that the cancellation of the concession was 'an inadmissible breach of its terms'; demanding the immediate withdrawal of the Persian Government's notification to the Company; declaring the British Government's intention—failing an amicable settlement by direct negotiations between the Persian Government and the Company—'to take all legitimate measures to protect' the Company's 'just and indisputable interests'; and giving warning that the British Government would not 'tolerate any damage to the Company's interests or interference with their premises or business activities in Persia'. To this note the Persian Government, on the 3rd December, made a stiff reply;³ and thereupon, in a note⁴ of the 8th December, the British Government declared that

should the Persian Government be unwilling to withdraw their notification of the cancellation of the concession within one week from the date of the present note—i.e., Thursday, the 15th December—His Majesty's Government will have no alternative to referring the dispute which has arisen between them and the Persian Government, in regard to the legality of the Persian Government's action, to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague, as a matter of urgency, under the Optional Clause.

To this the Persian Government replied, on the 12th December, by denying the competence of the Court to exercise jurisdiction in this case; charged the British Government with attempting to exercise intimidation; and expressed the view that they would be within their rights in bringing the British Government's action to the notice of the Council of the League. The British Government did not admit the Persian Government's contention that the case was beyond the competence of the Permanent Court; but they observed that 'by the terms of their acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Permanent Court under the Optional Clause'⁵ the Persian Government reserved the right 'to require that proceedings in the Court shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to the Council of

¹ *British Memorandum*.

² Text in *op. cit.*

³ Text in *op. cit.*

⁴ Text in *op. cit.*

⁵ *League of Nations Treaty Series*, vol. 104, pp. 492 and 493.

the League of Nations', and they therefore realized 'that, should they carry out their original intention of submitting the matter to the Permanent Court, and should the Persian Government then bring the matter before the Council, that Government would be entitled to put a stop to the proceedings before the Permanent Court, with the result that the time which had been spent on those proceedings would be thrown away'. Accordingly, on the 14th December, 1932, the British Government themselves submitted the dispute to the Council¹—not under Article 11 of the Covenant, but under the more peremptory Article 15—and on the 19th December, 1932, the Persian Government announced their intention² of appearing, in order to state their case, in the Council Chamber at Geneva.

The Council, having been seised of the British Government's submission on the 19th December, 1932, appointed Dr. Beneš (Czechoslovakia) to be its *rapporteur* on the matter on the 24th January, 1933, and on the 26th of the same month the Council listened to oral explanations, supplementing written memoranda previously communicated, from Sir John Simon on the British and Monsieur Davar on the Persian Government's part. In exposing the weak points in the Persian case, the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs was in his element; but his Persian opponent showed skill, as well as intrepidity, in standing up to one of the most accomplished advocates in the Western World of the day; and the outcome was determined less, perhaps, by the scoring of points in this play of words than by the experience and skill and resourcefulness of the *rapporteur* in applying the method of conciliation to two litigants who were neither of them anxious to pursue their quarrel *à outrance*. On the 3rd February, 1933, Dr. Beneš was able to present the Council with the following report:

As the Council is aware, the Persian Government considers that, so long as the concessionary company has not exhausted the legal remedies which are open to it in virtue of the national law of Persia, the Government of the United Kingdom does not possess, or has never possessed, the right to make the present case the object of a diplomatic claim, a fact which, in the opinion of the Persian Government, renders Article 15 of the Covenant entirely inapplicable.

The Government of the United Kingdom, while fully admitting the general principle on which the contention of the Persian Government

¹ Text of telegram of the 14th December, 1932, from the British Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in *League of Nations Official Journal*, December 1932, p. 2297.

² Telegram of the 19th December, 1932, in *League of Nations Official Journal*, February 1933, p. 289.

is based, maintains that it is not applicable, and cannot be invoked by the Persian Government, in the present case.

In addition to this preliminary question, the case involves important questions of law. I do not think it necessary for the moment and in existing circumstances even to mention these questions, for, since the first examination of this question by the Council, I have been able to proceed to conversations and to an exchange of views with the parties concerned with a view to arriving at a provisional arrangement, and I have the satisfaction of informing the Council that I have been able to arrive at a result which, I hope, may lead us to a final settlement of the difference. This arrangement has taken the form of the following conclusions:

1. The two parties agree to suspend all proceedings before the Council until the session of May 1933, with the option of prolonging, if necessary, this time-limit by common agreement.

2. The two parties agree that the company should immediately enter into negotiations with the Persian Government, the respective legal points of view being entirely reserved.

3. The two parties agree that the legal standpoint of each of them, as stated before the Council in their memoranda and in their verbal statements, remains entirely reserved. If the negotiations for the new concession remain without result, the question will come back before the Council, before which each party remains free to resume the defence of its case.

4. In accordance with the assurance given by the Persian Government in its telegram of the 19th December, 1932,¹ to the President of the Council, it is understood that, while negotiations are proceeding and until the final settlement of the question, the work and operations of the company in Persia will continue to be carried on as they were carried on before the 27th November, 1932.

Thereupon the Council, with the concurrence of the Persian and the British representatives, passed a resolution to the effect that the Council

1. Takes note of the cases put before it by the two parties concerned and reserves the right to study them;

2. Appreciates the wisdom of the two parties to the dispute in refraining from any steps likely to aggravate the situation;

3. Approves the present report together with the conclusions of the provisional arrangement to which the conversations between the *rapporteur* and the two parties have led.

The *rapporteur* had, in fact, succeeded in arranging for the establishment of conditions under which the Persian Government and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company could enter into comprehensive negotiations for placing their relations on a new footing without the Persian Government any longer having to fear that the Company would be able to evade the issue or the Company any longer having to fear

¹ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, February 1933, p. 289.

that it might be compelled to conduct the negotiations at an unfair disadvantage; and the two principals to the dispute now lost no time in getting together. Sir John Cadman left London for Tihrah on the 2nd March, 1933, and arrived at his destination on the 3rd April, and a new agreement¹ between the Company and the Persian Government was duly signed at 1.30 a.m. on the 30th of the latter month. This agreement was ratified by the Majlis on the 28th May, 1933, received the Shah's assent on the 29th, and came into force on the same day.

The negotiations which were brought to this successful conclusion were evidently difficult, even under the conditions which had been created by Dr. Beneš's mediatory action at Geneva. Indeed, it was reported that, at one stage, they had reached an *impasse* which was only overcome by the Shah's personal intervention on the 24th April. At the same time it seems unlikely that either Rizā Shāh or Dr. Beneš could have found a way of reconciling the opposing points of view if there had not been some common ground and common interest, all along, between the Persian Government and the Company. As the Chairman of the Company put it to the shareholders, in reviewing the history of the whole transaction in retrospect,

It should not be imagined for one moment that the desire for a new and more modern form of agreement was felt only by the Persian Government. A whole series of new conditions in Persia—which has passed very rapidly through a period of reconstruction in respect to its constitutional, legal, and fiscal structure—had made it necessary for the Company to seek a new relationship and a new code of interpretation of its rights and obligations. We were urgently in need of stable and acceptable definitions in respect to such matters as the recent Persian Income-tax Law and other laws and regulations relating to currency, exchange, customs, internal taxation, trade equalization—many of which had become or threatened to become controversial subjects. You will appreciate that it has been no easy task to evolve a new and balanced agreement in the face of all these complicated issues and apparently conflicting interests. However, the eventual result has been a clear agreement, fair to both contracting parties, liquidating our accumulated differences, providing the Government with a less variable basis of revenue and the Company with a new charter which enables it to go steadily ahead, free of the doubts, uncertainties, and embarrassments of the past.²

¹ The official French text is printed in *Oriente Moderno*, June 1933, pp. 282-9, and in *League of Nations Official Journal*, French version, December 1933. An authoritative English text will be found in the English version of the *L.N.O.J.*, December 1933, pp. 1653-60.

² Sir John Cadman's speech at the twenty-fourth ordinary general meeting of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company on the 11th July, 1933.

The Persian Government's gains under the new agreement were conspicuous. In the first place, the Persian Government—like the 'Irāqī Government in their revised agreement of the 24th March, 1931, with the 'Irāq Petroleum Company¹—obtained a drastic reduction of the area to which the Company's concession applied.² From the date of the coming into force of the new agreement until the 31st December, 1938, the concession was to apply to an area, coincident with the southern half of the original D'Arcy Concession, which was traced on a map attached to the new agreement. Within this reduced area, by the aforementioned date, the Company was to select 100,000 English square miles in one or more blocks, and the concession was to be confined within these narrower limits thereafter (Art. 2). This would greatly enlarge the area within which the Government were at liberty to grant other local concessions to other concessionaires; and the indirect means of ruling out rival concessions, which the Anglo-Persian Oil Company had hitherto possessed, was removed by the withdrawal (Art. 3) of the monopoly, which they had enjoyed under the D'Arcy Concession, of constructing pipe-lines to the south coast. At the same time the Government secured that, within the reduced area of the concession, the Company should extend the range of its operations more widely. The Company now undertook (Art. 9) to start operations immediately for both producing and refining petroleum in the Province of Kirmānshāh, in addition to its previous operations in the Province of Khūzistān.

In the matter of the Government's financial interest in the Company's activities, it was now arranged that, from the 1st January, 1933, onwards, the Persian Government should receive four shillings on every ton of petroleum which was sold by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company for consumption in Persia or which was exported from Persia. At the same time, in order to give the Persian Government an interest in the total business of the Company and its subsidiaries all over the world, the Government were to receive a sum equivalent to 20 per cent. of the Company's annual profits actually distributed to its ordinary stockholders in excess of the sum of £671,250 (equivalent to a 5 per cent. dividend on the ordinary stock capital), whether the excess consisted of normal dividend distributions or of general reserves in excess of the amount of the Company's reserves as these stood on the 31st December, 1932.³ Under these two heads the

¹ See p. 191, above.

² In either set of negotiations the proposal that a reduction of the area of the concession should be an element in the new settlement appears to have originated with the Company and not with the Government.

³ This arrangement insured an identity of interest between the Persian

Company guaranteed a minimum aggregate payment of £750,000 per annum to the Government; and, in consideration of this, the Government refrained from insisting upon a minimum annual tonnage of production of oil in Persia by the Company (Art. 10).¹ On their sterling receipts from the Company the Government were guaranteed an adjustment, in their favour, at an agreed rate, of the figure in sterling, if and when the price of gold rose above £6 sterling per ounce (troy); and this guarantee was to be reconsidered and, in default of agreement, referred to arbitration if at any time the Government came to the conclusion that gold had ceased to be the general measure of value (Art. 10).

Within the reduced area of the concession the Company's rights of exploitation were limited, as before, to petroleum; and the Company was to place at the Government's disposal all the information which it might acquire about any of the natural resources of the concession area (Arts. 12-14).

Subject to the over-ruling principle that the highest degree of efficiency and economy was to be maintained in the Company's administration and operations in Persia, the Company was to recruit its skilled labour and technical and commercial staff from Persian subjects as far as properly qualified candidates were forthcoming; and the unskilled labour was to be recruited from Persian subjects exclusively (Art. 16). The Company was to spend £10,000 per annum in Great Britain on giving a professional education, within the field of the oil industry, to Persian subjects. The Company was also to continue to provide, at its own expense, the necessary hygienic services and apparatus on its lands and in its plant and buildings in Persia (Art. 17).

For internal consumption, private and governmental, in Persia, of motor spirit, kerosene and fuel oil produced by the Company from Persian petroleum, the Company was to give a specially favourable price, based on the ruling price in Rumania or in the Gulf of Mexico, whichever happened to be the lower at a given time (Art. 18).

Outstanding financial controversies on points of detail were to be settled by a lump sum payment of £1,000,000 on the Company's part; and the regular payments for both the years 1931 and 1932 were to be made on the basis of the new agreement instead of being made on the basis of the D'Arcy agreement (Art. 23).

Government and the shareholders of the Company in the choice of the method of reckoning profits.

¹ It would, of course, have been impossible to guarantee that any minimum annual tonnage could be either found or got or sold.

While the Persian Government's gains, just enumerated, were conspicuous, the Company's advantages, under other provisions of the new agreement, were substantial.

For instance, the Company was still assured, as under the D'Arcy Concession, of being exempt from customs duties or any other kind of taxation on its exports of petroleum, and on its imports of all materials required exclusively for its operations in Persia, and the same privilege was now expressly extended to its imports of medical supplies and sanitary apparatus (Art. 6). A new and important advantage was its exemption from the obligation—which would otherwise have been incumbent upon it under the Persian Government's current regulations—of surrendering its foreign exchange to the Government (Art. 8). It was also exempted (Art. 11), for the first thirty years of the term of the new concession, from all Persian national or local taxation, in consideration of a fixed surcharge on the royalty per ton prescribed in Article 10. For the first fifteen years the surcharge was to be at the rate of 9*d.* on the first 6,000,000 tons¹ and 6*d.* on any tonnage beyond that figure, with a guaranteed minimum payment, under this head, of £225,000 per annum. For the next fifteen years the corresponding figures were to be 1*s.*, 9*d.*, and £300,000. The corresponding arrangements for the succeeding thirty years were to be settled, by agreement, before the year 1963.

The Company was given the right to renounce the concession at two years' notice, which might be given at the end of any calendar year (Art. 25). Otherwise (Art. 26), the concession was to run till the 31st December, 1993—a provision which was equivalent to a prolongation of the D'Arcy Concession (which was due to expire on the 28th May, 1961) by more than thirty-two years. This large extension of the concession in the time-dimension gave the Company a substantial compensation for the drastic cutting-down of the concession in the space-dimension. Moreover, it was expressly laid down in the same context that, if the Company did not renounce the concession, then the concession could not be terminated before the 31st December, 1993, unless the arbitral tribunal established under the new agreement (see below) were to declare the concession annulled by reason of the Company's failure to carry out the terms of the convention; and the only failures that were to count, for this purpose, were a failure on the Company's part to pay, within a month of the award, any sum which it was called upon, by the arbitral tribunal,

¹ By the terms of Article 23, this was also to be the basis for the retrospective settlement of any taxes owing from the Company for the period 21st March, 1930-31st December, 1932.

to pay to the Persian Government, or else a failure in the sense of a liquidation of the Company, either voluntary or involuntary (Art. 26). The concession was not to be annulled by the Persian Government; and its provisions were not to be altered either by legislation or by administrative action (Art. 21).

All differences of any kind between the parties were to be settled by arbitration; and an arbitration procedure was laid down in which the President or the Vice-President of the Permanent Court of International Justice was enlisted for the purpose of breaking any deadlocks in the appointment of the arbitral tribunal. A particularly important provision was that the award was to be based on the juridical principles contained in Article 38 of the Statutes of the Permanent Court of International Justice (*q.v.*), and that there was to be no appeal against the award (Art. 22).

The conclusion of this agreement between the Persian Government and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company disposed of the dispute, before the League Council, between the Persian Government and the Government of the United Kingdom. This was taken for granted at a meeting of the Council which was held on the 26th May, 1933, in the interval between the signature of the agreement on the 30th April and its entry into force on the 29th May. The formal liquidation of the inter-governmental dispute was consummated at a further meeting of the Council on the 12th October, 1933.

It remained for the Chairman of the Company to obtain the approval of the holders of the Company's ordinary stock, whose interests were directly affected by the increase in the onerousness of the financial terms of the new agreement, from the Company's point of view, by comparison with the terms of the agreement of 1901. The stockholders, who had received a 15 per cent. dividend for the year 1930, had received only 5 per cent. for 1931 and nothing at all for the first part of 1932. The Company's net profits, however, for the year 1932 turned out to be £2,379,677 as against £2,318,717 for 1931; and, after the conclusion of the new agreement, the Board decided to declare a dividend of 7½ per cent. for the year 1932 on the Company's ordinary stock. This was done at the price of reducing the amount of the sum carried forward to the next year; but this reduction of margin was explained by the Directors on the ground that the settlement with the Persian Government had relieved the Company of the uncertainty which had hitherto compelled it to maintain this margin at a high figure. For the year 1933 the net profits were £2,643,978; and, after providing for extra depreciation and placing £200,000 to reserves, the Directors were once again able

to declare a dividend, on the Company's ordinary stock, of 7½ per cent. These figures were not only remarkable, in themselves, for years of depression; they were also proof that Sir John Cadman and his colleague, Mr. W. Fraser, had not deserved ill of the stockholders in entering into the agreement of the 30th April, 1933, with the Persian Government. By the same token the Persian Government might be held to have been acting as they were in duty bound to act as the custodians of the interests of the Persian people when they had exerted themselves to obtain terms from the Company which were conspicuously more favourable than the terms of the D'Arcy Concession were to Persian interests—and this even though the high-handed action to which the Persian Government had resorted, in order to bring their long-drawn-out controversy with the Company to a head, might be indefensible in itself and unedifying by comparison with the moderation which the British Government had shown in submitting to the arbitrament of the League instead of meeting the Persian Government's appeal to force by a retort in kind. Now that the controversy had been settled, in the end, by free agreement, and on a basis which was neither inequitable nor oppressive to either of the two principals, it might be hoped that the relations between the Persian Government and the Anglo-Persian Oil Company would be smoother and more cordial than ever before, and that such improvement, if it did follow, would be reflected in a corresponding improvement in the general relations between the Persian and the British peoples, in whose contact with one another the activities of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company played so large a part.

(vi) **The Economic Development of Palestine excluding Transjordan (1930-34) and the Political Disturbances of October and November 1933.**

In a previous volume of this series,¹ the history of the administration of the British mandate for Palestine, with the threefold task that it enjoined upon the Mandatory Power,² has been carried down to the outbreak of August 1929 and its consequences. During the four years immediately following that calamity, the land had comparative peace.³ In their reports on the administration of Palestine

¹ *The Survey for 1930*, Part III, section (iii).

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 228-30. The three obligations entailed in the mandate were to promote the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine; to secure the non-Jewish element in the population against suffering detriment from the execution of the obligation towards the Jews; and to educate the population of Palestine into becoming a self-governing body politic.

³ 'Comparative' and not 'absolute' peace; for during the whole of the year

in 1930 and 1931 and 1932, the British Government were able to record, each time, that public order had been either completely or substantially preserved;¹ and when disorders did break out again in the autumn of 1933, these were very far from being on the same scale as those of 1929. Moreover, in the British Government's opinion, as declared in their report for the year 1930,

The comparative tranquillity which characterized the past year in Palestine was not due solely to the presence of strong forces for the maintenance of public security. While feeling between Jew and Arab still ran high, the temper of the populace became perceptibly less violent and inter-racial antagonism somewhat less bitter.²

At the same time, the recrudescence of disturbances in 1933 gave warning that the political passions which were the cause of these recurrent outbreaks had been driven below the surface without being appeased; and though the Arab *émeutes* of 1933 were directed against the mandatory authorities and not against the Palestinian Jewish community, and—perhaps on this account—were neither so virulent nor so destructive as the *émeute* of 1929, the fact that, on the later occasion, there was not any direct physical collision between the two rival communities in Palestine was reassuring only to a limited extent, since the underlying reason for this outbreak against the Mandatory Power on the part of the Arabs was the Mandatory's perseverance in carrying out its obligation of promoting the establishment of the Jewish National Home. The measure of the British Government's lack of success in their endeavour to bring about an effective reconciliation between the Arabs and the Jews in Palestine is given by the difficulty which they found in making any appreciable progress towards fulfilling their other obligation of promoting self-government. At the time of writing in the spring of 1935, the Legislative Council, which the Mandatory Power had first tried to establish in 1922-3,³ was still no more than a pious aspiration.⁴ The mandatory authorities

1930, and most of 1931, the situation was tense, and in August 1930 there was a minor Arab outbreak at Nāblus. During those two years, there was also a series of terrorist murders of Jews.

¹ See *Report 1930*, p. 6; *Report 1931*, p. 1; *Report 1932*, p. 4.

² *Report 1930*, p. 7.

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, Vol. i, pp. 363-4.

⁴ On the 10th November, 1932, the then British High Commissioner in Palestine, Sir Arthur Wauchope, stated to the Permanent Mandates Commission that he hoped for the establishment of a Legislative Council as soon as the then forthcoming Local Government Ordinance had been brought into working order (Minutes of the Twenty-Second Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 82). This latter ordinance, however, was not enacted till the 12th January, 1934; and thereafter, when the project for a Legislative Council was duly taken up again by the mandatory authorities, they met with opposi-

were, however, attempting to work their way, along a new line of approach, towards an eventual discharge of this particular obligation by fostering municipal autonomy; and, after a not very brilliant start,¹ some substantial results were achieved in this field in 1934. After the enactment of a Municipal Corporations Ordinance on the 12th January of that year, 'elections of councillors' took 'place, in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance, in 22 out of the 23 municipal areas scheduled. By the end of the year or the beginning of 1935 twenty newly elected councils were in being; and conditions had thus been created wherein representative Palestinians of all communities and races might acquire training in the common management of public affairs under a modern code of municipal legislation.'² It was to be hoped that this achievement might prove to be the first step towards a solution of the political problem as it had been described by the British High Commissioner in Palestine, Sir Arthur Wauchope, to the Permanent Mandates Commission on the 10th November, 1932.

As regards security [Sir Arthur Wauchope observed on that date], the Commission knows that the activities of the Government in its work of development are gravely handicapped, in that almost one-third of the revenue is spent on defence and police forces.³ I consider maintenance of peace and confidence in the general security both of person and

tion from the Jews and the Arabs alike: from the Jews because they were unwilling to accept a minority representation in proportion to their numbers in Palestine at the moment, and from the Arabs because they were unwilling to co-operate with the mandatory régime in a manner which might be taken to imply acquiescence in the terms of the mandate in respect of the Jewish National Home. The Arabs were, however, at this time more disposed to acquiesce in the project for a Legislative Council than they had been in previous years; and at the beginning of December 1934 the High Commissioner told an Arab deputation that, after consultation with the Secretary of State for the Colonies in Whitehall, he had decided to make a fresh move for the establishment of a Legislative Council, as soon as he had had time to see how the new municipal councils were working (*Report 1934*, p. 8).

¹ See *Report 1930*, pp. 29-30; *Report 1931*, pp. 16-17; *Report 1932*, pp. 17-19; *Report 1933*, pp. 30-1.

² *Report 1934*, p. 7 (see also pp. 26-7 and Appendix III). Even before this, Jews and Arabs had been working together successfully on the municipal councils of Haifa and Tiberias; and in Jerusalem—where Jews had found no place for themselves on the municipal council so long as Rāghib Bey an-Nashāshibi was mayor—a council composed of Arabs and Jews in equal numbers was working satisfactorily in June 1935.

³ This proportion did not compare unfavourably with a corresponding analysis of the contemporary budgets of neighbouring Middle Eastern countries (e.g. Transjordan, Syria, 'Irāq). At the same time, it did present a contrast to the extraordinarily low footing on which the Palestine Government had contrived to keep their military establishment in the years 1925-9 (see the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 224-5).

property to be of paramount importance in Palestine. The unhappy memories of 1929 are not yet effaced. A feeling of general goodwill between all sections of the community does not yet exist. Without a general feeling of security there would be little happiness and little progress or development. . . . It is . . . with deep regret that I have come to the conclusion that I shall neither now nor in the near future be able to recommend a reduction of expenditure in our Defence or Police Forces.¹

This statement of the political problem remained as true as ever two and three years later; and in the summer of 1934, at the height of the local Palestinian economic 'boom',² an ex-High Commissioner, Sir Herbert Samuel, frankly declared that

Every one in Palestine agrees that the economic development is astonishing; no one thinks that the political situation shows any appreciable improvement.³

At the moment when those words were written, in the depth of the world economic depression, the situation in Palestine was doubly paradoxical—if it is to be regarded as a paradox that one small country should move in a diametrically opposite direction to the World as a whole. Since the Peace Settlement after the General War of 1914–18, Palestine was already the theatre of a political *tour de force*: the attempt to inject a new national and religious minority into one province of a world in which, in this age, minorities, all around, were being repressed or expelled or exterminated. Since the onset of the world economic depression in 1929, Palestine had become the scene of an economic *tour de force* as well. For, while

¹ Minutes of the Twenty-Second Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 80.

² This term had perhaps acquired a depreciatory connotation after the sequel to the American 'boom' of the years ending in the autumn of 1929. At the same time, the use of the term is not easy to avoid in describing an economic phenomenon in Palestine which displayed so many of the outward features of American 'boom' conditions. In using the term in this Palestinian context, the writer of this *Survey* does not wish to create the impression that the Palestinian 'boom' which had declared itself in 1930, and which was still in full swing at the time of writing, was bound sooner or later to be followed by a 'slump'. The outward appearance of a 'boom' may be supported by a solid core of sound economic development; and in such a case the acceleration in the increase of prosperity need not entail any subsequent setback of corresponding magnitude. In the *Memorandum on the Development of the Jewish National Home, 1934*, submitted in June 1935 by the Jewish Agency for Palestine to the League of Nations, it was represented (p. 3) that 'the expansion of the last three years is . . . much more than a transitory boom phenomenon. A far-reaching change in the whole economic structure of the country is taking place, the effect of which will be many times to increase the country's economic capacity, and to create new standards of living, and new and wider social and political horizons, for all its inhabitants.'

³ Sir Herbert Samuel in *The Observer*, 8th July, 1934.

Palestine had been subject to the depression at the outset, she began, in the course of the year 1930, to make a remarkable recovery; during the next few years this recovery developed into a veritable 'boom'; and the most conspicuous feature in the 'boom' was that Palestine now audaciously cast off her moorings from her traditional economy of local self-sufficiency and hazarded her economic fortunes upon the ocean of world-economy¹ at a moment when the Mandatory Power and other Western countries which had sailed into affluence on the high seas in the nineteenth century were frantically seeking shelter from the economic storm by running into the antique haven of a primitive economic *autarkeia*.

This local Palestinian bout of prosperity at a time when economic perplexity and embarrassment reigned in almost every other country in the World was an unmistakable fact to which consistent testimony was borne by an imposing upward movement in a wide range of phenomena: in population, in immigration, in capital investment, in transport, in citrus-cultivation, in manufactures, and in government revenue.

A perhaps unparalleled increase in population was revealed by the results of a census taken on the 18th November, 1931, in comparison with the figures of the previous census of the 23rd October, 1922.² During a span of little more than nine years, the total population of Palestine increased from 757,182 to 1,035,821, representing an aggregate increase of 36.8 per cent. and an average annual increase of 354 per 10,000, against a corresponding figure of 298 per 10,000 for the population of Canada in each of the years 1906–11. This rate of increase in the total population was very unequally distributed between the three communities—Muslim, Jewish and Christian—which accounted, between them, for all but a negligible residue of the inhabitants of the country. While the Jewish population increased from 83,794 to 174,610—representing an aggregate increase of 108.4 per cent. and an average annual increase of 850 per 10,000—the Muslims only increased from 590,890 to 759,712 (an aggregate increase of 28.6 per cent. and an average annual increase of 283 per 10,000) and the Christians only from 73,024 to 91,398 (an aggregate increase of 25.2 per cent. and an average annual increase of 251 per 10,000).

¹ Palestine had, no doubt, been gradually entering into the modern Western world-economy ever since the conquest of the country by Mehmed 'Ali in 1831–2; but the change in pace, from 1930 onwards, was epoch-making.

² The following figures are taken from E. Mills: *Census of Palestine, 1931* (Alexandria, 1933, Whitehead Morris, 2 vols.). According to the *Report on the Administration of Palestine for 1934*, p. 139, the total population was estimated to have been 1,104,605, exclusive of Badu, on the 30th June, 1934.

On the other hand, when the same phenomena are considered in terms of absolute figures instead of percentages and rates, it will be seen that the absolute increase of 187,196 in the non-Jewish population was more than double the absolute increase of 90,816 in the Jewish population. And, even in terms of percentages, the aggregate increase of 28.6 per cent. for the Muslim population, and 25.2 for the Christian population, during this span of nine years, stand out in striking contrast to the stationariness of the population of Palestine under the old Ottoman régime as well as to the post-war increase in the population of Transjordan under the rule of the Hāshimī Amīr 'Abdu'llāh.¹

At the same time, the rate of increase in the Jewish population of Palestine during the nine years 1922-31 was extraordinary; and the pace did not slacken during the four and a half subsequent years that elapsed between the taking of the latest census and the time of writing; for the absolute figure, which had stood at not quite 175,000 in November 1931, was estimated² to have risen to about 245,000 by the end of 1933 and about 300,000 by the end of 1934. At the latter date, the Jewish element was believed³ to amount to about 25 per cent. of the total population of the country; and it was calculated that the extraordinary relative increase and remarkable absolute increase in the numbers of the Palestinian Jewish community was accounted for, to the extent of about 90 per cent., by immigration.

In this matter, the statistics of authorized immigration from 1925

¹ The contrast between Palestine and Transjordan may be illustrated by the following figures, relating to the years 1930 to 1934, which are taken from the Palestine Government's annual reports.

	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934
Total non-Jewish population of Palestine (excluding nomads)	680,665	785,153	805,526	828,924	850,905
Natural increase per 1,000	31.15	26.7	22.4	25.4	19.47
Total population of Transjordan (estimated)	305,000	305,000	305,000	305,000	305,000
Natural increase per 1,000	12.1	16.5	15.5	11.8	9.24

It is also interesting to note that in Palestine Proper (excluding Transjordan) a comparison of the 1922 census with the 1931 census showed a marked contrast between the large increase of the non-Jewish population in typical centres of Jewish development, and the trifling increase in centres not affected by Jewish development. (For the figures see *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1932*, paragraph 1, reprinted in *New Judea*, October 1932, p. 6.)

² *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 3.

³ *Op. cit., loc. cit.*

to the first four months of 1930 inclusive that have been quoted in a previous volume¹ may be here brought up to date.

	Immigrants.		Emigrants.		Net Immigration.	
	Total.	Jews.	Total.	Jews.	Total.	Jews.
1930 (complete year)	6,433	4,944	3,003	1,679	3,430	3,265
1931	5,533	4,075	1,346	666	4,187	3,409
1932	6,730	5,823	no record	no record
1933	29,101	27,862	no record	no record
1934	39,027	38,244	no record	no record

It will be seen that, after the re-opening of immigration under the Labour Schedule—a step which was taken on the 10th November, 1930, after the temporary suspension at the end of the foregoing May²—the volume of authorized immigration under all categories³ rose again until, in 1933, it approached the figures that had been registered in the 'peak' year 1925. In the year 1933, in order 'to relieve the plight of German Jews, the Palestine Government, without infringing the principle of economic absorptive capacity, granted a number of administrative concessions: it issued three thousand immigration certificates in 1933, in advance of publication of labour schedules, for distribution in Germany, and applications from settlers in Palestine for the admission of their near relatives were treated with special consideration. In addition, immigration of capitalists and skilled artisans from Germany was facilitated.⁴ On the other hand, in April 1930, the minimum amount of capital required to be at the disposal of an immigrant in order that he might qualify for category A 1 (persons of independent means) had been raised from £ (Palestinian)⁵ 500 to £P1,000.⁶

¹ *The Survey for 1930*, p. 244.

² *Op. cit.*, pp. 245 and 283.

³ These categories are set out in *Report 1932*, p. 25.

⁴ *Report 1933*, p. 16. In 1934 the total Jewish immigration into Palestine from Germany was 9,429, of whom 6,941 were German citizens (*Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, pp. 5-6. For further details see *op. cit.*, pp. 21-2).

⁵ The Palestinian Pound was equal to, and based upon, the Pound Sterling.

⁶ *Report 1930*, p. 37. The number of persons registered as immigrants in this A1 category was 5,193 in 1934 and 3,267 in 1933 as compared with 754 in 1932 and 269 in 1931 (*Report 1932*, p. 25; *Report 1933*, pp. 34 and 40; *Report 1934*, p. 39). It is significant that almost all the immigrants in the A1 category were Jews (233 out of 269 in 1931; 727 out of 754 in 1932; 3,250 out of 3,267 in 1933; 5,124 out of 5,193 in 1934). After the outbreak of the National Socialist Revolution in Germany and the consequent exodus of German Jews, the German Government and the Mandatory Power for Palestine appear to have co-operated, in regard to intending German Jewish migrants of the A1 category

The foregoing figures, however, do not tell the whole story; for the volume of authorized immigration was exceeded by the volume of actual immigration owing to the growth of a practice of unauthorized settlement, outside the limits of the immigration quota, on the part of persons who had entered the country either in the guise of travellers or else by evading the control of the Palestinian authorities altogether.¹ In 1931, 'steps were taken to regularize the position of a large number of persons in Palestine who, having with or without permission originally entered as travellers, had succeeded in establishing themselves on a reasonably sound economic basis in the country and were completely absorbed into its economic life. This action was considered to be desirable on general grounds, and also in view of the possibility that the persons concerned would otherwise be deterred from registering at the Census by fear of prosecution for the offence of illegal presence in the country. For this purpose an Order was made in the summer under the Immigration Ordinance, empowering the Chief Immigration Officer to register as immigrants of independent means persons possessing a capital of less than £P1,000. The Order applied only to persons already in the country on the date of its publication, and remained in force until the 31st December. The great majority of those who took advantage of it were Jews. Altogether 3,258 applications, affecting nearly 8,000 individuals, were made for

from Germany to Palestine, in order to reconcile the Palestine Government's requirements for the command of capital with the German Government's restrictions upon the export of it (Minutes of the Permanent Mandates Commission, Twenty-Third Session, p. 103; Twenty-Fifth Session, p. 27; *The Times*, 2nd September and 5th October, 1933). The Jewish Agency for Palestine estimated that, in 1934, the aggregate amount of capital brought into Palestine by Jewish immigrants of the A1 category from all countries was certainly well above £5,000,000 (*Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 7).

¹ On this matter, it was stated to the Permanent Mandates Commission on the 31st May, 1934, by the accredited representative of the Mandatory Power, that 'the illicit settlers mostly entered as travellers with a three months' permit. Once in the country, they concealed their identity and went into hiding. They were undoubtedly assisted in escaping detection by the connivance of Jews already established in the country. . . . The police were seriously hampered because a large proportion of the Jewish population sympathized with the illicit settlers and withheld information and assistance from the police.' (Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 26.) For the steps taken by the mandatory authorities to keep a control over travellers while they were in the country see *Report 1934*, pp. 8 and 43. For the smuggling of immigrants into Palestine, and the preventive measures that were adopted by the mandatory authorities, see *Report 1934*, pp. 8-9 and 44. The attention of the Arab Executive was drawn to these measures by the High Commissioner in a statement made, at an interview, in reply to a memorandum, submitted by them in the autumn of 1934, on their views as to the dangers arising out of Jewish immigration and sale of lands. (*Report 1934*, pp. 10-11.)

registration and granted.'¹ Again, in 1932, in addition to the 6,730 authorized immigrants, '4,599 persons who had entered Palestine during this year and previous years as travellers or without permission and had succeeded in establishing themselves as settlers, were registered as immigrants. Of these, 3,730 were Jews, 719 Christians, and 109 Moslems. Among these were 2,826 Jews and 224 non-Jews who were granted registration under the special rule applied in 1931.'² In 1933, likewise, '2,876 persons who had entered Palestine as travellers or without permission were registered as immigrants, comprising 2,465 Jews, 344 Christians, 63 Moslems and four others. They included 935 Jews and 15 others registered under the special regulation made in 1931.'³ It was estimated that, in the two years 1932 and 1933 alone, the number of unauthorized immigrants who had succeeded in establishing themselves in Palestine in defiance of the authorities was 22,400;⁴ and in the second of these years, in which the number of persons registered as immigrants on arrival was 29,101, 'forty-three thousand eight hundred and ninety-one individuals were' actually 'added to the population of Palestine by migration'.⁵

This evasion of the law was undesirable from the administrative and dangerous from the political standpoint. The administrative objections were described by the Mandatory Power, in its report for the year 1933, as follows:

This unauthorized settlement upsets the calculation of the absorptive capacity of the country upon the basis of which the High Commissioner determines the half-yearly labour schedule;⁶ it is not selective, so that there is no guarantee that the type of immigrants whom the country needs is entering; and it constitutes an infringement of the law which the Palestine Government is determined in future to prevent.⁷

In the political sphere, the recrudescence of disorders in the autumn of 1933 is perhaps partly to be explained by the fact that

exaggerated reports concerning illicit immigration found their way into the Arab Press; and unguarded statements by representative

¹ *Report 1931*, p. 21.

² *Report 1932*, p. 26.

³ *Report 1933*, p. 34.

⁴ *Report 1933*, p. 15.

⁵ *Report 1933*, p. 34. From *Report 1934*, p. 34, footnote, as well as from the table on p. 38 of *Report 1933*, it would appear that the true figure was not 43,892 but 41,891.

⁶ On the Jewish side, it was retorted that, in the calculation of these half-yearly labour schedules, the needs of the Palestinian labour market had been persistently underestimated, with the result that Palestine had been condemned to suffer from a perpetual shortage of labour supply—a handicap which was especially grievous in the 'boom' period which began in 1930. In 1934, the mandatory authorities met this criticism by taking steps to establish a Statistical Bureau of the Palestine Government (*Report 1934*, p. 45).

⁷ *Report 1933*, p. 30.

Zionists, to say nothing of irresponsible prophecies of individual Jews in newspapers and on the platform, did little to dissipate these reports.¹

By the year 1933, this infiltration of illicit immigrants into Palestine was causing the mandatory authorities much concern. In February 1933, the High Commissioner made a public statement² on the subject; and in November 1933 a number of measures³ for dealing with the situation were put into operation. In the same month, the High Commissioner was waited upon by a deputation of Arab mayors who came to protest against the volume of illicit immigration, and a few days later (on the 21st November, 1933) by a Jewish deputation which came to plead for a wholesale regularization of the status of illicit Jewish immigrants on the ground that the town of Tel Aviv and the citrus-growing district in the Plain of Sharon were both suffering from a shortage of labour. Further Jewish protests were evoked by the Palestine Government's decision to issue no more than 5,600 permits under the Labour Schedule for the half-year April to September, 1934. This was made the occasion for a half-day strike of Jews throughout Palestine on the 23rd May, 1934—a demonstration which was accompanied by rioting at Tel Aviv. On the 28th June, 1934, a deputation, on the subject of the Labour Schedule, from the Board of Deputies of British Jews was received in Downing

¹ *Report 1933*, p. 35. On the Jewish side it was pointed out that the illicit immigration was not exclusively Jewish, and it was estimated that the number of Arabs who had illicitly entered Palestine in search of work, and had then remained in the country, during the two or three years ending in June 1935, amounted to not much less than 25,000. In the nature of the case, any general estimate was highly conjectural. In detail, however, it was ascertained by the Jewish Agency, as the result of an unofficial census conducted at Petach-Tikwah in February 1935, that, while 988 Jews were employed in the Jewish-owned groves of that Jewish agricultural colony, no fewer than 3,220 Arabs were employed in the same groves, and that of these as many as 1,470 were Hawrānis or Transjordanians. In and around Haifa Harbour, again, the number of non-Palestinian Arabs in employment was counted on three successive days in February 1935, and the figure was 1,654 on the 25th, 1,854 on the 26th and 1,892 on the 27th of that month (*Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 15; cf. p. 8). Of course it did not follow that all these non-Palestinian Arab workers in Palestine had entered the country illicitly. The Palestine Government recorded, however, in their Report for the year 1934, p. 9, that illicit immigration was not confined to Jews and that there had been many Hawrānis among the illegal immigrants. The fact that there was this Arab immigration—authorized or illicit—into Palestine during these years would seem to bear out the Jewish contention that the immigration of Jews into Palestine, together with the other steps that were being taken towards the establishment of a Jewish National Home, was actually increasing, instead of diminishing, the openings in Palestine for the employment of Arabs.

² Extract in *Report 1933*, p. 15.

³ Summaries in *Report 1933*, pp. 36-7. See also the passages in *Report 1934* that have been cited on p. 254, above, in footnote 1.

Street by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. Thereafter, on the 30th October, 1934, Sir Philip Cunliffe-Lister announced that during the summer the High Commissioner for Palestine had issued 1,200 additional permits under the Labour Schedule for the half-year that had expired at the end of the previous month; and on the 15th November, 1934, the Palestine Government announced an allotment of 7,500 labour immigration certificates for the half-year ending the 31st March, 1935.¹ In the year 1934 the volume of illicit immigration appears to have been greatly reduced.² The figures of authorized immigration in this year were 38,244 Jews and 39,027 immigrants in all, as has been recorded in the table on page 253 above; there were 4,866 persons (4,114 Jews and 752 non-Jews) who entered the country during the year as travellers and were subsequently registered as immigrants;³ the number of persons deported during the year for immigration offences was 2,407, of whom 772 were Jews and 1,635 non-Jews;⁴ the net increase of population due to recorded migration was 47,807.⁵ The difference between this last figure and the total authorized immigration of 39,027 persons for the year is mainly accounted for by the fact that the number of travellers who entered Palestine during the year exceeded the number of travellers leaving by 9,593.⁶ Of the truants, 4,747 were Jews and 4,846 non-Jews.⁷ The 4,747 truant Jewish travellers in 1934 represented 18 per cent. of the total number of Jews who had entered Palestine as travellers during the year, whereas the corresponding figures for 1933 had been 10,376 and 40 per cent.

On the 19th December, 1934, the Chairman of the Executive of the Jewish Agency in Palestine, Dr. Ruppin, announced⁸ that no

¹ In making this allotment, the Government stated that they had estimated the absorptive capacity of the country at 9,700 for the forthcoming schedule period, but that 2,200 was being deducted from this figure as a set-off against past and anticipated illicit immigration.

² Statement made on the 1st December, 1934, at Jerusalem by the High Commissioner to an Arab deputation. At about this time, the High Commissioner estimated that the number of unauthorized immigrants had been brought down to a figure of not more than 100 per mensem (*Report 1934*, p. 11).

³ *Report 1934*, p. 35.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 44.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 35 and 43. The figure 9,593 is, of course, greater than the difference between 39,027 and 47,807. This apparent discrepancy is accounted for by the fact that the latter figure takes account of the movement of residents as well as immigrants and travellers, and in 1934 the number of residents leaving Palestine was slightly greater than the number of those returning.

⁷ Of these 4,846 non-Jews, 1,231 were Muslims and 3,615 Christians (as against an authorized immigration of only 1,494 Christians for this year 1934 (*Report 1934*, p. 37)).

⁸ *The Times*, 20th December, 1934, corrected by the original text of this passage in Dr. Ruppin's speech.

less than 15,042 German Jews had settled in Palestine during the preceding twenty-two months, ending on the 1st November, 1934, and he estimated that the capital which they had brought into the country amounted to about £P10,000,000.

In regard to the immigrants of the A1 class, who were required to have at their command not less than £P1,000 of capital, the Mandatory Power made the following observations in its report for the year 1932:

Some of these were men whose means considerably exceeded the minimum. In many cases the whole of the immigrant's capital was not transferred to Palestine. In others the qualifying capital included long term loans placed at the disposal of the immigrants. With reference to a question put at the twenty-second session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, it is not possible to state even approximately the total amount brought to Palestine by these immigrants nor the extent to which the qualifying capital was not the property of the immigrants. In some cases it may be that the qualifying capital was borrowed for the occasion. Judging, however, from the sums invested in house-building¹ and plantations and also lying idle at the banks awaiting opportunity of investment,² the amount of money brought to Palestine by immigrants and that invested here by persons resident abroad who have not yet settled in the country is relatively considerable. A large part of the activities of the population, at any rate of the Jewish section of it, may be said to be financed by this foreign capital.³

It was, indeed, estimated that 60 per cent. of the new industrial concerns that were established in Palestine in the year 1934 were set up by Jewish immigrants from Germany through a capital investment of nearly £P200,000.⁴ The total annual amount of Jewish capital invested in Palestine was estimated to have been £3,250,000 in 1932, £5,250,000 in 1933,⁵ and about £10,000,000 in 1934;⁶ and

¹ The aggregate amount invested in building of all kinds was £P5,600,732 in 1933 and £P6,000,000 in 1934 according to *Report 1934*, p. 198.—A.J.T.

² Deposits at the banks were estimated at £P12,000,000 at the end of 1933 and £P15,000,000 at the end of 1934 according to *Report 1934*, p. 196.—A.J.T.

³ *Report 1932*, p. 25. The aggregate amount of capital brought into Palestine by the 5,124 Jewish immigrants of the A1 category in 1934 was estimated to have been well above £5,000,000 (*Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 7).

⁴ *The Manchester Guardian*, 4th January, 1935. It would, however, give a misleading idea of the character of the German immigration into Palestine after the National-Socialist Revolution in Germany if attention were directed exclusively to the capitalist element in it. This stream of German Jewish immigration largely consisted of young men and women who took to agricultural and industrial work. In Palestine, the former Jewish intellectual proletariat of Germany was being transformed into a body of simple productive workers.

⁵ *The Times*, 13th June, 1933.

⁶ *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, pp. 46-7.

133 new factories were reported to have been erected in the second half of the latter year.¹ In 1934, '227 new companies were registered' in Palestine 'with a capital of £P2,180,000, compared with 89 and a registered capital of £P540,000 in 1933; and 35 companies increased their capital from £P1,737,000 to £P4,141,000 as compared with the year 1933, during which 15 increased their capital from £P87,000 to £P180,000. . . . This year, again, . . . witnessed a marked industrial development—the local production of goods increasing by nearly 10 per cent. to £P6,500,000.'² The building and electrical and clothing and toilet industries were among those in which the increase of activity was particularly conspicuous.³

This activity in the development of urban manufactures was surpassed by the expansion of the agricultural industry of citrus-farming in the Plain of Sharon. It was only since the War of 1914-18 that citrus-farming in Palestine had begun to assume really large dimensions; and the first year in which oranges were exported from Haifa on a large scale was 1930.⁴ The following figures were given by the Palestine Government Director of Development, Mr. L. French, in his supplementary report dated the 20th April, 1932.

Various estimates have been framed of the areas under citrus, and a special official survey of the groves is, I understand, being undertaken. The figures usually quoted of the existing plantations are about 130,000 dönüms,⁵ of which approximately 40,000 are said to be in bearing. The estimates assume, roughly, a general average of 80 to 85 exportable cases per dönüm; and the actual exports during the season just closed have aggregated about 3,500,000 cases. It would appear on this basis that in 1936-7 the total will be at least 11,000,000. In an article recently published in a Jewish paper, the writer arrived at a similar conclusion by a different method. He estimates the present Jewish citrus groves in bearing as covering 10,500 dönüms, with an exportable output this year of 1,400,000 cases. New Jewish plantings in the years 1926 to 1931

¹ *The Manchester Guardian*, 8th March, 1934.

² *Report 1934*, pp. 14-15. This passage appears to show some discrepancy with a later passage on p. 196 of the same report, where it is stated that 'about 170 companies with a total capital of about £P1,700,000 were registered, and 30 companies with a total registered capital of about £P340,000 increased their capital to nearly £P1,200,000'.

³ The Palestine Electric Corporation, Ltd., sold 11,590,000 KWII units in 1932, 20,137,500 in 1933, and 34,386,000 in 1934 (*Jewish Agency Memorandum 1934*, p. 26). According to *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 21, electrical and chemical works together accounted for no less than £2,368,000 out of a total investment of £5,266,000 in industry in Palestine as at August 1933.

⁴ *Report 1930*, p. 172. Oranges had, of course, been exported from Jaffa on a considerable scale since an earlier date, as the trade name 'Jaffa oranges' testified.

⁵ According to *Report 1933*, the total citrus-planted area amounted to 140,000 dönüms in 1932 and 175,000 in 1933 (p. 222).—A.J.T.

inclusive are given as 54,000 dönüms,¹ which in 1936-7 will yield over 5,500,000 cases (at over 100 cases per dönüm).² The writer assumes that the Arab citrus crop in the last-named year will be about the same as that of the Jews: so that the total number of cases to be marketed abroad five years hence will reach at least 11,000,000 cases. Even allowing a deduction for calamities, the produce in 1936-7 should be about, or possibly more than, three times the number of cases being exported in 1931-2.³

These large and rapid increases in population and in production, both manufacturing and agricultural, were reflected in a corresponding increase in the circulation of goods and persons, particularly through the development of motor-transport on the roads.

Another reflection of the 'boom' was to be found in the rise in the public revenue. The surplus balance in the public accounts, which stood at £P773,070 on the 31st December, 1929, at £P626,111 on the 31st December, 1930, at £P585,139 on the 31st December, 1931, and at £P730,772 on the 31st March, 1932, rose to £P1,230,296 on the 31st March, 1933, and stood at £P2,510,932 on the 31st March, 1934,⁴ and at £P4,750,000 on the 31st March, 1935.

This flourishing state of Palestinian public finance gave the Mandatory Power its opportunity of putting into effect a development policy which it had initiated under the influence of the catastrophe of 1929, and for which it had already carried out the necessary studies.

In a despatch of the 26th June, 1931,⁵ to the High Commissioner in Palestine, the United Kingdom Secretary of State for the Colonies had announced a decision to appoint a Director of Development in Palestine, and had assigned this officer a number of tasks. He was to prepare a register of, and draw up a scheme of re-settlement for, 'such Arabs as' could 'be shown to have been displaced from the land which they occupied in consequence of the land's falling into

¹ According to *Report 1934*, 'the increase' in that year 'in the area planted with citrus trees was approximately 50,000 dönüms as compared with 44,000 dönüms in 1933' (p. 115). On p. 198 of the same report, however, the area planted with citrus trees in 1934 is stated to have been 30,000 dönüms. According to the *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 14, between 20,000 and 25,000 dönüms were planted in 1934 in the Jewish villages.—A.J.T.

² About 5,250,000 cases of oranges and 350,000 cases of grape fruit were exported in 1934 (*Report 1934*, p. 198). According to the *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 14, 'citrus exports for the season 1934-5 totalled approximately 7,000,000 cases, valued at between £2,500,000 and £3,000,000'.—A.J.T.

³ L. French: *Reports on Agricultural Development and Land Settlement in Palestine* (London, 1931, Crown Agents), p. 83.

⁴ *Report 1934*, p. 14.

⁵ Text in *Report 1931*, pp. 3-6, and in French, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-3.

Jewish hands, and who' had 'not obtained other holdings on which they' could 'establish themselves, or other equally satisfactory occupation'. He was also to 'investigate the methods to be adopted in order to give effect to the policy of land settlement set forth in Mr. MacDonald's letter of the 13th February, 1931, to Dr. Weizmann.'¹ In particular, he was to investigate 'the feasibility and advisability of providing credits for Arab cultivators and Jewish settlers, and if so, the best method of achieving this purpose'; and 'proposals for draining, irrigating, and otherwise reclaiming land not at present cultivated or cultivated only to a limited extent'. The official appointed to this Directorship of Development in Palestine was Mr. L. French, who had formerly been Chief Secretary to the Panjab Government. The Director entered upon his duties in August 1931 and duly presented an interim report on the 23rd December, 1931, and a supplementary report on the 20th April, 1932.² These valuable expert studies were submitted by the High Commissioner in Palestine to the Arab Executive and to the Jewish Agency; but, for different reasons, they were displeasing to both parties; and, for the time being, the financial position both of Palestine and of the United Kingdom made it difficult to find the ways and means for putting Mr. French's recommendations into effect. The financial prosperity, however, which overtook the Palestine Government in the course of the year 1933, led the Mandatory Power to announce, in the House of Commons at Westminster, on the 14th July, 1933, its intention of giving the guarantee of the United Kingdom Government to a Palestine Government Development Loan of £2,000,000;³ and simultaneously Mr. French's reports were published in Palestine. On the 11th May, 1934, the House of Commons at Westminster, in committee, duly passed a resolution authorizing the Treasury in Whitehall to guarantee

¹ For the occasion and the contents of this letter, see the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 301-4.

² Both documents, with their respective appendices, are printed in the Palestine Government official publication already cited under Mr. French's name.

³ On the 17th November, 1930, when the moral effect of the catastrophe of 1929 was still fresh and potent, the British Government had announced their intention of promoting a Palestine development loan of £2,500,000 and had proposed not only to give a British Government guarantee for the principal, but also, during the first years, to pay the interest and sinking fund out of United Kingdom revenues (see the *Survey for 1930*, p. 300). Three years later, when the finances of Palestine were more prosperous and the feelings of His Majesty's Government were less contrite, the Government of the United Kingdom decided to limit their good offices to the giving of the guarantee, and to leave the whole charge to be borne by the Palestine Government in the first instance.

the principal and interest of a loan not exceeding £2,000,000 to be raised by the Government of Palestine for the following purposes:

	£
1. Re-settlement of displaced Arabs	250,000
2. Water supply and drainage schemes for Jerusalem and Haifa; water supply for Hebron and various villages; survey of water resources	933,000
3. Agricultural credits	200,000
4. Construction of oil-berth, and reclamation scheme at Haifa	210,000
5. Public buildings, including Jerusalem Post Office and various educational buildings and purposes incidental to, or connected with, any of the purposes mentioned in this Schedule, including the raising of the loan	407,000
	£2,000,000 ¹

On the 18th December, 1934, it was announced that the Jewish Agency for Palestine, for their part, had negotiated, with Lloyd's Bank and with the Anglo-Palestine Bank, a loan of £500,000 at 4 per cent. for paying off outstanding debts and for the final consolidation of the Jewish settlements in Palestine.²

In the Mandatory Power's report for the year 1933, the economic condition of Palestine at this time was described in the following terms:

If evidence is wanted of the continued economic prosperity of Palestine it may be found in surplus balances which, it is estimated, will amount to almost two and a half million pounds at the 31st March, 1934.³ Generally speaking, the favourable situation may be ascribed

¹ British Parliamentary Paper *Cmd.* 4576 of 1934, p. 3. For a criticism of this policy of borrowing money at perhaps not less than 3½ per cent., at a time when the Palestine Government had in hand a surplus balance, of more than the amount required, which was presumably on deposit at not more than ½ per cent., see a letter of the 17th February, 1934, from Mr. Harry Sacher in *The Manchester Guardian* of the 20th February, 1934. For an answer to this criticism, see the Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 40, where it is stated that, at the time, the average yield on the Palestine Government's investments was 3.49 per cent. At the 31st March, 1934, the Palestine Government held investments which were valued at £1,725,203, not including certain investments which were earmarked for special purposes. (*Report 1934*, p. 171.)

² This loan was primarily a conversion operation. The existing indebtedness of the Jewish Agency, which amounted to a sum not far short of the amount of the loan, was largely short-term in character, and carried a high rate of interest. The effect of the conversion to a long-term and lower interest basis was to render available a certain proportion of the funds for settlement purposes. (See *Report 1934*, p. 32.)

³ This estimate was actually exceeded; see the figure quoted on p. 260, above.—A.J.T.

to the arrival of capitalist settlers, and other immigrants whose needs in food, clothing and accommodation must be supplied; to a consequential increase in the import of foreign commodities and consumption of local produce; to trade facilities resulting from availability of cheap credit in the shape of unemployed capital lying in the banks; to the incessant extension of agriculture; and to sustained activity in the building trades. Cereal importations, including rice, were swollen also by the failure of the local harvests. There is no question that Palestine at present offers an attractive market for investment, not necessarily exclusively Jewish; and there are signs of the awakening of a livelier interest on the part of British and Continental investors and exporters. This interest is strengthened by the opening of the new harbour at Haifa, and by the completion of the pipe-line from Mosul to Haifa.¹ Transactions in land during the year were principally in respect of building sites and orange-groves; and the intensity of demand has brought about a measure of speculation which is disquieting.²

The foregoing quotation may be followed up by one from the Mandatory Power's report for the year 1934:

A striking testimony to the confidence which the present economic conditions of Palestine and prospects of the country's financial stability inspire in authoritative circles is provided by the success attending the issue of new share capital by Palestine companies and the making of loans to institutions. . . . These loans are for long terms, indicating a sense of security in the financial future of Palestine, and at exceptionally low rates of interest, which reflect the high value placed upon the credit of the country.³

The economic harvest portrayed in this picture is luxuriant; yet it manifestly contains some tares besides its imposing crop of wheat; and it is necessary to appreciate the weak and precarious as well as the strong and enduring features in this Palestinian 'boom', which coincided so strangely with the world economic depression, in order to estimate the prospects of Palestine in 1935.

In the twentieth century of the Christian Era, as in earlier ages of her history, the economic fortunes of Palestine were apparently being made—and her political fortunes possibly being marred—by her geographical situation. 'It is clear', wrote the Superintendent of the Census of 1931, 'that Palestine is still pursuing its ancient tradition by which it was regarded as a meeting-place of migrations east to west and west to east, and as an *entrepôt* for material. The development of the trans-desert projects connected with the delivery of oil from 'Irāq to the Mediterranean is likely to give greater impetus to these movements.'⁴ The collision between Jewish colonists who were

¹ For the construction of this pipe-line from the 'Irāq Petroleum Company's oil fields, see p. 192, above.—A.J.T.

² *Report 1933*, p. 19.

³ *Report 1934*, p. 15.

⁴ *Mills, op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 59-60.

flowing into Palestine from Europe across the sea and Arab occupants of the country whose ancestors had silted in from the desert was reminiscent of earlier collisions between Philistines and Hebrews¹ and between Crusaders and Saracens. And the position which Palestine was acquiring as an *entrepôt* in a latter-day Westernized World was similarly reminiscent of the position which she had occupied from the third millennium B.C. down to the thirteenth century of the Christian Era.

In that earlier age, Palestine had lain on the line of communication between one great centre of population and productivity in Egypt and a comparable centre in 'Irāq with its expanding Iranian and Anatolian hinterlands. In those circumstances, Palestine had profited economically from the flow of trade between the basins of the Nile and the Tigris-Euphrates; and, although she had suffered politically from the passage of Egyptian and Assyrian armies, she fell upon her most evil days—at any rate on the economic side of her life—after the virtual obliteration of 'Irāq in the thirteenth century owing to the devastating effects of a Mongol invasion. Thereafter, the flow of world-trade shifted from the Levant to the Atlantic; and even when the waters began to return to their old channel at the close of the eighteenth century owing to the search for a short cut between Europe and India, Palestine did not immediately benefit by the change; for, throughout the nineteenth century, the sea retained its primacy as the medium of transportation, and the sea-borne traffic between Europe and India was inevitably focussed upon Egypt, first across the Isthmus of Suez and then through the Canal. It was not till after the close of the General War of 1914-18 that Palestine was favoured by the conjunction of circumstances required to restore her to her historic position as an *entrepôt*. The first of these new factors was the commercial development of flying and trans-desert motor-traffic as practical alternatives to transportation by steamship—a development which tended to shift the alignment of trade-routes from the sea to the land.² The second factor was the re-emergence of

¹ In a previous volume (the *Survey for 1930*, p. 234, footnote 3) it has been pointed out that the Plain of Sharon, which was the stronghold of the Jewish colonists in Palestine in the twentieth century, had once been the stronghold of their predecessors the Philistines, while 'the Hill Country of Ephraim', which in the twentieth century was the stronghold of the Palestinian Arabs, had once been the stronghold of these Arabs' predecessors the Hebrews.

² Hitherto, of course, the principal modern means of overland communication had been the railway; and Palestine was already traversed by lines which connected Egypt with Europe via Syria and Turkey (see A. J. Toynbee: *A Study of History*, vol. ii (London, 1934, Milford), p. 51, footnote 2), while there was a long-standing proposal for the construction of a trans-desert line from

'Irāq, under British tutelage, from her seven-hundred-years-long economic and social eclipse. The third factor was the economic rehabilitation of Palestine herself through an inflow of Jewish enterprise under a British aegis.

The effective opening-up, for the first time in history, of the direct trans-desert route between 'Irāq and the Mediterranean coast of Syria was one of the most important developments in world-communications in the post-war age;¹ and while considerations of distance told in favour of the port of Tarabulus (Tripoli), in the French mandated territory of the Lebanon, as against the port of Haifa, in the British mandated territory of Palestine, the scales were in fact inclined to Haifa's advantage by the economic impetus of the Zionist Movement and by the link maintained between Palestine and 'Irāq through their common British connexion. The new harbour at Haifa—the third largest harbour in the Eastern Mediterranean—was formally opened on the 31st October, 1933.² The construction of an oil-berth there, together with the execution of a reclamation scheme, was one of the four purposes of the Palestine Development Loan of 1934.³ The Haifa branch of the 'Irāq Petroleum Company's pipe-line from the Kirkūk oil-field to the Mediterranean coast was formally opened on the 22nd January, 1935.⁴ If and when oil was struck in the 'Irāqī territory west of the Tigris by the British Oil Development Company which had obtained the concession for this area on the 20th April, 1932,⁵ it was probable that Haifa would become the maritime terminal of another pipe-line from 'Irāq. And it was still more significant that on the 18th October, 1933, a convention⁶ was signed at Jerusalem regulating the conveyance of mineral oils through the territory of Palestine by the Anglo-Persian Oil Company. In fact, Palestine seemed destined to become the *entrepôt*

Haifa to some point in 'Irāq. It was possible, however, that in Palestine itself, as well as in its eastern hinterland, the future lay with the motor-car rather than with the locomotive.

¹ See the *Survey for 1925*, Vol. i, p. 329, and the present volume, pp. 186-7, above.

² The total steam tonnage entered and cleared at all Palestinian ports amounted to the following figures in the four years 1931-4, according to the Palestine Government's annual reports:

Year	Tons
1931	3,624,000
1932	3,982,000
1933	6,365,000
1934	8,442,000

³ See p. 262, above.

⁴ See p. 192, above.

⁵ See p. 193, above.

⁶ Text in *Report 1933*, pp. 301-11.

for the vast new oil-extracting industry, of world-wide importance, which was promising—or threatening—to transform the face of material life throughout the Middle East.¹

Nor were the prospects of Palestine as an *entrepôt* confined to the trade between Europe and the Middle East. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company was moved to contemplate incurring the expense of constructing a long pipe-line to a Palestinian port on the Mediterranean, in addition to the short pipe-lines already in operation from the Khūzistān oil-field to the port of Ābādān on the Shattu'l-'Arab, because this would enable it to eliminate the time and cost exacted by the circumnavigation of Arabia; and this advantage of short-circuiting Arabia as well as Africa had already made Palestine a station on an air-route, competing with the Suez Canal sea-route, between Europe and Indonesia.² This air-route seemed destined to be prolonged in the near future from India north-eastward to China and Japan and from Indonesia south-eastward to Australia; and this probability revealed the possible destiny of Palestine³ as an *entrepôt* between two out of the three great focuses of population and activity in the Westernized World of the twentieth century: that is to say, Europe on the one hand and on the other hand the focus embracing India, Indonesia, the Far East and Australasia. On this showing, Palestine held a key-position in the twentieth-century world which was not incomparable to the position of Great Britain as the *entrepôt* between Europe and the Americas.

Here was a Palestinian asset of enduring value. At the same time, the contemporary spectacle of Great Britain, in the trough of the depression, bore witness that even the most favourable geographical position was not sufficient in itself to insure a local prosperity which would be proof against economic weaknesses at home and economic dislocations in the world at large; and, notwithstanding Palestine's

¹ For the development of the oil-extracting industry in Persia, 'Irāq and Bahrayn in the post-war period, see the *Survey for 1925*, Vol. i, pp. 529-31, and this part of the present volume, sections (ii) (c), (iv), and (v).

² In addition to the Imperial Airways Service, there was also a Dutch service plying along this route, with an aerodrome of its own in Palestine at Gaza (see *Report 1934*, p. 20).

³ On a closer view, it might perhaps seem rather to reveal the destinies of the Syrian territories under French mandate; for, as air and motor traffic developed, while xenophobia in Turkey diminished, there would be a tendency to replace the semi-maritime route from Europe to the Far East via the Eastern Mediterranean and the Levant ports by an all-land route via the Bosphorus; and in that event an air and motor port at Aleppo might eclipse the maritime port of Haifa. But in 1935 this possibility seemed still rather remote, and in any event it would apply mainly to passenger traffic, and not at all to oil or other bulky goods.

promising prospects as an *entrepôt*, the weak points in the Palestinian 'boom' of 1933-5 were unmistakable.

The increase in the public revenue of the Palestine Government, which was one of the striking features of the 'boom', was mainly accounted for by an increase in the customs receipts, as the following figures show:

Year.	Total Revenue.	Net Customs Revenue.
	£P	£P
1930	2,389,546	991,638
1931	2,333,895	922,080
1932 (1st Jan.-31st March)	657,289	257,107
1932-3	3,015,917	1,286,945
1933-4	3,985,493	1,868,598

This increase in customs receipts was due, in its turn, to a corresponding increase in imports which remained unbalanced by any equal increase of exports.

Year.	Imports for Consumption.	Exports of Palestinian Produce.
	1930	6,985,258
1931	5,940,000	1,572,061
1932	7,768,920	2,381,491
1933	11,123,489	2,591,617
1934	15,200,000	3,250,000

It will be seen that the volume, and the rate of increase in the volume, of Palestine's excess of recorded imports over recorded exports during the five years under review were as extraordinary, by comparison with her total trade, as the volume, and the rate of increase in the volume, of immigration into Palestine was extraordinary by comparison with the total population of the country; and the two phenomena were not unrelated; for, apart from the excess attributable to the expenditure of pilgrims and tourists; the rising figure under this head was mainly accounted for by the expenditure of immigrants—particularly Jewish immigrants of the A1 category who had been entering Palestine from Germany since 1933.¹

This expenditure appears largely to have been directed towards the purchase of consumption goods and buildings and land, and while the first two of these lines of expenditure contributed nothing directly

¹ See pp. 253, 257-8, above.

to exports,¹ the third was directly inimical to them in so far as land was now tending to fetch speculative prices which heightened one of the unescapable overhead charges upon all Palestinian production. The local production of the consumption goods that were now in increasing demand in Palestine, together with the local production of building materials, and the utilization of these in construction, appear, as was to be expected in the circumstances, to have accounted for most of the capital investment in Palestine during these years.² Another aspect of the same picture was the astonishing growth of the towns, which was, however, balanced by a proportionate contemporary increase in the population of the countryside. The census of 1931 showed that 39.9 per cent. of the settled population of Palestine was then residing in towns as against 60.1 per cent. who were villagers;³ and about 50 per cent. of the total population enumerated in all municipal areas were found in the three towns of Jerusalem, Haifa and Jaffa. During the nine years' interval that separated the census of 1931 from that of 1922, the population of Jerusalem had increased by 44.6 per cent. from 62,578 to 90,503; that of Jaffa by 59.5 per cent. from 32,524 to 51,866; and that of Haifa by 104.6 per cent. from 24,634 to 50,403; but the most astonishing increase was that of Tel Aviv—a city which in 1931 was still just below the 50,000 mark. Within the same nine years, the population of Tel Aviv had risen by no less than 203.6 per cent. from 15,185 to 46,101;⁴ and by the turn of the years 1934 and 1935 it was reported⁵ to have passed the 100,000 mark, with a school-going population of 20,000 and a municipal budget of some £P300,000 a year.⁶ This unparalleled

¹ Indirectly, of course, the new buildings—whether these consisted of dwelling-places for housing the additional population, or of factories for carrying on the new industries, or of farm buildings for conducting a more intensive cultivation of the land, might be expected to minister eventually to production, and so to contribute incidentally to exports. The question was whether the investment would begin to show a reasonable return within a reasonable period of time, and at the moment of going to press, in September 1935, it was still far too early to attempt to give the answer. It could only be said that building activity was normally regarded as one of the symptoms of economic health.

² For details, see *Report 1933*, pp. 202 and 204.

³ The corresponding figures shown in the census of 1922 were 39.36 per cent. in the towns and 60.64 per cent. in the villages (see Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 56; vol. ii, p. 7). The slightness of the shift in the balance, in favour of the towns, by comparison with the extraordinarily large increase in the urban population itself, brings out the fact that, during the interval between the taking of the two censuses, the rural population also increased notably, even if it did not quite keep pace with the urban population.

⁴ Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 16.

⁵ *The Manchester Guardian*, 4th January, 1935.

⁶ A correspondent of the writer of this *Survey*, in a letter addressed to him from Jerusalem and dated the 13th May, 1935, informed him that the budget

growth of Tel Aviv was significant inasmuch as it was an entirely Jewish city—a Jewish creation from first to last. It was, indeed, the Palestinian equivalent of New York, for it was estimated¹ that 50 per cent. of the Jewish immigrants into Palestine became residents in this single Jewish Palestinian town.² The portent of Tel Aviv drives home the truth that the 'urbanization' of Palestine, which was one of the concomitants of the increasing lack of balance between recorded exports and imports, was the product of Jewish energies. According to the census of 1931, only 15 per cent. of the Jewish community in Palestine was supported by agriculture,³ as compared with 18 per cent. of the Christian community and as contrasted with 64 per cent. of the Muslim community; while, of the total agricultural population of Palestine, the Jews accounted at the time for 5 per cent., as compared with a Christian percentage of 3.5 per cent. and as contrasted with a Muslim percentage of 90 per cent.⁴

In drawing attention to the urban proclivities of the growing Jewish element in the population of Palestine, the historian must qualify this observation in two respects. In the first place, he must point out that the proportion of Palestinian Jews resident in agricultural colonies to Palestinian Jews resident in towns was perceptibly rising. According to the census of 1922, the urban Jewish population

which had been recently passed by the municipality of Tel Aviv exceeded the figure of £P400,000. For details of the municipal budget of Tel Aviv for the financial year 1934-5, see the *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 24. The total was estimated at £305,000.

¹ *The Times*, 13th June, 1933.

² The Jewish community in Tel Aviv already had one advantage over the vastly larger and wealthier Jewish community in New York. In the American city the Jews were mainly engaged in the distributive trades; in the Palestinian city they were also the producers and the builders.

³ The proportion of Jews gainfully employed in (as distinct from being supported by) agriculture to the total number of Jews gainfully employed in Palestine was higher: i.e. 18 per cent. instead of 15 (for this figure of 18 per cent. see Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, pp. 282 *seqq.*, table XVI).

⁴ Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 284. According to the *Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, the percentage of the Palestinian Jewish community which was engaged in agriculture had risen by 1934 to 21.2 (p. 4); about 25 per cent. of the community was living in the villages and about 75 per cent. in the towns (pp. 3-4); and about 66.6 per cent. of the community (i.e. about 200,000 souls) was concentrated in the four large towns Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Haifa, and Jaffa (p. 22). At the time of writing of the Memorandum, the total number of Jewish settlements in Palestine was 160, on an area of 1,300,000 dönüms of agricultural land, and with a population of 70,000. Of this total, 40,000 were occupied in agricultural work (p. 10). The Jewish Agency complained (pp. 5 and 20) that the shortage of labour in Palestine, which they attributed (p. 7) to the Government's niggardliness in issuing certificates under the Labour Schedule, was having the undesirable effect of drawing the rural Jewish population into the towns through the attraction of inordinately high urban rates of remuneration

was 68,622 (82 per cent. of the whole Jewish community) and the rural 15,172 (18 per cent.); according to the census of 1931, the urban Jewish population was 128,467 (73 per cent.) and the rural 46,143 (27 per cent.). In the second place, it must be noted that the Jews were active in agricultural as well as in industrial production. They were the creators of the citrus-planting industry in the Plain of Sharon which was as extraordinary a growth as the town of Tel Aviv; and the exports of oranges and grape-fruit had now come to account for the major part of the country's 'visible' exports, such as they were.¹

Year.	Total value of Exports of Palestinian Produce.	Total value of Exports of Citrus- Fruit.
	£P	£P
1930 . .	1,896,095	..
1931 . .	1,572,061	926,606
1932 . .	2,381,491	1,780,565
1933 . .	2,591,617	2,078,361
1934 . .	(nearly) 3,250,000	..

Meanwhile, the tendency displayed in Palestine's balance of trade raised two questions. First, was the difference in value between recorded exports and imports likely to diminish before the evil day, which was bound to come sooner or later, when the 'invisible exports', on which the country was now living, would fall off? And, second, was the volume of export of the one staple export-crop likely to maintain its current rate of increase?

The first of these two questions was raised by the Superintendent of the Census of 1931 in the following terms:

The fact that the present population will double itself within twenty years at the present rate of increase must naturally and properly lead to speculation as to its means of subsistence. . . . The effective question to which no effective answer can yet be returned is concerned, in Palestine, with the possibility of relating human intelligence to the material resources in such a way that increasing production of subsistence for the population can keep pace with the growth of the population itself. A population depends for its subsistence on what it can acquire by its own efforts applied to the natural resources of its own country, and by purchase from other countries. Its ability to purchase depends upon its ability to produce a surplus for sale from its own natural resources, and

¹ 'Oranges and grape-fruit are the only products of intensive farming in Palestine which can at present be profitably exported in any quantities.'—French, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

is also derived from invisible¹ import of value which, in Palestine, takes the form of liberal contributions to Christian charities and religious foundations; to Jewish enterprise, under the impulse engendered by the ideal of a Jewish National Home in Palestine; and to Jewish charitable and religious institutions. These contributions have naturally diminished during the economic disturbance affecting the World during the last two years. Nevertheless, Palestine, as a buying country, its imports being about eight times the value of its exports, by reason of the fact that world prices have fallen, has not yet experienced the economic discomforts shared by selling countries. But, when world conditions are restored, that is, when world prices are raised to a level of proper adjustment between supply and demand, the problem in Palestine will be to meet the demand for subsistence by proportionate increases in export trade, and in the Christian and Jewish invisible contributions of value upon which the whole population relies, perhaps unconsciously. Without these proportionate increases in imported invisible value and in internal production of special supplies surplus to the internal requirements of the country and so available for sale abroad, it is difficult to see how the rate of increase of subsistence for the population is to keep pace with the growth of that population. . . .

Undoubtedly, the annual increase of subsistence so far has been due to the policy of immigration. Immigration has not only stimulated local production and so enabled the sale of Palestine produce abroad, but has introduced invisible import of value into the country and so raised the capacity to purchase its requirements where these are not satisfied by internal production. It is, however, important that there should be at least a proportionate increase in exports and in invisible contributions of value when world conditions have improved; and that energies should be directed towards the full utilization of all the natural resources of the country. . . . If Christian and Jewish contributions, constituting invisible import of value, were suddenly to cease, it is certain that a proportion of the population would in a short time be forced to live on the starvation line² until the general standard of life of

¹ The word 'invisible', as applied in this passage to imports into Palestine which were made from religious or charitable motives, is obscure, for on the material side these imports—being 'of value'—presumably consisted of goods or money like any others. The distinctive mark of this category of imports was not the nature of the commodities but the motive of those who introduced them. Perhaps the term 'invisible' is to be interpreted here as meaning 'gratuitous' or 'non-economic'. In the technical terminology of the economists 'invisible imports into Palestine' ought to mean the expenditure abroad of Palestinian tourists visiting foreign countries, or services (shipping, banking, insurance, &c.) which had been rendered abroad to Palestinian nationals. But it is manifest that these are not the 'invisible imports' that the writer of the passage has in mind.—A.J.T.

² This thesis was contested on the Jewish side. It was pointed out that the major part of the free gifts from non-Palestinian Jewry for Jewish purposes in Palestine consisted of money provided by or through the Jewish Agency, and that the total income of the Jewish Agency, including all its affiliated institutions, amounted in the year ended the 30th September, 1934 to £650,000 (*Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 49, Table XVIII), while at the end of that calendar year the Jewish population in Palestine amounted to about

all the population had been lowered in adaptation to the conditions created by a sudden reduction in purchasing capacity.¹

On the question of the future of the citrus-fruit exporting industry, the following observations were offered by the Director of Development:

There is no sign of cessation in citrus planting; quite the reverse. Indeed, a prominent member of the Jewish community has expressed to me his opinion that even if 50,000,000 cases are produced, they can all be absorbed (in addition to the dozen million cases of 'rejects'). The onlooker aware of the march of events in other citrus-producing countries may well pause to wonder how all these enormous increases are to be disposed of, at home and abroad.²

The paths of modern agricultural history are strewn with the disasters that have, all the world over, attended too rapid or too extensive production of commodities which has ended in glutting foreign markets and ruining over-sanguine producers. The dangers to Palestine of a similar collapse in the citrus industry must be foreseen and guarded against with all the greater vigilance, inasmuch as there is no evidence that if the bottom falls out of the citrus-growing industry, it can be replaced by any other reasonably profitable product of agriculture.³

This warning was borne out by past experience in Palestine itself,⁴ and it was the more serious in view of the Director of Development's opinion that, both for the closer settlement of Jews on the land in Palestine, and for the re-settlement of Arabs who had been displaced by Jewish colonization and had not succeeded in re-settling themselves on their own initiative, the only feasible opening—in view of the scarcity of available land in the dry-farming areas—was 'the

300,000 souls. It is evident that, even if the whole of the Jewish Agency's income had been applied to providing the Jewish population of Palestine with the bare means of material subsistence, it could only have covered a small fraction of the minimum sum required to keep 300,000 persons alive for twelve months. The inference is that the Jewish population of Palestine was already almost entirely self-supporting, and was therefore not in danger of suffering a catastrophe even if the free gifts from abroad did fall off.—A.J.T.

¹ Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, pp. 46-8.

² French, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 69. For a threat to the important German market for Palestinian citrus-fruit, see *Report 1934*, pp. 16 and 20.

⁴ E.g., in the pre-war period of Jewish agricultural colonization in Palestine, the bottom had fallen out of the market of the wine-producing industry which had been built up by Baron Edmond de Rothschild's 'Palestine Jewish Colonization Association'. (See A. Ruppin: *The Agricultural Colonization of the Zionist Organization in Palestine*, trans. from the German by R. J. Feiwel (London, 1926, Martin Hopkinson), Chapter I.) Again, since 1928, the Egyptian Government—wrestling with the problem created in Egypt by the collapse of the world-market for Egyptian cotton—had placed virtually prohibitive duties upon imports of Palestinian fruits and fruit-products, including not only citrus-fruits, grapes, and wine, but also olives, olive-oil, and olive-oil soap (*Report 1930*, p. 16; *Report 1933*, p. 21; French, *op. cit.*, p. 8).

development of small irrigated holdings on land adapted for citrus growing which' was, at the time, 'being cultivated extensively for cereals, &c.'¹

No doubt, if only the maintenance and expansion of the world-market for Palestinian citrus-fruits could be assured, there was a fair prospect that the Palestinian Arab peasantry would prove capable of achieving that revolution in its way of life which was involved in a transition from an extensive subsistence farming to an intensive agricultural production for export. Testimony to this effect was borne by the Mandatory Power in its report on Palestine in the year 1931:

It is interesting to record the spread of modern methods of agriculture among the Arab rural community; the increasing frequency of application by fallāhīn to the Government Department for selected seeds and seedlings, for pedigree stock, and for advice generally in up-to-date husbandry is evidence that Arab conservatism in agriculture is being broken down by the realization of the benefits attending scientific farming.²

Indeed, the number of Arabs gainfully employed in the citrus-growing industry was actually larger than the number of Jews;³ and this fact was a signal vindication of the Jewish contention that the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Palestine was bringing the Arab population of the country substantial benefits which ought to be set against the Arabs' grievances. At the same time, the economic outlook for Arab agriculturalists who went over from cereal farming to citrus-cultivation, whether on their own initiative and at their own charges or as the beneficiaries of a Government re-settlement scheme, was manifestly precarious; and this element of precariousness was the more serious inasmuch as the estimated cost of Government-managed re-settlement of landless Arabs as citrus-growers worked out⁴ at the high figure of £800 for each Arab family

¹ French, *op. cit.*, p. 93; cf. pp. 8 and 64-5.

² *Report 1931*, p. 6. This opening of Palestinian Arab minds to an acceptance of Western technical progress was no doubt largely the result of personal contact with immigrant Jewish workers. In 1933 and 1934 there was reported to have been a marked tendency towards a closer co-operation between Arab and Jewish labourers.

³ The following figures are given in Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 290. 'A population of 51,476 persons is supported by the growing of special products. About one-quarter of these derive their livelihood from the cultivation of oranges, and the remainder from the cultivation of other fruits, vegetables, vines and the maintenance of nursery gardens. In orange cultivation there are 3,578 earners of whom 1,917 are Muslims, 1,493 are Jews and 165 are Christians, there being three other earners in the minor religious confessions. Of the 10,849 earners who are engaged in the growing of other special products, 6,802 are Muslims and 3,195 are Jews.' ⁴ French, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-7.

unit. In 1931, the Director of Development estimated that out of 3,700 claims to qualify for benefit under the proposed scheme, between 1,000 and 2,000 would perhaps eventually pass muster;¹ and in the House of Commons at Westminster on the 14th July, 1933, the Secretary of State for the Colonies gave the figure of 889 claims as having been passed up to date;² but both these figures appear to have been erroneous. The first was given, by mistake, for the very much lower figure of 2,722, which was the correct figure at that date; and the figure 889 would have shrunk to 584 if it had been strictly confined to the number of claims that had then actually been admitted to the register.³ As late as the 31st December, 1934, according to the Palestine Government's own returns,⁴ the Development Officer had admitted only 656 heads of families to the register, while he had disallowed 2,578 claims, and had two claims still under consideration, out of a total of 3,236 applications received. No more than eleven new claims had been filed in the course of the year 1934. By the end of the year 1933, the Palestine Government had acquired, for the purpose of meeting these claims, 14,869 metric dönüms of land in the Baysān and Janīn sub-districts at the cost of £P64,000;⁵ and by the end of 1934 these figures had risen to 17,868 dönüms and £P72,240.⁶ By that date, 'all registered Arabs who' had 'signified their willingness to take up holdings upon Government estates' had 'been accommodated. That only a small number of Arabs' had 'come forward so far to take up land' was 'due to the fact that there' was 'at present plenty of employment to be found in the towns and neighbouring orange groves.'⁷ Thus the investigations which the Palestine Government had carried out disproved the allegation that the process of Jewish agricultural colonization had been displacing Arab cultivators on a large scale.

This was a happy discovery, not merely in itself, but because, if the displacement had proved to be considerable, it would have been

¹ French, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

² The process of investigating and taking decisions upon claims was unavoidably slow. Each claim was submitted to the Jewish Agency for its observations after a first consideration by the Director of Development's Legal Assessor (French, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-60).

³ It appears subsequently to have been confessed by the Mandatory Power that on the 14th July, 1933, only 584 claims had been admitted out of a total of 3,188. The higher figure of 889 had been arrived at by adding, in the first place, 237 claims which it was anticipated that the Government would have to include, unless, as was hoped, these claimants were prevented from becoming landless by the new Protection of Cultivators Ordinance (see p. 273), and, in the second place, 68 claims on the part of members of the Zubayd tribe of Arabs, who were being treated as a special case.

⁴ *Report 1933*, p. 10.

⁵ *Report 1934*, p. 57.

⁶ *Report 1934*, p. 57.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 58.

difficult to make good; for the Director of Development found that in Palestine there were no 'surplus' lands—in the sense of virgin lands never yet utilized for economic purposes—and no state domains available either for the re-settlement of landless Arabs or for further Jewish agricultural colonization—with the inference that any land now required for either of these purposes would have to be purchased or expropriated from private owners.¹ He submitted that, for either purpose, it would be prudent, for the present, to confine operations to lands in the citrus-bearing belt in the Plain of Sharon, and to refrain from embarking on schemes for the irrigation of lands in the Baysān district, the Hūlah basin,² and the Jordan Valley with an eye to the extension of citrus-cultivation to these hitherto untried parts of the country.³ He drew attention to the fact that, at this time, the Jewish colonization organizations had 'admittedly in their possession reserves of land, aggregating over 40,000 dönüms, which' had 'yet to be effectively colonized';⁴ and he advised the Mandatory Power against accepting proposals which had been put forward by the Jewish Agency for the establishment of a Jewish Agricultural and Settlement Bank with the financial support of the Palestine Government.⁵

Meanwhile, apart from the special and easily manageable case of the displaced Arabs, the Palestine Government were confronted with a general problem, of far larger dimensions, in the shape of the continuing distress among the Arab peasantry as a whole. It is evident from the facts and figures, ascertained by the mandatory authorities, which have been recorded above, that this Arab distress in Palestine was not a consequence, either direct or indirect, of Jewish immigration. So far from that, the 'boom' which Jewish activities

¹ French, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-2.

² The special problems of the Baysān district and the Hūlah basin are discussed in French, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-8 and 36-53. For the history of the Hūlah Concession, see also *Report 1934*, pp. 75-9. On the 1st December, 1934, the British High Commissioner in Palestine announced that the concession for opening up the Hūlah basin had been transferred from the original Arab concessionaires (who had obtained the concession from the Ottoman Government before the War of 1914-18) to a Jewish group, which was to arrange for the drainage, by an early date, of 40,000 dönüms. Under this new concession, 15,000 dönüms of the lands reclaimed were to be reserved for occupation by Arabs (*The Times*, 3rd December, 1934), as against only 9,200 dönüms under the original concession (*Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, pp. 8-9).

³ French, *op. cit.*, pp. 67 and 69-70.

⁴ French, *op. cit.*, p. 70. For previous controversies over the extent of these Jewish land-reserves, see the *Survey of 1930*, p. 239, footnote 2. The total net area of Jewish purchases (in excess of Jewish sales) of land in Palestine was 62,114 dönüms in 1934 and 155,900 over the five years 1930-4 (*Jewish Agency Memorandum, 1934*, p. 8).

⁵ French, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-4.

in Palestine were now producing had manifestly relieved the economic pressure upon the Arab agricultural population by opening to it new urban markets, as well as a more lucrative alternative field of employment. The distress is to be accounted for partly by the slowly changing long-term social factor of Arab backwardness, and partly by the physical calamity of three successive years of drought which affected Arab and Jewish cultivators with impartial severity.¹ In dealing with this peasant Arab section of the population of Palestine, which numerically still accounted for about 47 per cent. of the whole (some 486,216 out of a total population of 1,035,821, according to the census of 1931),² the Government found themselves constrained, year by year, not only to remit taxes but even to grant short-term loans for the purchase of seed.³ 'The winter months and the early spring of the year 1934 found a large proportion of the fallāhīn in a state of destitution, approaching starvation in some cases, and their live stock dying in large numbers.'⁴ Thus the fear expressed by the Superintendent of Census that 'a proportion of the population would . . . be forced to live on the starvation line'⁵ if the current 'invisible exports' of Palestine were to fall off, was actually being realized at a time when the country as a whole was still enjoying its local 'boom'.⁶

¹ 'The prosperity of the country was not reflected in the rural population, and that applied to Jews and Arabs alike, both of whom were suffering as a result of four (*sic*) years of drought'—the British accredited representative at the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission (Minutes, p. 18). For a vivid description of the disastrous effects of this three-years' drought, see the Report of the Agricultural Department of the Government of Palestine for the year ended March 1934, p. 18. The Transjordanian peasantry seem to have suffered still more severely than their brethren west of the river; and since the Transjordanian Government were not in a financial position to make loans for the purchase of seed and other purposes, the Palestine Government stepped into the breach and provided a loan for the distressed Transjordanian fallāhīn (Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 36).

² These figures follow from the statement in Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 284, that 64 per cent. of the Muslim community was supported by agriculture, which gives a figure of 486,215.68. The Muslim rural population, including those inhabitants of villages who lived off the proceeds of agriculture indirectly, was shown by the census of 1931 to amount to 571,637 (Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 19). 'Agricultural distress reacted in certain local market towns to cause acute poverty among some of the inhabitants, and the Municipal Councils in Nāblus, Hebron and Baysān were obliged to distribute free flour for bread' (*Report 1933*, p. 24).

³ *Report 1931*, p. 7; *Report 1933*, pp. 23-5; Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, pp. 14 and 18.

⁴ Statement by the British accredited representative at the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission (Minutes, p. 14).

⁵ Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 48.

⁶ The economic difficulties of the rural population were aggravated by the decay of village industries (Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 284), and this was also a

As in previous years, this distress among the Arab rural population of Palestine continued to be felt most acutely in 'the hill country of Ephraim and Judah'.¹ The population of this hill country, according to the census of 1931,² was 373,196 (36 per cent. of the total population of Palestine), as against a population of 395,350 (38.2 per cent. of the total) in the Plain of Sharon; and since the hill country was about half as large again as the Plain of Sharon (about 5,570 square kilometres as against about 3,777), it followed that the mean density of population in the hill country was 67 persons per square kilometre as against a corresponding figure of 105 for the Plain—or 51 as against 78, excluding the urban populations of the four large towns of Jerusalem, Jaffa, Tel Aviv and Haifa.³ On the basis of these densities of the respective rural populations in the hill country and in the Plain, it would appear that the amount of land (uncultivable together with cultivable) at the disposal of each individual member of the rural population was 19.6 metric dönüms in the hill country and 12.8 in the Plain; and since the average size of an Arab agricultural household was found to be 4.5 persons, the amount of land of both kinds at the disposal of each rural household would work out at 88 metric dönüms in the hill country and 58 in the Plain.⁴ These findings of the Superintendent of Census are illuminated by the Director of Development's estimate that the *lot viable*—that is, the minimum holding which would suffice to support a Palestinian Arab cultivator and his family on a reasonable standard of living—was 130 dönüms for unirrigated land and 30 for irrigated land.⁵ On this showing,⁶ the minimum holding could easily be secured to every rural household on the irrigable Plain of Sharon, but was hopelessly beyond the reach of the rural population of the hill country.⁷

As the Director of Development pointed out,⁸ the first thing serious loss for the country as a whole in a world that was moving back again so rapidly towards a primitive régime of local *autarkeia*.

¹ See an article from a special correspondent in *The Times*, 14th August, 1934. ² Mills, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 21. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 22. ⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ French, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9. In the former of these two figures, Mr. French follows Sir John Hope Simpson (see the *Survey for 1930*, p. 240, footnote 2).

⁶ The Director of Development's figure of 130 dönüms as the minimum in the case of unirrigated land was criticized, in Jewish quarters, on the ground that it did not sufficiently take into account the possibility of more scientific cultivation in the highlands as well as in the lowlands.

⁷ This contrast between the respective fortunes and prospects of the Arab peasantry in the hill country and in the Plain will appear the more remarkable when it is recollected that the Plain had been the main theatre of Jewish agricultural colonization, while in the highlands this had been a negligible factor. The contrast is another proof that Jewish immigration cannot have been the cause of the distress of the Arab peasantry in the hill country.

⁸ French, *op. cit.*, pp. 75-8.

needful—pending positive remedial action, which was bound to take time—was the taking of effective measures for preventing the displacement of the agricultural Arab population from the land; for though, as has been recorded above, this process had not yet been proved to have affected more than 656 families, it might be expected, nevertheless—if not held in check—to outstrip and stultify the execution of the Palestine Government's slow and costly task of resettling the handful of cultivators who had been displaced already. With this intent, a Protection of Cultivators Ordinance¹ had been enacted on the 31st July, 1929 (on the eve of the outbreak of the disorders of that year), and had been subsequently strengthened more than once (e.g. on the 30th May, 1931). The Director of Development criticized this ordinance as inadequate for its purpose,² and advised the Palestine Government to pass a Homesteads Protection Ordinance and an Occupancy Tenants Ordinance to supplement and reinforce it.³ The Government did enact an ordinance for the protection of tenants in August 1933;⁴ and a Co-operative Societies Ordinance, which was enacted in the December of the same year,⁵ to replace an ordinance on the same subject which had been issued in 1920 in the early days of the Civil Administration, stood to benefit the whole agricultural population, Arab and Jewish alike.

Nevertheless, the position of the rural Arab population of Palestine in the hill-country remained painful and critical; and the bitterness aroused in the heart of the upland fallāh was exacerbated by the contrast between his own hard lot and the apparently easy prosperity of the townspeople and the citrus-growers.⁶

¹ Text in *Report 1930*, pp. 257-61.

² French, *op. cit.*, p. 79.

³ French, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-80, with drafts of the suggested ordinances on pp. 101-11.

⁴ *Report 1933*, p. 11.

⁵ *Report 1933*, p. 12.

⁶ It was also alleged that there was an inequality in the incidence of taxation in the urban population's favour and to the rural population's disadvantage. It was true that the urban population had no income-tax to pay, while the cultivators had to pay a tithe. Yet, out of a total revenue of nearly £P4,000,000 for the financial year 1933/4, the total collection of tithe amounted to no more than £P57,720 (Palestine Government Treasurer's Report for the financial year 1933/4, p. 4), and this figure included the collections on citrus-land in the Plain, in respect of which there was no commutation. Nor was the non-rural section of the population exempt from direct taxation; for the Urban Property Tax (introduced in 1928) and the House and Land Tax (which was also urban in character) were direct taxes, and these produced, between them, £P300,084 in 1933/4. Moreover, the prosperous sections of the population were evidently paying the greater part of the rapidly increasing volume of customs receipts which was the principal element in the total increase in the public revenue (see p. 267, above). Furthermore, the Rural Property Tax Ordinance, which came into force on the 1st April, 1935, abolished both the tithe and the

These social and economic facts throw light both upon the prospects of the mandatory régime in Palestine and upon the antecedents of the outbreak of disorder in the autumn of 1933; for, though the disturbers of the peace on these occasions, between the 13th and the 29th October of that year, were all of them urban Arabs—the disturbances being confined to the four towns of Jerusalem, Jaffa, Haifa and Nāblus¹—the cause, or pretext, for the demonstrations was the progress of Jewish immigration and land-purchase;² and it was the contemporary condition of the rural Arab population in the hill-country that gave, in Arab eyes, the most plausible colour to the thesis that the establishment of the Jewish National Home was inimical to the economic (as distinct from the political) interests of the Arab community in Palestine.³

Within the dates above mentioned, there were five disturbances in all: the first at Jerusalem on the 13th October; the second at Jaffa on the 27th October; the third at Haifa on the 27th-28th October; the fourth at Nāblus on the 27th October; the fifth at Jerusalem

Ottoman Werko, and replaced the two by a lighter tax which was assessed on the productive capacity of the land (*Report 1934*, pp. 17-18 and 80). Finally, account has to be taken of the substantial reliefs and subsidies which were afforded to the fallāhin who were hit by the drought (for details, see *Report 1934*, pp. 18-19). During the financial year 1933/4 (Treasurer's Report for 1933/4, p. 2), taxes were remitted to the extent of £P214,059 in respect of tithes, and £P21,000 in respect of Animal Tax, while relief works were carried out to the value of £P33,249 and seed and fodder loans were granted to the amount of £P76,863. These reliefs and subsidies, which were provided out of current receipts and expenditure, were evidently made possible by the economic developments that were resulting from the Jewish immigration.

¹ Report of the Murison-Trusted Commission of Inquiry, published as a supplement to the *Palestine Gazette* of the 7th February, 1934, p. 89.

² 'The immediate cause of the disturbances with which we are concerned was the resolution of the Arab Executive calling upon the Arabs to hold demonstrations to protest against the policy of Government, the ground for which was prepared by a general feeling of apprehension amongst the Arabs engendered by the purchase of land by the Jews and by Jewish immigration' (*op. cit.*, p. 104).

³ This thesis was not borne out by the facts, as these were brought to light by the exhaustive investigations that were carried out by the Director of Development and the Superintendent of Census (see pp. 260-1, 273-4, above). The number of claims admitted to the register of displaced Arab cultivators was insignificant; and, while the distress among the rural Arab population was unhappily genuine, it was most acute in the hill country, which had hardly been touched by Jewish agricultural colonization, while it was felt much less severely in the Plain of Sharon, where the Jewish colonies were concentrated. In those circumstances, it is not surprising that the urban Arab disturbances of the autumn of 1933 had no echo in the countryside, where the Arab population was less sensitive to those political considerations which were always at the back of the Arab anti-Jewish movement in the cities—even when the movement hoisted the flag of an alleged economic grievance.

on the 28th-29th October. A detailed account of the events, which it would be superfluous to recapitulate here, will be found in the report¹ of the Commission of Inquiry which was subsequently appointed by the Palestine Government.² The Commission found that the first Jerusalem disturbance and the Jaffa disturbance 'were the direct result of instigation by the Arab Executive at Jerusalem',³ while the Haifa disturbance 'anticipated, but was in conformity with, the plans of the Arab Executive in Jerusalem. The central feature of the first Jerusalem and the Jaffa disturbances, if not of that of Haifa, was an organized procession.'⁴ The Nāblus disturbance appears⁵ to have been excited by the news from Jaffa; and the second Jerusalem disturbance was found by the Commission to have been 'mainly fortuitous in its origin', and to have 'consisted of three entirely separate incidents, all of which occurred without any definite preparation and without any plan for a procession.'⁶ The mandatory authorities appear to have been conciliatory, as well as firm, in negotiating with the leaders of the movement before the disturbances occurred, and considerate, as well as efficient, in dealing with the trouble when it broke out notwithstanding their efforts to avert it.⁷ No doubt their problem was simplified by the fact that, on this occasion, they themselves were the sole target of attack.⁸ The total casualties were one policeman and 26 members of the public killed and 56 policemen and 187 members of the public injured; and neither the Jewish community nor the military forces were involved. 'Throughout the disturbances the military forces were placed in positions of readiness, but on no occasion did they come into conflict with the populace.'⁹ It was not till the 29th October, which was the last day of the disturbances as it turned out, that the High Commissioner

¹ *Op. cit.* in footnotes on preceding page.

² The Commission consisted of two members: a former Chief Justice of the Straits Settlements, Sir William Murison, and the Attorney-General of Palestine, Mr. Trusted. The Murison Commission's report is dated the 4th January, 1934.

³ 'The idea of a demonstration at Jaffa originated from the Arab Executive in Jerusalem. The date originally fixed for it was the 20th October, but it was said that this was afterwards altered to the 27th because the Jaffa Lawn Tennis Tournament was fixed for the 20th, and one of the leaders was much interested in the tournament' (*op. cit.*, p. 93). If this detail is correct, it shows how deliberate and cold-blooded the disorders were, and how far they were removed from being a spontaneous outcome of the distress among the upland fallāhīn in whose name they were organized. A starving peasant does not postpone his outbreak for a week in order to make sure of getting in a tennis-party.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 101-2.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 102.

⁷ See *op. cit.*, *passim*, but particularly pp. 104-5.

⁸ 'These disturbances were aimed against the Government and not against the Jews'—*op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 105.

proclaimed the emergency law entitled the Palestine Defence Order in Council, 1931.

On the 9th December, 1933, the police had to deal at Tel Aviv with a somewhat similar disturbance which arose out of an illegal procession of Zionist Revisionists in protest against the measures which the Palestine Government had taken¹ to detect and deport illicit immigrants. In this disturbance at Tel Aviv, eighteen policemen (British and Jewish) appear to have sustained injuries, and twenty persons to have been arrested.

As a sequel to the foregoing Arab disturbances, three persons were prosecuted on the charge of having taken part in the first disturbance at Jerusalem, and eighteen on the charge of having taken part in the disturbance at Jaffa.² In both trials, appeals were lodged against the convictions which were arrived at by the court of first instance; and in both cases these convictions were upheld by the court of appeal. The appellants, however, were given the option—as an alternative to serving the terms of imprisonment to which they had been condemned—of release on probation if they would consent to be bound over for three years, without thereby being debarred from engaging in lawful political activities. These terms were accepted by all the prisoners but one, who served a sentence of six months' imprisonment and was then placed under police supervision for a further period of twelve months.

The tact and conciliatoriness which the Mandatory Power in Palestine displayed in its handling of the Arab disturbances of the autumn of 1933 did not prevent this affair from producing widespread repercussions in other Arab countries.

In Transjordan, there were sympathetic strikes and demonstrations at 'Ammān and As-Salt on the 28th October, 1933; and the Amīr 'Abdu'llāh's efforts to calm the feelings of the demonstrators in front of his palace by making them a sympathetic speech³ did not avert a repetition of the demonstrations; first on the 31st October and then again on the 3rd November. On this second occasion, Peake Pasha, the British commanding officer of the Arab Legion, was pelted with date-stones by boys who recognized him as he was driving

¹ See p. 256, above.

² Both groups of prisoners included the secretary of the Arab Executive, Jamāl Efendī al-Husaynī, as well as the Shaykh 'Abdu'l-Qādir al-Muzaffar.

³ The Amīr seems to have been so far moved by the demonstration of his subjects' feelings as to have written a letter, on the same day, to the High Commissioner at Jerusalem, protesting in friendly terms against the persistence of illicit Jewish immigration into Cisjordanian Palestine (*Oriente Moderno*, December 1933, p. 641). An ancient historian will be reminded of the correspondence between Herod Antipas and Pilate.

through the streets of 'Ammān in his car. In reply to this not very formidable demonstration, the Transjordanian Government proclaimed a state of siege.¹ At Damascus, on the 3rd-7th November, 1933, there were demonstrations in protest against the Balfour Declaration; and on the first of these days there was a shooting incident between the crowd and the police, in which two members of the public were wounded and one (a Kurd) was killed. In 'Irāq there were demonstrations both at Baghdad and at Mosul—those at Baghdad finding a forum in the mosques, in the press and in parliament. In Egypt, the *Wafd* telegraphed its expressions of sympathy to the Palestine Arab Executive as early as the 29th October, and there were demonstrations in the mosques on the 3rd November. Similar expressions of sympathy came in from the Muslim diaspora *in partibus infidelium*, from as far afield as India in one direction and Jugoslavia in another; but perhaps the most impressive of all the manifestations of solidarity was the Persian.

Ever since the recrudescence of Imāmī Shi'ism and the unification of Persia into a single state—with Imāmī Shi'ism as its established religion—towards the beginning of the sixteenth century of the Christian Era, the Persians had been living in a state of moral alienation from the Sunnī Muslims west and east of them.² The response which was evoked in Persia in the last decade of the nineteenth century by the Pan-Islamic Movement was one of the first signs that this moral isolation was breaking down; and now, in the fourth decade of the twentieth century, when Persia's neighbour Turkey—who had been the last refuge of the Sunnī Caliphate—was deliberately repudiating the tradition of Muslim solidarity, the Persians, in their sympathy with the Arab cause in Palestine, were making a motion to go back upon their own previous secession from the Islamic body social. The initiative in this Persian move appears to have been taken by the Shi'ī ulamā of Qum:³ the 'die-hards' of the Imāmī Shi'ite tradition, whose last historic exploit had been to veto Rizā Khān Pahlawī's project of turning Persia into a republic on the recent Turkish precedent.⁴ On the 17th December, 1933, speeches on behalf of the Palestinian Arabs were made in the Majlis at Tihirān; and on the 16th January, 1934, the Persian Minister accredited to the Court of Egypt, *en voyage* between Persia and Cairo, broke his journey at Jerusalem and was given a state reception in the

¹ Text of proclamation in *Oriente Moderno*, December 1933, p. 641.

² See A. J. Toynbee: *A Study of History*, vol. i (London, 1934, Milford), pp. 388-400.

³ *Oriente Moderno*, December 1933, p. 618.

⁴ For this incident, see the *Survey for 1925*, Vol. i, pp. 536-7.

Haramu-'sh-Sharif by the Permanent Representation of the Jerusalem Muslim Congress¹ in association with the Afghan Minister from Cairo, who had just completed a ten-days' religious retreat in the Mosque of Al-Aqsā.

These repercussions of the autumn disturbances in Palestine were interesting, not only for the light which they threw upon the general tendencies of the day in the Islamic World as a whole, but also in their bearing upon the local question of the economic future of Palestine. The lesson of Palestine's extraordinary economic development since the close of the General War of 1914-18 was that this fragment of Arab Asia had promising material prospects if she could succeed in resuming her historic rôle as an *entrepôt* for the regions round about. For playing this part, geographical position and business ability were not in themselves enough; a third indispensable requisite was a state of good will between the Jewish men of business who were seeking to build the economic fortunes of Palestine up and their future Gentile correspondents in Egypt and Syria and 'Irāq and Persia; and the sensitiveness of public feeling, throughout Palestine's Middle Eastern economic hinterland, to the political atmosphere in Palestine itself would suggest that Palestine's economic problem abroad could hardly be solved apart from a solution of the political problem in the interior of the country.

Thus, perhaps, the hard-pressed Arab peasantry of the hill country of Ephraim unwittingly held in its hands the key which alone could unlock the door of the Zionist's eagerly sought earthly paradise. If these unconscious instruments of propaganda could plausibly be represented, to the Arab World at large, as being victims of the Jewish ambition to re-establish a Jewish national home in Palestine, then their plight might continue to be turned to contentious political account, and an obscure local community of fallāhīn might thus become a lode-stone for attracting a massive Arab opposition to Zionist aims from as far afield as Baghdad and Riyād and Mecca and Cairo and Aleppo. On the other hand, if it became manifest, beyond question, that the sufferings of the Arab peasantry in the hill country of Ephraim were in no way due to Jewish immigration into Palestine, but on the contrary were actually being mitigated and relieved by the general prosperity, both private and public, which this Jewish immigration had brought in its train, then, conversely, it might be hoped that a gradual improvement in the condition of the Palestinian Arab fallāhīn might afford the basis for a reconciliation between Jews and Arabs throughout the Middle East.

¹ See section (i) (b) of this part of the present volume.

If and when that reconciliation became manifest, a Western observer of Middle Eastern affairs would begin to feel some assurance that the astonishing 'boom' which had prevailed in Palestine since 1930 was not an ephemeral phenomenon but was the outward visible sign of a durable and substantial economic renaissance.

(vii) The Non-Ratification of the Syro-French Treaty signed on the 16th November, 1933

The emancipation of the Kingdom of 'Irāq from the mandatory régime on the 3rd October, 1932, through admission to membership of the League of Nations,¹ automatically brought into force the 'Irāqī-British treaty which had been signed, in anticipation of this event, on the 30th June, 1930.² When a treaty, avowedly on this model, between Syria and France was subsequently signed on the 16th November, 1933, it might have seemed as though a long step had been taken towards a similar emancipation of the adjoining Arabic-speaking country which lay between 'Irāq and the Mediterranean, and which was traditionally known by the name of Syria throughout its length from the Amanus Mountains on the north to the Gulf of 'Aqabah on the south.³ The Syria, however, which was one of the two parties to the treaty of the 16th November, 1933, was very far from being coextensive with the Syria of tradition; for the victorious Allied Powers who had received mandates in the Asiatic Arabic-speaking countries that had formerly been provinces of the Ottoman Empire had pursued contrary policies in the eastern and in the western portions of the region which their victory over Turkey in the war of 1914-18 had brought under their control. In the eastern portion—that is to say, in 'Irāq—the British Mandatory Power had done its utmost, since the suppression of the insurrection of 1920, to unify the country and at the same time to nurse it, with the greatest possible rapidity, into becoming a genuinely self-governing unitary state. In the western portion, on the other hand—that is to say, in Syria in the wider sense of the term—the British and French Mandatories had divided the country into two separate mandated areas—Palestine under a British mandate, and Syria-and-the-Lebanon under a French mandate—and they had then each proceeded to divide and subdivide their respective mandated territories: Palestine into Palestine Proper and Transjordan; Syria-and-the-Lebanon into

¹ See the present volume, section (ii) (d) of this part.

² See the *Survey for 1930*, Part III, section (vi).

³ For the physical boundaries of Syria in the traditional meaning of the name see the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 347-8.

a Syrian and a Lebanese state; and Syria itself into the state of Syria Proper and the two separate Governments of Lādiqīyah (originally styled the 'Alawīyīn) and the Jabalu'd-Durūz. Even within this post-war Syria in the narrowest sense, which was the Syrian party to the Syro-French treaty of the 16th November, 1933, the Turkish-speaking Sanjāq of Alexandretta was endowed with a special régime.¹ At the same time, in these fragments of Syria, both the British and the French showed themselves distinctly less zealous in fostering self-government than the British showed themselves in 'Irāq.

This differentiation in the Mandatory Powers' treatment of 'Irāq on the one hand and the Syrian territories on the other was a political paradox, because the heterogeneity of the population, which was the declared obstacle both to unity and to self-government in the Syrian territories, was at least as strongly pronounced in 'Irāq,² where it did not deter the Mandatory Power from pressing forward towards the goal of self-government on a unitary basis, while in political maturity, as measured by a familiarity with Western institutions, there could be no doubt that the Syrian Arabs were more ripe than the 'Irāqī Arabs for managing their own affairs.

The readiness of the Mandatory Powers to emancipate their wards was, indeed, in exact inverse ratio to the actual degree of these wards' maturity. 'Irāq, which was the least mature of all the Arabic-speaking countries in question, attained full emancipation on the 3rd October, 1932.³ The next least mature of these countries—namely Transjordan and Syria in the narrow sense of the term—were placed in treaty-relations with the respective Mandatory Powers by the signature of a Transjordanian-British agreement on the 20th February, 1928,⁴ and of a Syro-French treaty on the

¹ For the genesis of these post-war divisions and sub-divisions of Syria see the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 346-66.

² *Pace* the statement to the opposite effect that was made in the Chamber of Deputies at Paris by the French Prime Minister on the 30th March, 1933.

³ See the present volume, section (ii) (d) of this part.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (vi), pp. 321-8. A further Agreement, supplementary to that of the 20th February, 1928, was signed at Jerusalem on the 2nd June, 1934, by the British High Commissioner in Palestine and a representative of the Transjordanian Government (text in *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan for the year 1934*—Colonial No. 104, 1935, Appendix VI). The supplementary agreement modified Article 1 and the first paragraph of Article 7 of the agreement of 1928. The Amīr of Transjordan was now empowered to appoint consular representatives in neighbouring Arab states; he was relieved of the financial charge for salaries, expenses, and accommodation of the British Resident and his staff; and the previous stipulation that 'the customs-tariff in 'Transjordan' should be approved by His Britannic Majesty' was struck out, though it was still agreed that there should be no

16th November, 1933. On the other hand, at the time of writing in the spring of 1935, neither the British nor the French Government had yet shown any intention, in regard to Palestine Proper and the Lebanon, of even going so far as to translate the tutelage of the mandatory régime into treaty form, though Palestine and the Lebanon were undoubtedly the least immature of all the Arabic-speaking countries under mandate. In a colloquy with the Permanent Mandates Commission at Geneva on the 1st December, 1932,¹ the then High Commissioner of the French Government for their Levantine mandated territories, Monsieur Ponsot, found himself quite unable to suggest a serious reason why the Mandatory Power should be contemplating, as it was at the time, the negotiation of a treaty with Syria alone, and not with the Lebanon as well. The unavowed reason was, perhaps, that in the Lebanon the French were unwilling to relax their control for fear of this leading to a break-up of the Greater Lebanon which they had created on the 31st August, 1920.² As for Palestine west of Jordan, British statesmen had often frankly avowed³ that they could not foresee a time when they would feel able to emancipate this territory, because emancipation would mean the destruction, by the local Arab majority, of the Jewish National Home which the British had caused themselves to be enjoined to establish in Palestine by the terms of their mandate.

This British readiness to postpone the advent of self-government in Palestine for an indefinite time to come, for the sake of ensuring the establishment there of a national home for an immigrant Jewish minority, presented a striking contrast to the contemporary British readiness in 'Irāq to sacrifice the immigrant Assyrian minority's aspirations for a national home there for the sake of hastening on the political emancipation of the 'Irāqī Arab national state. Similarly, we may contrast the French policy of satisfying the aspirations of the religious and linguistic minorities in Syria—the non-Muslim Druses and 'Alawīyīn and the non-Arabic-speaking Turks of the sanjāq of Alexandretta—by the grant of a measure of territorial autonomy, with the unwillingness of the British in 'Irāq to provide in this way for the Shī'īs or the Yazīdīs or the Turks and Kurds. On the merits of the case, the Jabal Sinjār had as good a claim to territorial autonomy as the Jabalu'd-Durūz, the Shī'īs of Southern 'Irāq

customs barrier between Palestine and Transjordan except by agreement between the two countries.

¹ Minutes of the Permanent Mandates Commission, Twenty-Second Session, p. 263.

² See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 355-6.

³ See *op. cit.*, p. 394, and the *Survey for 1930*, p. 260.

as the 'Alawīyīn of the Jabal Ansariyah, and the Turks and Kurds of Kirkūk and Arbīl and Sulaymānīyah as the Turks of Antioch and Alexandretta. On the other hand, if the unificatory British policy in 'Irāq were to be proved, by the outcome, to have been the right policy there, then there would be little to be said for the Anglo-French policy of sub-division in Palestine and Syria. Linguistically, 'Iraq was actually much less of a unity than the Syrian territories were; for the Circassian, Jewish, Armenian and other non-Arabic-speaking elements in the Syrian territories were not comparable in numbers with the non-Arabic-speaking Kurds and Yazīdīs and Turks and Assyrians in 'Irāq. In heterogeneity of religion, the two regions were approximately on a par with one another. In administrative tradition both alike had previously been articulated into a hierarchy of Ottoman vilāyets, sanjāqs and qazās whose boundaries had been drawn without regard either to religion or to language.

The sole difference in this respect was the existence in the Syrian area, since A.D. 1861, of a special régime in the Lebanon sanjāq: a province that had been carved out of the main body of the Ottoman Empire, by international action, in order to confer a measure of autonomy, which was likewise internationally guaranteed, upon a local Christian population.¹ By the time when the Arabic-speaking provinces of the Ottoman Empire came under French and British control after the General War of 1914-18, the establishment of this national home in the Lebanon for a majority of the Arabic-speaking Christians of Syria was a long-since accomplished fact; and this fact was taken account of in the terms of the French mandate, which was conferred upon France for Syria and the Lebanon, and which required the Mandatory Power (Art. 1) 'to facilitate the progressive development of Syria and the Lebanon as independent states'.² In regard to the Lebanon, and the Lebanon alone, the post-war dissection of the Syrian territories was fore-ordained by the pre-war situation.

On all other points the contrast between the dissected post-war map of the Syrian territories and the unified post-war map of 'Irāq was the consequence, not of any antecedent difference in the local conditions, but of an arbitrary local diversity in the policies of the Mandatory Powers. In 'Irāq the British had decided to risk the welfare of minorities for the sake of bringing into existence a unitary sovereign independent state at the earliest possible date. On the other hand,

¹ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, p. 354.

² On this point see the colloquy between Monsieur Ponsot and the Permanent Mandates Commission in the minutes of the Permanent Mandates Commission, Twenty-Second Session (November-December 1932), pp. 263-5.

in the Syrian Arabic-speaking territories between 'Irāq and the Mediterranean, both the British and the French had decided to postpone the attainment of sovereign independence for an indefinite time to come for the sake of safeguarding the welfare of minorities. Time alone could show which of these two diverse policies was the more beneficial on the whole; and it was not, in itself, unreasonable to try a variety of political experiments in the *terra politicè incognita* of these mandates of the 'A' class in the Middle East. At the same time, an impartial observer might have been inclined to regard the relatively mature Syria as the more propitious forcing-ground for a sovereign independent unitary state, and the relatively backward 'Irāq as the more natural field for experimenting in a prolonged tutelage for the benefit of minorities. The actual course of events, in which the two diverse policies were respectively put into action in the opposite areas, entailed a wanton aggravation of the intrinsic difficulties of the task which would be an inexplicable paradox if the Mandatory Powers were to be credited with an exclusive and disinterested devotion to their public duties. The paradox could be resolved, however, on the hypothesis that, in both areas, both Mandatory Powers were seeking all the time to reconcile their public duties with their local view of their own private interests. The British policy in 'Irāq could be explained as the outcome of a local application of the newfangled idea that, in twentieth-century Oriental countries, a nineteenth-century form of Western Imperialism was no longer 'a paying proposition'.¹ Conversely, the Anglo-French policy in Transjordan, 'Syria' (in the post-war sense), the Lebanon and Palestine could be explained on the supposition that, in this region, the British as well as the French Government were still persisting in their nineteenth-century 'Imperialist' point of view. In this chapter we have to follow the workings of the more old-fashioned policies in the Syrian territories under French mandate.

In previous volumes of this series² some account has been given of the constitutional development of the Greater Lebanon Republic which had been created by a French act on the 31st August, 1920. The Lebanese had been allowed to frame for themselves an ultra-democratic parliamentary Constitution which had come into force on the 23rd May, 1926. Thereafter, in the light of experience, this Constitution had been modified, by the successive constitutional laws of the 17th October, 1927, and the 8th May, 1929, in the direction of increasing the executive powers of the President of the Republic.

¹ See pp. 111-12, above.

² See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 441-3, and the *Survey for 1930*, p. 304.

In spite of these modifications, the Lebanese Constitution proved to be excessively costly to the country—not only on account of its elaborateness, but also owing to the financial corruption for which the multiplication of public offices gave opportunities—and this partly superfluous and partly illegitimate burden upon the resources of a small and poor country became intolerable when the Lebanon was overtaken by the onset of the world economic crisis: a social calamity which fell with particular severity upon a state that was largely dependent, for its national income, upon its foreign trade and the remittances of its emigrants. Economies in the judicial and educational departments, which were effected early in the year 1930, proved insufficient; and thereafter 77 out of the 111 schools which had been closed had to be opened again owing to the dissatisfaction of the Muslim element in the community with an economy which had borne disproportionately hard upon Muslim children.¹ In the spring of 1931, the popular feeling displayed itself in demonstrations in Christian Bayrūt against the cinemas and the tramway and electricity companies, and in Sunnī Tarabulus (Tripoli) against the Italian conquerors of the 'Tripolitans' co-religionists in North Africa.² In these circumstances, on the 9th May, 1932, the French High Commissioner in the Levant promulgated two *arrêtés*³ partially suspending the existing Constitution of the Lebanese Republic and conferring legislative power—particularly over the budget—upon the President of the Republic, Monsieur Charles Dabbās, who was to act on the advice of a council composed of the heads of the seven public services. The sessions of the Chamber were suspended.

This drastic intervention on the Mandatory Power's part was greeted with popular demonstrations of approbation which were certainly widespread and were also, to all appearance, genuine; and the popular expectations were largely fulfilled on the financial side by the rapid achievement of sweeping economies in the conduct of public business. On the other hand, an attempt to bring corrupt public servants to account was frustrated by the influence of the relatives and friends of the accused and by the collusive procrastination of the judicial authorities; and eventually all persons who were awaiting trial on this account obtained the benefit of a general amnesty on the 1st September, 1933.⁴

¹ French Government: *Rapport sur la Situation de la Syrie et du Liban, 1930* (Paris, 1931, Imprimerie Nationale), pp. 10-11.

² *Rapport 1931*, pp. 9-10.

³ Texts in *Oriente Moderno*, June 1932, pp. 277-8.

⁴ *Rapport 1932*, p. 9; *Rapport 1933*, pp. 12-13; Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission (May-June 1934), p. 75.

The emergency régime which had been introduced in the Lebanon on the 9th May, 1932, was brought to an end on the 2nd January, 1934. On that date Monsieur Dabbās' resignation was tendered and accepted in an exchange of letters between the Head of the Lebanese Government and the French High Commissioner in the Levant; and on the same date the High Commissioner promulgated four *arrêtés*: one¹ provisionally reorganizing the public administration in the Lebanon; a second embodying a new electoral law for the Lebanese Republic; a third nominating a Maronite elder statesman, Habib Pasha as-Sa'd,² to a year's term of office as President of the Republic; and a fourth conferring the powers of Head of the State, under the High Commissioner's previous *arrêté* of the 9th May, 1932, upon a French official pending the new President's assumption of office. Under this new provisional Constitution, the parliamentary element in the government of the Lebanon was restored; but the Chamber was now deprived of all power to initiate expenditure (Art. 31), and in the last resort the President was empowered to pass the budget over the deputies' heads. Moreover, seven out of the twenty-five deputies were to be the President's nominees (Art. 4). The executive power was conferred upon the President, who was to be assisted by a Secretary of State (Art. 3) and, for certain purposes, by a Government Council (Arts. 3, 6, 33, 42, 43). The Secretary of State, and most other public officers, were to be the President's appointees (Art. 38).

Under this Constitution, which was possibly better suited to a politically adolescent country in time of crisis than the more elaborate Constitution of 1926, the Lebanon was still living, at the time of writing in the spring of 1935, without any apparent intention on the French side of liquidating the mandate or any overt agitation on the Lebanese side for political emancipation on the 'Irāqī precedent. On the other hand, by this date, the development in relations between Great Britain and the Kingdom of 'Irāq had had a profound effect upon the relations between France and the state of Syria.

In a previous volume in this series,³ the history of Franco-Syrian relations has been carried down to the 22nd May, 1930, when the French High Commissioner in the Levant published a set of six *arrêtés*, signed by him on the 14th of that month, in which he dissolved the Syrian Constituent Assembly and at the same time promulgated, by his own unilateral act, a Constitution for the state of Syria, a *règlement organique* for the sanjāq of Alexandretta, two

¹ Text in *Oriente Moderno*, February 1934, pp. 66-9.

² For Habib Pasha as-Sa'd's previous career see *Oriente Moderno*, February 1934, p. 74.

³ *The Survey for 1930*, pp. 310-14.

statuts organiques for the government of Lādiqiyah and the government of Jabalu'd-Durūz respectively, and a *règlement organique* setting up a Conference on Common Interests (particularly on customs administration) between the Governments of the states under French mandate in the Levant. The new Constitutions for Alexandretta, Lādiqiyah and Jabalu'd-Durūz did little more than confirm the existing régime in each of these three territories; and they were put into force without delay and without disturbance.¹ The application of the new Constitution for the state of Syria was a more delicate matter; for although for the most part it was identical with the text that had been drafted by the Syrian Constituent Assembly, the modifications introduced by the French High Commissioner were highly contentious;² and the French variation upon the original Syrian text was rendered still more unpopular by the rather high-handed manner of its promulgation. Meanwhile, the state of Syria continued to be administered by the Provisional Government under the Presidency of Shaykh Tāju'd-Dīn which had been set up by the French High Commissioner on the 14th February, 1928;³ and it was only towards the end of the year 1931 that steps were taken to bring the new Syrian Constitution into operation.

On the 19th November, 1931, the French High Commissioner addressed a letter to Shaykh Tāju'd-Dīn heralding the termination of the provisional régime and announcing that free elections for a Syrian Chamber of Deputies would be held in January 1932. On the same date the High Commissioner promulgated three *arrêtés*: one setting up a Consultative Council in view of the putting into force of the Syrian Constitution; a second reorganizing the Syrian Government services pending the entry of the Constitution into force; and a third modifying the existing regulations for the conduct of elections.⁴ The new Consultative Council held its first meeting on the 7th December, 1931, at Damascus; and on this occasion the French High Commissioner, in a public statement,⁵ drew attention to the fact that on the 11th June, 1931, during the twentieth session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, and again on the 4th September, 1931, during the sixty-fourth session of the League Council, the French representatives at Geneva had intimated the French Government's acceptance of the principle that the proper road to the emancipation of a territory under a mandate of the 'A' class lay through the negotiation of a

¹ *Rapport 1930*, p. 4.

² *The Survey for 1930*, pp. 307-10.

³ *Op cit.*, pp. 305-6.

⁴ Texts of the letter and the three *arrêtés* (with annexes) in *Oriente Moderno*, December 1931, pp. 575-8, and in *Rapport 1931*, pp. 177-83.

⁵ Text in *Rapport 1931*, pp. 184-6.

treaty between the state under mandate and the Mandatory Power. He informed his audience that the purpose of the forthcoming elections was to convene a Syrian parliament with which the French authorities would be able to negotiate for this purpose.

The Syrian elections in the first degree were duly held on the 20th December, 1931; but in the electoral districts of Damascus, Dūmā and Hamāh the polling precipitated disorders which moved the High Commissioner to cancel the proceedings and order the elections to be held again. Elsewhere, the elections in the second degree took place on the 5th January, 1932; and in the three disturbed districts the supplementary proceedings took place on the 30th March and the 6th April, 1932, respectively. These supplementary elections were won by the Syrian nationalists; and the combined results produced a Chamber, consisting of 54 'moderates' and 17 nationalists, which assembled at Damascus on the 7th June, 1932.

It might have been expected that a Chamber of this complexion would prove not unaccommodating in its negotiations with the Mandatory Power. Feelings were embittered, however, on the Syrian side, by a belief that the moderate majority was due to the exertion of illegitimate pressure by the mandatory authorities; this belief was not extinguished when—at the instance of the nationalist minority which had won the supplementary elections—the results were declared valid by the Chamber itself;¹ and, from the moment when the Chamber assembled, the nationalist minority began to establish over the moderate majority an ascendancy which tended steadily to increase. At this stage it was the policy of the nationalists to co-operate, and two nationalist Ministers found a place, side by side with two moderates, in the Cabinet which was formed under the presidency of Haqqī Bey al-'Azm. The treaty negotiations with this new Syrian Government were opened by the French High Commissioner before the end of the calendar year;² but they do not seem to have been taken up vigorously until the beginning of February 1933; and the result of this delay was to strengthen the hands of the nationalists and so to stiffen the opposition.

This opposition mainly arose out of the policy of dividing and subdividing the mandated territory which had been pursued from

¹ On this point see the statement made to the Permanent Mandates Commission by the French High Commissioner, Monsieur Ponsot, on the 1st December, 1932. (Minutes of the Twenty-Second Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, pp. 260-1.)

² Statement by Monsieur de Caix to the Permanent Mandates Commission on the 4th June, 1934. (Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 56.)

the outset by the Mandatory Power. To begin with, the terms of the French mandate envisaged the eventual emancipation of two separate states, Syria and the Lebanon; and there were few Syrian nationalists who disputed the Lebanon's title to independence (though, at the same time, there were equally few who acquiesced in the annexation to the Lebanon of the additional territories—Tarabulus; Sūr and Saydā; the Biqā'¹—which had been assigned to the Lebanon at Syria's expense in 1920).² In a colloquy with the Permanent Mandates Commission on the 1st December, 1932,³ Monsieur Ponsot admitted that, of the various portions into which the French mandated territory had been carved, Syria and the Lebanon were the only two that possessed 'an international vocation' in the sense of being entitled to look forward to an eventual emancipation with the status of sovereign independent states. At the other extreme, Monsieur Ponsot admitted, on the same occasion, that the sanjāq of Alexandretta was 'simply a Syrian province' which 'enjoyed a special administrative régime'. The crux was the status of the two 'governments' of Lādiqiyah and Jabalu'd-Durūz; for while, on the one hand, these were admittedly disqualified from eventually maturing into independent states, on the other hand they were excluded from the domain of the Syria which had been endowed with the Constitution of the 14th May, 1930, and which was to be the Syrian party to the projected Franco-Syrian treaty. 'In the near future', Monsieur Ponsot observed to the Mandates Commission, 'we shall have a treaty zone and a mandate zone';⁴ and the effect of this differentiation within the French mandated territory would be virtually to cut off the Syrian party to the treaty from access to the sea—the Syrian ports of Sūr, Saydā and Tarabulus being now annexed to the Lebanon, while Lādiqiyah remained autonomous and the nominally Syrian port of Alexandretta enjoyed a special régime.

The approaching prospect of a fresh advance towards the emancipation of the state of Syria brought the question of division versus union to the front and excited hopes and fears on all sides. In the Jabalu'd-Durūz, where the non-Druse minorities in the population were very small,⁵ the Government Council had conveyed to Monsieur

¹ The Syrians do not seem to have set their hearts upon the recovery of the city of Bayrūt, which had been annexed to the Lebanon simultaneously. Bayrūt was an enclave in territory that was indisputably Lebanese, and it was a predominantly Christian city.

² See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, p. 355.

³ Minutes of the Twenty-Second Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, pp. 263-5.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 264.

⁵ Only 1,000 Sunnis and 7,500 Christians out of a total population of 65,000, according to Monsieur Ponsot, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

Ponsot, on the 2nd November, 1932, the desire of the Druse community that the Jabal should be assured of retaining its independence *vis-à-vis* Syria. The Ansariyah community was equally concerned on behalf of the independence of the government of Lādiqiyah—though here a vigorous campaign in favour of re-union with Syria was maintained by the Sunnī minority, who in 1933 were reckoned by the mandatory authorities to amount to 17 per cent. of the population of the district¹ and to 80 per cent. of the population of the city of Lādiqiyah itself. On the other side, the Syrian nationalists were determined not to enter into a treaty with the French which would signify their acquiescence in the separation from Syria of the several territories that had been detached from it during and since the Peace Settlement of 1919-20.

These conflicting aspirations in Syria had their repercussions at Geneva as well as on the spot.

At Geneva the Permanent Mandates Commission, during its twenty-fourth session (23rd October-4th November, 1933), had to deal with no less than twenty-two petitions in five series, regarding the political organization of Syria and the Lebanon. The Commission's *rapporteur* on these petitions, Monsieur Rappard, observed in his report² that

they are of two characters, which clearly distinguish them from most of the petitions the Commission is usually called upon to consider. On the one hand, they do not voice the dissatisfaction aroused by a particular act of the Mandatory Power or one of its agents, but they lay before us various desires and complaints in regard to its general policy. On the other hand, and in particular, they do not refer to past acts, but to the presumed intentions of the Mandatory Power as regards the future.

The gist of these petitions, as analysed in the same report, was as follows:

The first series, comprising seven petitions, emanates from signatories living in the state of Syria properly so called, and are all in favour of a policy of unity. The second series, comprising five petitions, emanates from 'Alawiyin and Ismā'ilis living in the territory of the Government of Lādiqiyah. The authors of these petitions are hostile to unity and favour the autonomy or even the independence of their territory. The third series, comprising four petitions, emanates from Christians in the government of Lādiqiyah. Two are hostile and two favourable to unity. Two of the three petitions of the fourth series come from Sunnī Muslims of Lādiqiyah and of Jabalah and favour union with Syria. The third, signed by 'Uthmān-Zaydān in the name of the 'Alawī youth, is

¹ *Rapport 1933*, p. 9: Sunnīs 17 per cent., Christians 14 per cent., Ansariyah 69 per cent.

² Minutes of the Twenty-Fourth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, pp. 116-19.

dated from Banyas and expresses contrary aspirations. Lastly, the fifth series, comprising three petitions, shows even less homogeneity in the character of its signatories. The first, bearing more than 600 signatures, is dated from Tarabulus; the second, coming from a Muslim of Bayrūt, is signed 'For the Youth of Bayrūt', but bears only one signature, which the Mandatory Power tells us is that of the owner of a racing stable who has hitherto taken no part in politics. The last, dated from Bayrūt, bears the signatures of some fifty Muslim small traders, a few Druses and a few Orthodox Greeks. These three petitions are in favour of unity.

In short, and without analysing them now or adverting to the various demands unconnected with the central problem of future policy, all these petitions contain the following characteristics: the petitioners from Syria, properly so called, the representatives of the Muslim minority in the Government of Lādiqiyah and a few other Christian or Muslim elements of Lādiqiyah and Bayrūt are in favour of unity with or without explicit mention of decentralization. The 'Alawiyin of the Government of Lādiqiyah and the Christians and Ismā'ilis of the same region are hostile to the policy of unity and in favour of autonomy or independence with or without the collaboration of France.

The *rapporteur* made the following observations on the action to be taken, on the assumption that 'all the wishes of the petitioners contrary to the provisions of the mandate must be set aside', while 'the Mandatory Power' was 'free to satisfy any that' were 'in accordance with the mandate'.

The authority of the Mandatory Power in the Levant extends to Syria and the Lebanon. The frontiers separating these two countries from their neighbours have been fixed by international conventions. This is not the case with the frontiers separating these territories from each other. All that may be affirmed in accordance with the Covenant and the mandate is that, within the region entrusted to the mandate of France in the Levant, all that is not Syria is the Lebanon, and all that is not the Lebanon is Syria.

Consequently, to ask for independence for a territory which is neither Syria nor the Lebanon, as do certain petitioners in the Government of Lādiqiyah, is to express a wish contrary to the mandate, if by independence the petitioners mean the breaking of all connexion with Syria or the Lebanon.

Contrary to the mandate, too, would be the demand for the fusion of the Lebanon and Syria, since, according to Article 1 of the mandate, the Mandatory Power must 'enact measures to facilitate the progressive development of Syria and the Lebanon as independent states'.

Moreover, the mandate does not exclude—indeed, it actually calls for—the constitution of autonomous regions within the two mandated territories. The efforts of the Mandatory Power to establish local autonomy therefore seem fully in accordance, not only with Article 1 of the mandate, in which the Mandatory is asked to 'encourage local autonomy as far as circumstances permit', but also with the protection of minorities,

which it has to ensure under Article 8 of the mandate. The wishes of the petitioners, in so far as they relate to the establishment in Syria of a unitary state, thus seem as much contrary to the mandate as those of their opponents who would like independence to be granted to a territory which would be neither Syria nor the Lebanon.

In the light of these considerations, the Commission included the following passage in its report to the League Council:

The Commission,

Having taken cognisance of the petitions in five series regarding the general organization of the territories of the Levant under French mandate transmitted by the French Government in its letter of the 16th June, 1933;

Having heard, on the subject of these petitions, the accredited representative of the Mandatory Power at the present session, and bearing in mind the statements made by the High Commissioner for Syria and the Lebanon at its twenty-second session:

Considers that the petitioners' wishes for the creation in Syria of a unitary state as well as their wish that full independence should be granted to any part of the territory under mandate other than Syria or the Lebanon are contrary to the fundamental charter of the mandate;

Wishes the Mandatory Power all success in the difficult task in which it is engaged of reconciling the aspirations towards full independence of the populations placed under its tutelage with the guaranteeing of the rights and interests of the minorities among these populations.

Meanwhile, in Syria, the conversations on the subject of the projected treaty, which were resumed, in February 1933, between the French High Commissioner and the Syrian Government, were being carried on to the accompaniment of a rising tension of feeling. In April, they were interrupted by the resignation of the two nationalist members of the Damascus Cabinet; and none of the nationalist deputies took part in a session on the 8th May at which the moderate majority of the Chamber gave the Government a unanimous vote of confidence in their policy of proceeding with the treaty negotiations.¹ At this juncture Monsieur Ponsot fell ill; and the negotiations were not resumed until after the arrival of his successor, Monsieur de Martel, at Bayrūt on the 12th October, 1933. Thereafter, on the 3rd November, there was a new outbreak of violence at Damascus, which was followed on the 14th by the resignation of one of the two moderates in the Cabinet. It was in these circumstances that, on the 16th November, the Cabinet empowered the Prime Minister, Haqqī Bey al-'Azm, to sign the treaty, and that the Prime Minister duly gave it his signature on the same day.

¹ The vote of confidence was explicitly on this point. See the extract from the Syrian Government's foregoing declaration to the Chamber in the Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 56.

This treaty of friendship and alliance between France and Syria was accompanied by two protocols and two exchanges of letters, all signed on the 16th November, 1933, like the treaty itself.¹ A first draft of the text of the treaty, and the general sense of the subsidiary agreements foreshadowed in the accompanying protocols, seem to have been agreed upon between the French High Commissioner and the Syrian Government during the negotiations in the spring of 1933, while Haqqī Bey's two nationalist colleagues were still in office.²

The second of the two protocols was 'concerned with the programme to be carried out in the course of a preparatory period' (reckoned tentatively at four years) 'in order to assure by agreement, and within the framework of the Syrian Constitution, the development of existing institutions with a view to the progressive transfer of responsibilities to the Syrian Government;' and it was laid down in the treaty (Art. 10) that the agreements foreshadowed in this protocol were to come into force immediately after the ratifications of the treaty had been exchanged. This protocol provided that there were to be agreements on military questions and on the organization of the Syrian national army; on the financial questions envisaged in the text of the mandate; and on the position of French officials in the service of the Syrian state. The French Government were progressively to take the Syrian Government into partnership in the conduct of Syria's foreign affairs. There was to be a special agreement—to rank as an integral part of the treaty—on the working of the services of common interest between the territories embraced under the French mandate in the Levant; and 'the necessity for the existence' of these services was explicitly acknowledged by both the contracting parties. The Syrian Government undertook to work out, in agreement with the French Government, the organic laws and legislative acts which might be necessary for giving effect to the guarantees contained in the existing Constitution of the state of Syria in favour of individuals and communities, particularly in the matter of equality before the law, liberty of conscience, respect for religious interests and personal statute, freedom of thought, freedom of teaching, admission to public office, and the representation of religious minorities. Upon the fulfilment of the foregoing programme, and as soon as the rate of progress might allow, the French Government

¹ Texts of all five documents in *Rapport 1933*, pp. 189-95, and in *Oriente Moderno*, December 1933, pp. 607-12. In the latter place there is also printed an explanatory *communiqué* of the 19th November, 1933, from the French High Commissioner.

² Statement by Monsieur de Caix in the Minutes of the Twenty-Fifth Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, p. 56.

were to use their good offices for obtaining the admission of Syria to membership of the League of Nations—the preparatory period being expected to extend to four years.

The admission of Syria to membership of the League, at whatever date this might be achieved, was to bring into force the treaty itself, as well as the agreements contemplated in the first of the two protocols attached to it (treaty, Art. 10). In this provision, the Franco-Syrian Treaty was deliberately drafted after the precedent of the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty of the 30th June, 1930;¹ and it also followed the same precedent in many points of substance. For example, the Franco-Syrian Treaty was likewise to run (Art. 9) for twenty-five years; and in Articles 1, 2, and 4, which related to concerted action in diplomacy and war, the text corresponded closely with that of Articles 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty.² Again, Article 5, like the article of the same number in the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty, stipulated for the maintenance, during the currency of the treaty, of armed forces, belonging to the ex-mandatory Power, on the territory of the party formerly under mandate. In this article, however, the latitude for which the French were asking was wider; for the article contemplated the maintenance of French military, air and naval forces on Syrian territory, or in Syrian territorial waters, without the specification of any geographical limits, whereas in the corresponding article of the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty the British forces were only to be stationed at air-bases which were to be leased to the British Government in certain specified districts along the desert fringe of the other party's country. There were also certain other points in which the draft Franco-Syrian Treaty imposed greater servitudes than had been imposed by the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty upon the non-European contracting party. The French as well as the Syrian Government were to have a say (Art. 6.) in the question of how many French technical advisers, judicial officers and officials were to be employed by the Syrian Government, and what their powers were to be. The value of maintaining the arrangements

¹ For the text of this treaty see *Documents on International Affairs 1930*, pp. 132-9.

² The chief differences between the terms of the two treaties in this set of articles were (i) that the Franco-Syrian Treaty, unlike the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty, provided that the other contracting party should be represented diplomatically, by the agents of the European contracting party, whenever she had no diplomatic representative of her own; and (ii) that in the Franco-Syrian Treaty the stipulation for concerted action in the event of war was couched in vague language which might possibly diminish, but might also possibly increase, the liabilities of the contracting parties if and when the contingency took effect.

actually in force, as between the several territories under French mandate in the Levant, for giving effect to their communities of economic interests was to be formally recognized by Syria (Art. 8). And the article guaranteeing the protection of minorities, which had been conspicuous by its absence in the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty,¹ was not omitted in the French Government's draft, in which Article 7 was to the following effect:

The Syrian Government undertakes to maintain in force the permanent guarantees of public law which are laid down in the Constitution of the state of Syria in favour of individuals and communities, and to give full effect to these guarantees.

In the matter of the rights, and the personal statute, of racial and religious minorities, it undertakes to insure them a treatment in conformity with the general principles which have been accepted by the League of Nations in this connexion.

The first of the two protocols provided for the conclusion of the military agreements which were implied in Article 5 of the treaty, the agreement on officials which was contemplated in Article 6, and the judicial, financial and establishment agreements which were required by the terms of the mandate.

The two exchanges of letters were both concerned with the vexed question of the future relations between the state of Syria and the two governments of Lādiqīyah and the Jabalu'd-Durūz. The first pair of letters provided that, as soon as the exchange of ratifications of the treaty had taken place, the two governments should be brought under the authority of the state of Syria in the two matters of judicial appeals and the administration of *awqāf*. In the second pair of letters, the Syrian Prime Minister declared that the Syrian Government regarded the two territories as forming part of Syria, but recognized at the same time that the particular situation of these regions made it necessary to assure to them a special régime which ought to be an expression of the wishes of their inhabitants. The French Government, in reply, set forth their own point of view in the matter:

The French Government is prepared to examine, immediately before the moment when the request for the admission of Syria to membership of the League of Nations will be presented, the modifications that it may be feasible to make in the existing position of these two autonomous governments. This examination will extend both to the definition of the régime of these two governments and to the conditions in which the administrative and financial autonomy, now enjoyed by them, is to be maintained and guaranteed. Properly qualified representatives of the populations concerned will be invited to take part in this study,

¹ See the present volume, pp. 198 *seqq.*, 285-8, above.

and the conclusions that are reached will not be put into effect without their consent.

When the documents which had been signed on the 16th November, 1933, were made public on the 19th, and were officially communicated to the Syrian Chamber on the 20th, they raised a storm. The treaty was denounced on the general ground that it failed to confer true sovereignty upon Syria while it set the seal upon the forfeiture of her unity; and particular objection was taken to Articles 5 and 8. In Syrian eyes, Article 5 appeared to provide for a French military occupation of the whole territory of the Syrian state, while Article 8 would have the effect of retaining in French hands the control of Syrian customs, postal services and indirect taxes, which, under the existing arrangements, were all being administered as matters of common economic interest to all the territories embraced under the French mandate. When the Chamber met on the 21st November, feeling ran so high that the High Commissioner suspended the sittings till the 25th, in order to prevent a debate on the treaty before it had been referred to committee; and on the 24th he suspended the session altogether. On the 25th, there was a general strike in Damascus, accompanied by disorders in which a woman lost her life.¹ On the 26th, the President of the Syrian Republic withdrew the text of the treaty from the cognisance of the Chamber, at the High Commissioner's request.² On the 30th the High Commissioner decided to empower the President provisionally to promulgate decree-laws, especially in budgetary matters, under the supervision of the High Commissioner himself. This decision was put into execution in an *arrêté* of the 7th December.

Thus the relations between France and Syria fell into a deadlock again, as had happened so many times before; and this deadlock was still unresolved at the time of writing in March 1935. In the annals of the intervening fifteen months the only entries were incidents which contributed nothing towards a solution of the Syrian problem. In March 1934, the salaries of the Syrian deputies were reduced, and the secretary and other officers of the Chamber were dismissed, as a measure of economy. On the 25th May, 1934, there was a demonstration at Aleppo which resulted in a number of arrests,

¹ While the treaty was arousing these passions in Damascus, similar emotions were being aroused among the 'Alawiyin by the text of the first pair of letters, against which a strong protest was made, on the 22nd November, by the President, together with all the 'Alawī and Christian members, of the Administrative Council of the Government of Lādiqiyah (*Rapport 1933*, p. 10).

² Text of the High Commissioner's letter of the 24th November, 1933, in *Rapport 1933*, p. 7.

and these in turn evoked a general strike at Aleppo on the 26th and at Homs, Hamāh and Damascus, as well as Aleppo, on the 28th. On the 2nd November, 1934, the French High Commissioner promulgated an *arrêté*¹ suspending the activities of the Syrian Chamber *sine die*.

Thus the post-War Arab state of Syria found itself deprived of self-government—not to speak of sovereign independence—more than two years after the completion of the political emancipation of the adjoining Arab kingdom of 'Irāq. Yet at this date it would still have been premature for an 'Irāqī to count himself politically more fortunate than his Syrian neighbour, or for an Englishman to assume that the British Government in 'Irāq had been either more successful or more altruistic than the French in Syria in their manner of discharging their mandatory responsibilities. It remained to be seen whether 'Irāq's early taste of the sweets of independence was really more desirable than the long-drawn-out bitterness of Syria's disappointed expectations. The Syrian Sunnīs were being shielded, against their will, by the conservative cautiousness of the French, from experiencing, in relation to the Druses and 'Alawiyin, those troubles which the 'Irāqī Sunnīs were encountering, at this very time, in their dealings with the local Assyrians and Shi'īs,² with whom the British had left them at liberty to cope as best they could. And as for the Mandatory Powers, the French, when they were charged with a reactionary Imperialism by the Syrian Sunnīs, might comfort themselves with the thought that at any rate they had avoided laying themselves open to the accusation of having abandoned the Druses and the 'Alawiyin to the fate to which the Assyrians had been abandoned by the British. In all these Middle Eastern countries, it was as important a part of the Mandatory Powers' duty to secure protection for the local minorities as it was to endow the local majorities with self-government; and, on this criterion, the Franco-Syrian Treaty of the 16th November, 1933, might not appear less statesmanlike, in retrospect, than the Anglo-'Irāqī Treaty of the 30th June, 1930.

(viii) The Definitive Settlement of the Frontier between 'Irāq and Syria

In previous volumes of this series,³ the history of the frontier between Syria and 'Irāq has been carried down to the year 1928.

¹ Text in *Oriente Moderno*, December 1934, p. 570.

² See section (ii) (b) above.

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (ix); and the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (ix).

There were two separate problems involved: the settlement of the frontier line itself; and the working out of satisfactory arrangements for collaboration between the authorities on either side for dealing with the seasonal migration, across the frontier, of nomadic pastoral tribes.

The frontier agreed upon in the Franco-British Convention of the 23rd December, 1920, had been an imaginary line drawn upon a map without sufficient knowledge or consideration of the actual conditions on the spot. Its most glaring defect was that it arbitrarily partitioned the Jabal Sinjār: an island of mountains, in the North Mesopotamian plain, which was inhabited by the single community of the Yazīdīs. Since the Yazīdīs were intimately associated with 'Irāq—their language being Kurdish and the principal shrine of their religion being situated at Ba'īdrah, on the left bank of the Tigris, in 'Irāqī Kurdistan—the British Government had formed the opinion that it was desirable to modify the frontier-line of 1920 in such a way as to include the whole of the Jabal Sinjār in 'Irāq in exchange for equivalent rectifications of the line, in Syria's favour, in other sectors. After prolonged discussions, the two Mandatory Powers, in December 1931, submitted to the Council of the League of Nations a joint request that the Council should give an interpretation of Article 1 of the 1920 convention and should then indicate a frontier based upon this but modified in the light of those considerations that have been mentioned just above in the present paragraph. In proffering this request, the two Powers undertook that the frontier so indicated would 'be accepted by all concerned as a definitive solution of the frontier question'.

In response to this request, the Council, on the 9th December, 1931, took the decision to appoint a Commission to make recommendations to the Council after studying the question on the spot. The Commission, consisting of a Swiss chairman and a Spanish and a Swedish member, duly performed its task in April and May 1932, and presented its report in September. In four sectors out of five, the Commission's recommendations were unanimous; on the other hand, in the crucial Jabal Sinjār sector, the Spanish member recommended a line which was rather more favourable to Syria than the line here preferred by his two colleagues. After considering the Commission's report on the 3rd October, 1932, the Council referred it to the Permanent Mandates Commission. The latter body discussed the question on the 3rd November and took a non-committal line in view of the fact that in this case, as in other cases, they had been given no opportunity to study the situation on the spot at first

hand.¹ They did, however, report to the Council in favour of the Commission of Inquiry's report, albeit in rather negative terms, on the 9th November, and thereafter, on the 25th of the same month, the Council passed a resolution to the effect that it

Finally adopts for the settlement of the question of the frontier between 'Irāq and Syria the line unanimously suggested by the Commission of Inquiry set up by the Council resolution of the 9th December, 1931, and in the Sinjār area the line indicated by the majority of that Commission.

This decision was promptly accepted by the French Government; and on the 9th February, 1933, the French and 'Irāqī Governments made a joint request to the Council for the appointment of some national of a third country to serve as chairman of the Demarcation Commission which was to trace the frontier on the lines of the Council's resolution of the 25th November, 1932. The President of the Council appointed Colonel Iselin (Switzerland) the second chairman of the Commission of Inquiry.² The Delimitation Commission completed its work on the 31st July, 1933;³ and, by an unforeseen coincidence, the date of transfer of territory from 'Irāq to Syria on the sector of the frontier adjoining the Tigris—a transfer which was due to take place as soon as the work of demarcation was completed—had a bearing upon the tragic history of the Assyrian trek from the east to the west bank of the Tigris in July and August 1933. This point has already been dealt with in a previous chapter of the present volume.⁴

This settlement of the frontier-line was accompanied by further progress in the arrangements for collaboration in dealing with frontier problems. In August 1932, 'arrangements were made for the 'Irāqī Qā'im-maqām at 'Anah to hold regular monthly meetings with the French Special Service Officer at Abu Kamāl for the settlement of minor frontier incidents. Similar meetings of the Mutasarrif of Ramādī and the French Délégué at Dayr-az-Zūr were also arranged to take place half-yearly to deal with matters not disposed of by the

¹ Minutes of the Twenty-Second Session of the Permanent Mandates Commission, pp. 18-19.

² The first chairman, Colonel de Reynier (Switzerland), had lost his life on the 29th March, 1932, in an aeroplane accident *en route* from Bayrūt to Baghdad.

³ A slight difference of opinion which arose between the two parties was surmounted by an arbitral decision which was rendered by the chairman of the Commission on the 15th May, 1933, and was embodied in a Franco-'Irāqī agreement of the 3rd July, 1933 (text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, September 1933, p. 1065).

⁴ In section (ii) (b) (3) of this part, above, pp. 160, 162.

Special Service Officer of Abu Kamāl and the Qā'im-maqām of 'Anah'.¹

(ix) The Settlement of the Frontiers between the Lebanon and Syria on the one hand and Palestine and Transjordan on the other

In a previous volume² it has been recorded that the boundary between the French mandated territories of the Lebanon and Syria on the one hand and the British mandated territories of Palestine and 'Irāq on the other hand was laid down, from Cape Naqūrah on the coast of the Mediterranean to a point on the right bank of the Tigris opposite the village of Fēsh Khabūr, in an Anglo-French convention of the 23rd December, 1920. This convention dealt with the boundary from end to end, but this only in a rough and ready way; and it was subsequently found necessary to readjust the line in certain places in the light of administrative experience in the border districts. This more detailed and more closely considered settlement was carried out in three sections.

The first section to be settled was that between the Lebanon and Syria on the one hand and Palestine Proper on the other from Cape Naqūrah to the village of Hammah on the right bank of the River Yarmuk. In regard to this section, an Anglo-French Boundary Commission presented, on the 3rd February, 1922,³ a report which was adopted by the two Mandatory Powers in an agreement of the 7th March, 1923.⁴ By an oversight, it was not till the 30th January, 1932, when the question came up (in connexion with the settlement of the adjoining section) at a meeting of the League Council, that steps were taken to obtain the Council's approval of this action on the part of the two Mandatory Powers. Thereafter, on the 15th February, 1934, the French and British Governments duly—if belatedly—solicited the Council's approval for the agreement of the 7th March, 1923; and thereupon, on the 14th May, 1934, the Council invited the Permanent Mandates Commission to inform it of its opinion on the line fixed in this agreement from the point of view of the execution of the mandates. The Mandates Commission considered the matter during its twenty-fifth session (30th May–12th June, 1934) and reported to the Council that the agreement of the 7th March, 1923, delimited, with slight changes, the western section of the frontier-line defined by the convention of the 23rd December, 1920, and that, 'during the eleven years which' had 'elapsed since

¹ British Government's *Report on 'Irāq for the year 1932*, pp. 16–17.

² *The Survey for 1925*, vol. i, p. 465.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 362.

⁴ Text in British Parliamentary Paper *Cmd. 1910 of 1923*.

the coming into force of this agreement, the Commission' had 'had no occasion to note any disadvantages arising in connexion with the present frontier-line from the standpoint of the administration of the mandated territories concerned, or from that of the interests of the local populations'.

In the next section, between the French mandated territory of Syria on the one hand and the Transjordanian portion of the British mandated territory of Palestine on the other, a definitive settlement was more difficult to arrive at. In this section, the parties had to strike a balance between three desiderata: 'not to disturb the populations in the exercise of their rights and customs; to increase security by facilitating administration; and to ensure, in the present and the future, the security of the vital communications between 'Irāq and Transjordan towards the Mediterranean'.¹ In the first two of these three matters, the situation on this section of the border was not unlike that on the third section, which divided Syria from 'Irāq.² The frontier here ran through the borderland between the nomads of the steppe, whose seasonal migrations to and fro across the frontier had to be provided for,³ and certain sedentary populations constituting historic wholes that could not be arbitrarily partitioned without great injustice and hardship. The rough-and-ready line of 1920, which had partitioned the Yazīdī community in the Jabal Sinjār in the section between the Tigris and the Euphrates,⁴ had inflicted the same wrong upon the Druse community in the Jabalu'd Durūz in the section now in question between the Hamād and the Yarmuk. In the Jazīrah section, a solution was found, as is recorded in another chapter,⁵ on the lines of a readjustment of the 1920 frontier which had the effect of reuniting the whole Yazīdī community within the borders of 'Irāq. On the same principle, the middle section of the 1920 frontier was readjusted in such a way as to reunite the whole Druse community within the borders of the French mandated territory.⁶ Thus the principle which worked out to the territorial disadvantage of the French mandated territory on one sector worked out to its advantage on another.

An Anglo-French agreement for a readjustment of the middle section of the 1920 frontier, in the sense indicated above, was em-

¹ Statement made to the League Council by its *rapporteur*, Monsieur Fotić (Jugoslavia), on the 30th January, 1932.

² For the history of the settlement of this section, see the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (ix); the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (viii).

³ See the *Survey for 1930*, p. 316.

⁴ See p. 302, above.

⁵ See the present volume, section (viii) of this part above.

⁶ *Rapport sur la situation de la Syrie et du Liban (Année 1931)*, p. 12.

bodied in a protocol of the 31st October, 1931;¹ and on the 10th and 11th November of the same year 'a joint request relating to the question of the settlement of the frontier between 'Irāq and 'Transjordan on the one hand and Syria and the Jabalu'd-Durūz on the other' was addressed to the League Council by the French and British Governments. The eventual settlement of the Syro-'Irāqī frontier is recorded in the chapter of this volume that has been referred to above.² In regard to the Syro-Transjordanian frontier, a further joint request from the French and British Governments—this time, for approval of the protocol of the 31st October, 1931—was considered and complied with by the Council on the 30th January, 1932.

The revised frontier in this section, which was thus confirmed, was demarcated in the course of the year 1932.³

The protocol of the 31st October, 1931, had an annex⁴ providing for the conclusion of a separate agreement to regulate the passage of the frontier by the two parties' respective nationals, nomad and sedentary, on their lawful occasions. This agreement on frontier relations and *bon voisinage* had not been concluded up to the end of the year 1934.

(x) Relations between Transjordan and Sa'ūdī Arabia

In a previous volume,⁵ the history of relations between Transjordan and the united kingdom of the Najd-Hijāz or Sa'ūdī Arabia has been carried down to May 1927, when notes were exchanged at Jiddah between a representative of the British Government, Sir Gilbert Clayton, and King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz, in which Sir Gilbert Clayton put on record the British Government's view of the position of the frontier between Transjordan and the Hijāz,⁶ while the King put on record his dissent from this view but at the same time signified his willingness 'to maintain the *status quo* in the Ma'ān-'Aqabah district' and promised 'not to interfere in its administration until

¹ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, March 1932, pp. 799-800; in *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan for the year 1931*, pp. 207-9; and in *Rapport sur la situation de la Syrie et du Liban (Année 1931)*, pp. 190-2.

² See the present volume, section (viii) of this part, above.

³ *Rapport sur la situation de la Syrie et du Liban (Année 1931)*, p. 10.

⁴ Text in *League of Nations Official Journal*, March 1932, p. 800; *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan for the year 1931*, pp. 209-10; *Rapport sur la situation de la Syrie et du Liban (Année 1931)*, p. 193.

⁵ *The Survey for 1928*, p. 287.

⁶ The frontier between Transjordan and the Najd had already been settled by agreement in the Treaty of Haddā, signed on the 2nd November, 1925 (see the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 343-4).

favourable circumstances' should 'permit a final settlement of this question'.

Thereafter, in 1929, 'by an agreement with King Ibn Sa'ūd and the Amīr 'Abdu'llāh, it was arranged that outstanding claims in respect of inter-tribal raids between Transjordan and the Hijāz-Najd which had taken place since the conclusion of the Haddā Agreement in November 1925 should be referred to His Britannic Majesty's Government for decision in their absolute discretion'.¹ The judgment, which was announced in August 1931, 'was that all claims up to the 1st August, 1930, should be mutually abandoned', while, 'with regard to raiding claims which arose subsequent to the 1st August, 1930, an arrangement was made that local representatives of the two Governments should meet on the frontier and make recommendations to their respective Governments for the liquidation of these claims'.²

In May 1932, a fresh strain was placed upon Transjordanian-Sa'ūdī relations through an invasion of the north-western corner of the Hijāz by a band of Hijāzī exiles—belonging to the Bilī and Huwaytāt tribes and led by the Bilī chief Ibn Rifādah—who had been refugees in Egyptian territory, in the Sinai Peninsula, ever since the overthrow of the Hāshimī régime in the Hijāz by the Sa'ūdī Power in the war of 1924-5.³ The preparations that were being made by these refugee partisans of the House of Hāshim for their desperate venture came to the knowledge of the Sa'ūdī Government before they were complete; and the Sa'ūdī Government informed the British authorities, who were concerned in as much as Ibn Rifādah's force was being organized on Egyptian territory and would have to traverse a corner of Transjordanian territory in order to make its way from its Egyptian point of departure to its Hijāzī objective. At the time the British Government did not take the warning very seriously. As soon, however, as Ibn Rifādah actually went on the war-path, the Sa'ūdī Government were apprised of the movement by the British Legation at Jiddah,⁴ and, expecting the invasion as they did, they were able to take prompt measures. While armed forces were concentrated towards the north-west, seven prominent partisans of the Hāshimīs in Mecca, and ten at Jiddah,

¹ British Government's *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan for the year 1930* (London, 1931, H.M. Stationery Office = *Colonial No. 59*), p. 195.

² British Government's *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan for the year 1931* (London, 1932, H.M. Stationery Office = *Colonial No. 75*), p. 170.

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (v).

⁴ *Oriente Moderno*, July 1932, p. 346.

were interned in the Najd, and two other persons were expelled from the Sa'ūdī dominions.¹ The Transjordanian Government, for their part, co-operated with the Sa'ūdī Government by enforcing certain special measures from the middle of June 1932 to the early part of September. 'The export of foodstuffs to Sa'ūdī Arabia was prohibited; and, to prevent unauthorized persons entering or leaving the Hijāz, a Special Zone was declared to a depth of some thirty miles from the Hijāz frontier, to enter which a permit was required.'² Finally, on the 31st July, the revolt was crushed in a battle at Dabā in which 370 of Ibn Rifādah's followers were killed, while the leader himself was beheaded.³ Ibn Rifādah's insurrection was manifestly of little importance in itself; but it left its mark upon Sa'ūdī-Transjordanian relations; for, when invading the Hijāz from their Egyptian asylum, the Hijāzī exiles had traversed a corner of the territory of Transjordan, in the immediate hinterland of 'Aqabah, without being intercepted by the Transjordanian authorities; and this was noted and resented by the Sa'ūdī Government, in view of the warning which they had given, in advance, of Ibn Rifādah's intentions.

In 1933, however, energetic steps were taken to improve the relations between the two countries. On the 1st April, 1933, the Amīr 'Abdu'llāh and King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz officially recognized one another's Governments; in the same month, at Jiddah, negotiations were opened for a treaty of friendship and *bon voisinage*⁴ which was signed on the 27th July (ratifications being exchanged on the 21st December); and on the 3rd August the two states agreed to the cancellation of all claims on account of damages inflicted in raids which had occurred between the 1st August, 1930, and the 27th July, 1933. The cumulative effect of these measures was a distinct improvement in relations, in spite of the fact that the Transjordanian-Hijāzī frontier still remained unsettled.

(xi) Relations between the Yaman and Great Britain

In a previous volume⁵ the history of the relations between the Zaydī Government of the Imām Yahyā and the British Government has been carried down to the Imām's overtures, in September 1928,

¹ *Oriente Moderno*, August 1932, pp. 385-6.

² British Government's *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan for the year 1932* (London, 1933, H.M. Stationery Office = *Colonial No. 82*), p. 203.

³ *Oriente Moderno*, August 1932, p. 386.

⁴ Text of treaty, with the protocol on arbitration and the schedule attached, in the British Government's *Report on the Administration of Palestine and Transjordan for the year 1934*, pp. 300-7, and in the British Parliamentary Paper *Cmd. 4691 of 1934*.

⁵ *The Survey for 1928*, p. 317.

for the negotiation of a settlement between the two Powers. These overtures were followed up, in October 1931, by proposals for a treaty, which commended themselves to the British Government as providing 'a suitable foundation for treaty negotiations'.¹ In the meantime, however, the Imām had reoccupied part of the Awdalī country, within the boundaries of the British Aden Protectorate, from which he had been expelled by British air operations in 1928, and had seized about forty hostages. This hostile act did not deter the British Government from entering into negotiations with the Imām; but on the 28th June, 1933, it was announced in the House of Commons at Westminster, by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies, that 'the release of the remaining prisoners² had been made an absolute condition of the signing of a treaty' and that 'the recovery of the Awdalī territory had been definitely linked up with the treaty negotiations'. The Under-Secretary went on to say that 'His Majesty's Government had laid down three conditions for the signing of the treaty. First, the evacuation of all the Protectorate territory; secondly, the release of the Protectorate tribesmen; thirdly, the removal of restrictions on trade between Yaman and the Protectorate. He understood that the Imām had agreed to the first two conditions, but up to now no satisfactory answer had been received from him in respect of the last.'

An Anglo-Yamani treaty of friendship and mutual co-operation³ was eventually signed at San'ā on the 11th February, 1934 (ratifications being exchanged at the same place on the 4th September of the same year). In the first of the seven articles, King George recognized the complete independence of King Yahyā and his kingdom. The second article provided that there should always be peace and friendship between the parties, and that they should maintain good relations with each other in every respect. The third ran as follows:

The settlement of the question of the southern frontier of the Yaman is deferred pending the conclusion, in whatever way may be agreed upon by both high contracting parties in a spirit of friendship and complete concord, free from any dispute or difference, of the negotiations which shall take place between them before the expiry of the period of the present treaty.

Pending the conclusion of the negotiations referred to in the preceding

¹ Statement in the House of Commons at Westminster, on the 16th July, 1932, by the Under-Secretary for War.

² Of the original forty, 'one was reported to have died, two had escaped, and nine had been released' by the 28th January, 1933.

³ English and Arabic texts in British Parliamentary Paper *Cmd. 4752 of 1934*.

paragraph, the high contracting parties agree to maintain the situation existing in regard to the frontier on the date of the signature of this treaty, and both high contracting parties undertake that they will prevent, by all means at their disposal, any violation by their forces of the above-mentioned frontier, and any interference by their subjects, or from their side of that frontier, with the affairs of the people inhabiting the other side of the said frontier.

Since the treaty was to run for forty years from the date of the exchange of ratifications (Art. 7), the third article provided for a peaceful maintenance of the territorial *status quo* for as long a period in the future as it was practicable to take into account.

(xii) The Dispute between Sa'ūdī Arabia and the Yaman over 'Asīr and Najrān, and the Arabian Seven Weeks' War (1931-4)

The destruction of the Hāshimī Power in the Hijāz¹ and the establishment of a Najdī protectorate over a remnant of the Idrīsīyah principality of Sabyā, in Southern 'Asīr,² had brought the expanding Sa'ūdī Power into immediate contact with the Zaydī Imamate in the Yaman, and had left these two Powers face to face as the two sole surviving sovereign states in the whole of the Arabian Peninsula west of the Rub'u'l-Khālī. From that time onwards there were perpetual expectations of a struggle between King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz b. Sa'ūd and the Imām Yahyā for the hegemony of all Arabia; but these expectations were repeatedly falsified and, when the war did break out at last in the spring of 1934, the victor's peace terms were as moderate as his victory was rapid. The peace settlement left the two Arabian Powers both on the political map and each in possession of its full sovereign independence *vis-à-vis* the other, while there was a distinctly perceptible *détente* in their relations—as though the thunder-storm, when it burst at last, had really cleared the air.

In certain respects the two Arabian Powers presented a piquant contrast. The Zaydī masters of the Yaman were Shī'īs, whereas the Sa'ūdī masters of the Najd-Hijāz were Sunnīs of the extreme puritanical Wahhābī sect. A majority of the Yamanīs were highlanders and sedentary cultivators, while a majority of the inhabitants of the Najd-Hijāz were steppe-dwellers and nomadic stock-breeders. The subjects of Ibn Sa'ūd were scattered sparsely over a vast extent of mostly inhospitable territory, while the dominions of the Imām, which were insignificant in area by comparison, actually supported,

¹ For the Najdī-Hijāzī War of 1924-5 see the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, Part III, section (v) (c).

² See *op cit.*, pp. 585-6, and the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 319-20.

on the terraced flanks of mountains visited by the monsoon, a dense population which was probably not much less numerous than that of Sa'ūdī Arabia. Of these contrasts, the religious difference made for war but the others for peace—since the difference in geographical extent, in combination with the difference in density of population, resulted in a substantial equality in man-power, while a conflict between equal forces of highlanders and badu was likely to be as inconclusive as the legendary battle between the elephant and the whale.

Moreover, there were also certain points of resemblance in the situations of the two Powers which likewise told in favour of peace. For example, the Zaydīs and the Wahhābīs were no more than the ruling element in their respective dominions; and both the Imām Yahyā and King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz had to reckon with alien and seditious subjects who might seize the opportunity of a foreign war to throw off an irksome yoke. In 1928, for example, the Imām had to cope with the Sunnī tribal confederacy of the Zarānīq in the Southern Tihāmah,¹ while Ibn Sa'ūd's rule had been challenged by repeated rebellions, culminating in the insurrection of Faysalu'd-Dawīsh and Farhān b. Mashhūr in Hasā at the turn of the years 1929 and 1930² and the insurrection of Ibn Rifādah in Northern Hijāz in 1932.³ In their foreign relations, again, the two Arabian Powers had each two fronts to think of. Ibn Sa'ūd marched not only with the Zaydī Power on the south, but also, on the north, with the two Hāshimī states of 'Irāq and Transjordan, which had not been involved in the fall of the Hāshimī Kingdom of the Hijāz, and whose rulers, King Faysal and the Amīr 'Abdu'llāh, could not readily forget that their new southern neighbour, Ibn Sa'ūd, had recently ousted their father, King Husayn, and their brother, King 'Alī, from the ancestral patrimony of the Hāshimī house. Similarly, the Imām marched not only with the Sa'ūdī Power on the north but also, on the south, with the British Empire; and his unprovoked and obstinate encroachment upon the fringes of the British Aden Protectorate had led to his being driven back to the line of the pre-war Anglo-Ottoman frontier as a result of British air operations in the summer of 1928.⁴ Throughout the years under review in the present chapter, both the Aden-Yamanī frontier and the Transjordanian-Hijāzī frontier remained mere *de facto* boundaries, maintained by British military force, without having yet been settled by mutual agreement. At the same time, in the course of

¹ See the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 317-18.

² See the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 178-80.

³ See the present volume, section (x) of this part, above.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1928*, p. 316.

these years, both the Imām Yahyā's relations with Great Britain and King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz's relations with the two surviving Hāshimī states considerably improved;¹ and this *détente* on their respective opposite frontiers may have inclined the King and the Imām to become stiffer in their relations with one another. At any rate, the signature of the Anglo-Yamanī treaty of the 11th February, 1934, was immediately followed by a fresh access of intransigence, on the Imām's part, in his dealings with Ibn Sa'ūd; and whether or not the Najdīs correctly interpreted the facts in arguing from *post hoc* to *propter hoc* in this case, it is certain that this unfortunate turn in the Imām's policy, whatever its cause, did precipitate the war between the Yaman and Sa'ūdī Arabia which broke out a few weeks later.

The principal causes of this war are to be found in the local situation on the borders between the two Arabian empires, and it will be convenient to trace the changes in this situation from the point to which the narrative has been carried down in previous volumes.

The Sa'ūdī protectorate under which the Idrīsīyah principality had passed in 1926 had been petitioned for by the reigning Idrīsī Sayyid in order to save the remnant of his dominions from being conquered by the Imām, who had taken the opportunity of the Najdī-Hijāzī War of 1924-5 to extend his own dominions at the Idrīsī's expense while the other two Arabian Powers were pre-occupied with their struggle with one another.² In granting his protectorate, Ibn Sa'ūd had been careful to limit its range to the territories which were under the Idrīsī's authority at the time *de facto*; and the result was a virtual partition of the *ci-devant* Idrīsīyah domain between Sa'ūdī Arabia and the Yaman; for the Imām retained the conquests which he had already made at the Idrīsī's expense in the Southern Tihāmah, including the two ports of Luhayyah and Hudaydah, while in 1930 Ibn Sa'ūd converted his protectorate over the northern remnant of the principality into a régime which reduced the Idrīsī to a cipher and placed the province under the direct administration of Ibn Sa'ūd's own officers.³ Thenceforward, the two surviving Arabian Powers marched with one another directly both on the Tihāmah and on the crest of the plateau which rises abruptly from the coastal plain; and they were also in contact in the interior, in the district of Najrān, where the plateau gradually falls away eastward towards the Rub'u'l-

¹ For the improvement in Sa'ūdī-Iraqī relations see section (ii) (c) of this part above; for the improvement in Sa'ūdī-Transjordanian relations see section (x) above; for the improvement in relations between the Yaman and Great Britain see section (xi) above.

² See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 321-3; and the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 319-20.

³ See the *Survey for 1930*, p. 172, footnote 3.

Khāli.¹ The result was to place Sa'dah, the cradle of the Imām's dynasty and the second city of the Zaydī highlands, in a perilously exposed salient flanked by Wahhābī outposts on either side. The boundaries on the Najrān side were uncertain; and when those on the 'Asīr side were disturbed by an insurrection against Ibn Sa'ūd's authority, the whole situation along the border between the two Powers became unstable. This instability, taken together with the tiresomeness of the Imām as a neighbour (a characteristic with which both the Turks and the British had previously become familiar), is enough to explain the trouble that now followed between the Imām and Ibn Sa'ūd.

The conciliatory mission which the Imām sent to Mecca in the spring of 1928² did not succeed in negotiating a settlement of the questions then outstanding between the two parties;³ and the next event was the occupation, in the summer of 1931, of the 'Asīr border-district of Jabal al-'Arw by Zaydī forces who took hostages and incited the tribes to repudiate their allegiance to Ibn Sa'ūd. At the end of negotiations which dragged on till the close of the calendar year, Ibn Sa'ūd waived his claim to the district, in the Imām's favour.⁴ This settlement was followed by the signature, on the 15th December,⁵ 1931, of a treaty of amity and *bon voisinage* between the two Powers.⁶ The following articles of this treaty deserve quotation on account of their bearing upon subsequent events:

Art. 2. Each of the two states shall be bound to hand over to the other any persons guilty of offences, whether political or non-political, who may cross the frontier after the conclusion of this agreement, when their Government demands their extradition.

Art. 3. Each of the two states shall be bound not to harbour any person, great or small, in the public service or in a private station, who is seeking to evade the jurisdiction of his own state, and shall be bound to hand him back immediately to the state to which he belongs.

Art. 7. Officers and administrators are forbidden to meddle with the subjects [of the parties] in matters likely to cause disturbance and to produce misunderstandings between the two states.

¹ See the *Survey for 1928*, p. 318.

² *Op. cit.*, *loc. cit.*

³ For the failure of this mission see the Sa'ūdī *Green Book* published on the 28th April, 1934, Docs. 7-10, summarized in *Oriente Moderno*, May 1934, p. 246.

⁴ *Green Book*, summarized in *Oriente Moderno*, May 1934, pp. 246-7, and June 1934, p. 301.

⁵ This was the date according to *Oriente Moderno*, *loc. cit. infra*. On the other hand, *The Times*, in reporting the conclusion of the treaty on the 24th December, 1931, gives the date of signature as the 14th. Presumably this discrepancy arises from the fact that the Sa'ūdī version of the Islamic calendar differed, by one day, in its reckoning from the version in use elsewhere.

⁶ Text in *Oriente Moderno*, March 1932, pp. 130-1.

Art. 8. Any of the subjects of either party who may be resident in the other party's dominions after the conclusion of this agreement shall be handed over to his own Government immediately upon that Government's demand.

In the telegraphic exchange of the ratifications of this treaty, the Imām asked Ibn Sa'ūd to send a mission to San'ā to settle certain outstanding minor questions, and Ibn Sa'ūd agreed; but the despatch of this mission was anticipated by the outbreak of Ibn Rifādah's revolt in the Northern Hijāz in May 1932,¹ and by the Sa'ūdī Government's discovery that a number of fugitive rebels from the Sa'ūdī dominions had found asylum in the Imām's dominions, at Luhayyah, and were there carrying on their hostile activities against the Sa'ūdī régime. To a protest from Ibn Sa'ūd on this point, the Imām replied by making a courteous denial of the charge.² In the autumn of 1932 Ibn Sa'ūd proposed negotiations for a comprehensive settlement, and the proposal was accepted by the Imām,³ but action was once again delayed—this time by the outbreak of the Idrīsī's insurrection in 'Asīr against Ibn Sa'ūd's domination.

The insurrection opened⁴ with an attack, by 'Asīrī tribesmen acting at the Idrīsī Sayyid Hasan's instigation, upon the Sa'ūdī garrison in the port of Jayzān. The first shots were fired on the 4th November, 1932; and on the 7th the Idrīsī entered the town and imprisoned the Sa'ūdī amīr, who had been the *de facto* ruler of the Idrīsīyah principality since November 1930.⁵ When the Idrīsī telegraphed to King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz confessing what he had done but making accusations against the Amīr Fahd b. Zu'ayr and protesting his own loyalty, Ibn Sa'ūd proposed to send a commission of inquiry, and the Idrīsī agreed; but the commissioners reported that they had found his preparations for resistance in full swing—whereupon a Sa'ūdī force reoccupied Jayzān on the 17th November, while the Idrīsī retreated to Sabyā. Before the end of February 1933, Sabyā, which was the seat

¹ See the present volume, section (x) of this part, pp. 307-8, above.

² *Green Book*, Docs. 18-22, summarized in *Oriente Moderno*, June 1934, p. 301.

³ *Green Book*, Docs. 23-4, summarized in *Oriente Moderno*, June 1934, p. 302.

⁴ See the official *communiqué* printed in the *Sawtu'l-Hijāz* of Mecca on the 21st November, 1932, which is translated in *Oriente Moderno*, December 1932, pp. 603-4. See also the documents printed in the *Ummu'l-Qurā*, 2nd December, 1932, which are translated in *Oriente Moderno*, January 1933, pp. 45-6. The same issue of the *Ummu'l-Qurā* contains information (translated in *Oriente Moderno*, January 1933, p. 49) which purports to show that the Idrīsī's revolt had been instigated by the Amīr 'Abdu'llāh of Transjordan. For the Idrīsī's own account of the origin of his revolt see the interview with him, in *Al-Muqattam* of Cairo, 10th February, 1933, which is reprinted in *Oriente Moderno*, March 1933, p. 145.

⁵ See the *Survey for 1930*, p. 172, footnote 3.

of the Idrīsīyah dynasty, had been reoccupied likewise, and the Idrīsī Sayyid, with a number of his followers, had fled just over the border into the territory of the Imām; but the resulting situation was inconclusive; for the Idrīsī had escaped capture and the tribes which had supported him were still defying the Sa'ūdī Power from mountain fastnesses, on the Sa'ūdī side of the frontier, from which the Sa'ūdī forces were unable to dislodge them.¹

While the fighting in 'Asīr between the rebels and the Sa'ūdī forces had been taking place, the Imām had maintained neutrality and had sent Ibn Sa'ūd a not unfriendly telegram.² Upon the Idrīsī's flight into the Imām's territory, a telegraphic correspondence began between the Imām and Ibn Sa'ūd: Ibn Sa'ūd demanding the extradition of the fugitive and his companions; the Imām asking for an amnesty for them; Ibn Sa'ūd replying that he had already given instructions to that effect and pressing the Imām to hand the refugees over.³ This correspondence was followed by a conference between representatives of the two Arab rulers at Midī, in the Imām's territory. On this occasion a settlement appears to have been prevented⁴ by the insistence of the Idrīsī's representatives upon the restoration of the *status quo ante* November 1930 and *post* October 1926:⁵ i.e., a return to a genuine protectorate under which the Idrīsīyah principality would once more enjoy a local autonomy instead of continuing to be incorporated, as it had been *de facto*, into Ibn Sa'ūd's direct dominions. Thereafter, on the 14th April, 1933, it was officially announced,⁶ on the Sa'ūdī Government's part, that King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz had agreed—notwithstanding the terms of the Sa'ūdī-Yamanī treaty of the 15th December, 1931—that the Idrīsī Sayyid should be allowed to reside in the Imām's territory, at some place of the Imām's choosing, under a guarantee from the Imām for his good behaviour, and that there he should receive a monthly pension from Ibn Sa'ūd.

After this Ibn Sa'ūd made another attempt to arrive at a comprehensive settlement of outstanding issues, and arranged with the Imām

¹ See the information published in *Oriente Moderno*, March 1933, pp. 143-5. The previous fighting seems to have been severe, and the Sa'ūdī losses included both Khalid b. Lu'ayy and his son (*Oriente Moderno*, January 1933, p. 49, and March 1933, p. 145).

² Text of exchange of telegrams in *Oriente Moderno*, January 1933, pp. 46-7, from the *Ummu'l-Qurā*, 2nd December, 1932.

³ See *Oriente Moderno*, March 1933, p. 143, and April 1933, p. 212.

⁴ *Al-Muqattam* of Cairo, 14th March, 1934, translated in *Oriente Moderno*, April 1933, pp. 211-12.

⁵ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 584-6; the *Survey for 1928*, pp. 319-20; and the *Survey for 1930*, p. 172, footnote 3.

⁶ In the *Ummu'l-Qurā* of that date, which is translated in *Oriente Moderno*, May 1933, p. 269-70.

to send a mission to the Yaman with this object; but, from the moment of their arrival at the Yamanī frontier in the Tihāmah in the first week in May 1933 down to the moment of their departure from San'ā in the first week in August, the members of this Sa'ūdī mission appear to have met with perpetual obstruction.¹ The mission eventually came home without having accomplished anything; and, in the meanwhile, the relations between the two Powers were further disturbed by a forward move, on the Imām's part, in Najrān, where the situation had remained indeterminate since the first conflict of Zaydī and Sa'ūdī influences in 1926. In the second half of May 1933, the Zaydī forces conquered the North-West Najrānī territory of the Ismā'īlī tribe of Yām;² and this Zaydī conquest of a district to which Ibn Sa'ūd laid claim was at the same time a threat to the security of the Sa'ūdī Government's hold upon 'Asīr, since the conquered territory lay within striking distance of the South 'Asīrī highlands where the insurgent tribesmen had been successfully defying the Sa'ūdī authorities. After the return of his envoys from San'ā, Ibn Sa'ūd once more attempted to obtain a settlement by telegraphic correspondence; but the Imām's replies to his telegrams were evasive; and at last, on the 14th November, 1933, Ibn Sa'ūd gave orders for a concentration of troops on the Yamanī frontier and at the same time requested the Imām to give him satisfaction on three definite points: the conclusion of a treaty confirming the frontiers as they stood; the extradition of the Idrīsī Sayyid Hasan; and the settlement of the question of Najrān.³ On the 2nd December, 1933, Ibn Sa'ūd declared himself willing, in regard to the third point, to turn Najrān into a neutral territory;⁴ and on the 18th December the Imām proposed the negotiation of a treaty, on a basis of *uti possidetis*, to run for twenty years.⁵ By this time, however, Ibn Sa'ūd was receiving information from his new amīr in the Idrīsīyah province that the Yamanī troops were beginning to push their way into the South 'Asīrī highlands, inciting the tribesmen to throw off their allegiance to Ibn Sa'ūd and taking hostages and tribute from them on the Imām's account.⁶ Nevertheless, Ibn Sa'ūd arranged for the holding of a Sa'ūdī-Yamanī conference at Abhā, in Northern 'Asīr, and this conference duly met on the 16th February, 1934; but, once again, the negotiations came to nothing, and the telegraphic correspondence was resumed. On the

¹ *Green Book*, Docs. 25-44, in *Oriente Moderno*, June 1934, pp. 302-4.

² *Oriente Moderno*, June 1933, p. 319.

³ *Green Book* in *Oriente Moderno*, June 1934, p. 305. (See also Mr. H. St. J. Philby in *The Times*, 16th April, 1934, for the last stage of the negotiations which opened with this request on Ibn Sa'ūd's part.)

⁴ *Op. cit.*, loc. cit.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, loc. cit.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, loc. cit.

22nd March, 1934, the Sa'ūdī Government announced that the negotiations had broken down and that the Crown Prince had been ordered to march, with the object of recovering the 'Asīrī territory into which the Zaydī troops had penetrated.¹

The war which now began was conducted with great ability on the Sa'ūdī side. The Wahhābī forces did not attempt any direct assault upon the South 'Asīrī highlands, where the insurgent tribesmen had proved capable of holding their own even before the arrival of the Zaydī troops, so that they were likely to be still more difficult to cope with now that they had received these reinforcements. The Wahhābī commanders concentrated their efforts, in the first instance, upon cutting the communications between these 'Asīrī highlands and the Yaman by a simultaneous encircling movement from the Tihāmah and from the interior. For the rest, they were content to operate in the Tihāmah itself, on the one side, and in Najrān on the other, and to avoid the highlands where the Zaydīs would have the advantage of fighting on their native terrain. By the 9th April, 1934, the Sa'ūdī Government were able to announce that their encircling movement, round the South 'Asīrī highlands, had been crowned with success;² and on the 12th the Imām telegraphed to Ibn Sa'ūd suing for peace and announcing that he had ordered his troops to evacuate Najrān. Thereupon, Ibn Sa'ūd laid down four conditions—the evacuation of Najrān; the restitution of the hostages taken by the Zaydīs from the tribes in Ibn Sa'ūd's domain; the cessation of all relations between the Zaydīs and these tribes; and the extradition of the Idrīsī Sayyid Hasan in accordance with the treaty of the 15th December, 1931—and, pending the execution of these conditions, the Wahhābī offensive continued. The Wahhābī advance on both the Najrān and the Tihāmah front now became very rapid. On the 27th April the Sa'ūdī Government were able to announce the completion of the conquest of Najrān and the capture of Midī; and this latter success, which was achieved on the 26th April, was followed up by the capture of Luhayyah on the 1st May and Hudaydah on the 4th.

The Wahhābīs now found themselves at the gates of Sa'dah on the Najrān front and within striking distance of San'ā itself on the Tihāmah front; and a less cautious and experienced statesman than King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz might have been led on by these dazzling military successes into striking at the heart of his rival's kingdom with a view to settling accounts with so tiresome a neighbour once for all. Ibn Sa'ūd, however, seems to have been well aware that up to this point

¹ *Oriente Moderno*, April 1934, pp. 170-3.

² *Communiqué* of the 9th April, 1934, in *Oriente Moderno*, May 1934, p. 232.

he had had two factors working in his favour which would cease to operate from now onwards if he were to continue his advance. He had been fighting in the open lowlands and steppes, where his troops were on familiar ground; and he had been advancing through the territories of friendly populations—for the Sunnī inhabitants of the Tihāmah and the Ismā'īlī element in Najrān had no love for their Zaydī masters, and were ready to welcome the Wahhābīs as liberators. On the other hand, except at one strategic point, the Wahhābīs had not yet attempted to penetrate the hill country; in the extreme north of the war zone, on Sa'ūdī soil, the rebellious highlander tribesmen and their Zaydī allies were still holding out; and if he were now to strike at Sa'dah and San'ā he would have to try conclusions with the Zaydīs on their own ground, and to fight them when they were standing at bay with their backs to their mountain wall. Accordingly, when the Imām now consented to carry out Ibn Sa'ūd's terms immediately and in full, Ibn Sa'ūd duly granted him an armistice on the 13th May; on the 18th, a peace conference was opened at Tā'if; on the 20th May a peace treaty was signed at the same place; and when the armistice ran out on the 29th, before certain undertakings, given by the Imām in the armistice agreement, had been carried out, Ibn Sa'ūd granted the Imām's petition that the period should be prolonged for a few days.¹

The terms of the treaty of the 20th May, 1934, need not be analysed here, since the text, together with that of the accompanying arbitration agreement and exchanges of letters, is printed in the companion volume of documents;² but the Western historian cannot mention this instrument without drawing his readers' attention to its extraordinary generosity. The two belligerent Powers were neither of them members of the League of Nations and were perhaps more immune than any other pair of existing states from the influences of the modern Western civilization; yet, in spite—or, perhaps rather, because—of their old-fashionedness, they succeeded in concluding a peace of which it was justly written, in one of the leading newspapers of the Western World, that 'its spirit might be profitably compared by Christian statesmen with that of some recent European treaties of peace'.³

This peace settlement was hailed with relief and satisfaction throughout the Muslim World, and particularly in the Arab countries beyond the bounds of the Arabian Peninsula; for the outbreak of

¹ Sa'ūdī communiqué in *Oriente Moderno*, June 1934, p. 299.

² *Documents on International Affairs, 1934*, pp. 458-64.

³ *The Times*, 4th July, 1934.

the war had caused consternation among patriotic Arabs and pious Muslims. Arabia was the cradle of Islam, and the two powers of the Arabian Peninsula were the only Arab states that were still completely sovereign and independent. In consequence, the outbreak of a fratricidal conflict between them seemed an equally serious disaster for Arab patriotism and for Muslim faith; and, upon the news of the outbreak of hostilities, the standing organization which had been established by the General Muslim Congress of Jerusalem¹ appointed a delegation to mediate between the belligerents.² This Arab peace delegation reached Mecca on the 16th April; was received by King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz; and was permitted by him to communicate telegraphically with the Imām Yahyā.³ The direct effect of its labours upon the course of military and political events may not have been great;⁴ but the spirit of the peace treaty may possibly reflect its influence.

The instrument was entitled a 'Treaty of Islamic friendship (*sudāqah islāmīyah*) and Arab brotherhood (*ukhuwwah 'arabīyah*)'. In the preamble the contracting parties declared their desire, not only to put an end to the state of war, but also 'to establish concord in the Arab Muslim people, to raise its dignity, and to safeguard its honour and independence'; and their further desire 'to act as a single unit in face of emergencies and to constitute an edifice one and indivisible for the preservation of the integrity of the Arabian Peninsula'. In the body of the treaty they made a 'perpetual peace' with one another (Art. 1); recognized one another's absolute independence and sovereignty (Art. 2); agreed not to construct any fortifications within five kilometres' distance of the frontier on either side (Art. 5); and entered into a mutual pledge to refrain from all resort to force for the settlement of future difficulties between them, and to have recourse to arbitration—according to the terms of an arbitration convention attached to the treaty—in the event of their being unable to arrive at a settlement by negotiation (Art. 8). A number of other articles re-enacted the provisions of the *bon voisinage* treaty of the 15th December, 1931,⁵ which was now (Art. 21) declared to be superseded. A reciprocal amnesty covered both Ibn Sa'ūd's subjects of Idrīsī sympathies in 'Asir, who had joined forces with the Zaydīs,

¹ See the present volume, section (i) (b) of this part.

² *Oriente Moderno*, May 1934, p. 231. The delegation was led by the Sayyid Muhammad Amīnu'l-Husaynī, Muftī of Jerusalem and President both of the Supreme Muslim Council of Palestine and of the General Muslim Congress of Jerusalem. He was accompanied by an Egyptian, a Druse and a Syrian colleague (see section (i) (b), p. 109, above).

³ *Oriente Moderno*, May 1934, pp. 231-2.

⁴ On this point see Mr. H. St. J. Philby in *The Times*, 9th June, 1934.

⁵ See pp. 313-14, above.

and the Imām's subjects of Sunnī religion in the Tihāmah who had joined forces with the Wahhābīs (Art. 13). In one remarkable passage of the treaty (Art. 16), the parties, in virtue of their being 'united by the bonds of Muslim fraternity and Arab race', proclaimed 'that their two peoples' were 'a single people (*ummah wāhidah*)'; and, on this ground, they mutually undertook each to maintain a benevolent neutrality in the event of the other party being the victim of external aggression or internal disorder (Arts. 17 and 18). In the same spirit they agreed to place at one another's disposal the services of their respective diplomatic missions in foreign capitals (Art. 20). The territorial arrangements, which were set out with great circumstantiality (Art. 2), were such as to leave no sore feelings on the Zaydī side; for while they definitely assigned Najrān to the Sa'ūdī Empire, they did not deprive the Imām of any of his original territories nor again of those conquests that he had made at the Idrīsī's expense before the establishment of the Sa'ūdī protectorate over the remnant of the Idrīsīyah principality; and the Imām even retained possession of the Jabal 'Arw, which Ibn Sa'ūd had conceded to him in 1931.¹

The signature of this instrument on the 20th May, 1934, was followed by unprecedentedly prompt measures of execution on the Imām Yahyā's part, under the menace of a possible resumption of hostilities. The military evacuation of the 'Asīrī highlands was begun before the end of May; the Idrīsī Sayyid Hasan was delivered up on the 2nd June;² and on the 5th June the Sa'ūdī Government were able to announce that he had arrived, with his suite, at the head-quarters of the Amīr Faysal Āl-Sa'ūd at Hudaydah, and that the evacuation of the occupied territories in 'Asīr by the Zaydī forces was proceeding. The treaty was ratified by King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz on the 8th June and by the Imām on the 19th; and on the 23rd the text was published simultaneously at Mecca, San'ā, Cairo and Damascus. On the 27th June the Sa'ūdī Government announced that the Zaydī evacuation of the occupied territories in 'Asīr was now complete, that the Yaman had thus 'fulfilled all the conditions stipulated at the cessation of hostilities', and that accordingly King 'Abdu'l-'Azīz had released all the Yamanī prisoners held by the Sa'ūdī forces in the Tihāmah, while those held in Najrān would be released upon the liberation of the Najrānī hostages that the Zaydīs had taken. On the 14th August

¹ See p. 313 above.

² The extradition of the Idrīsī Sayyid was not stipulated for in the treaty explicitly, but it was covered by the general terms of Articles 9 and 10. The Imām, to his credit, showed more concern over securing an amnesty for the 'Asīrī insurgents and the members of the Idrīsī family, whom he was handing over to Ibn Sa'ūd, than over the safeguarding of his own interests.

the Sa'ūdī Government announced that the Sa'ūdī forces had now evacuated all territories which the treaty had assigned to the Yaman. Therewith the execution of the treaty was complete; and there seemed to be every prospect that it would remain in force, as a bulwark of peace in Arabia, for the full term of twenty years which was prescribed in its twenty-second article.

PART III EUROPE

A. INTRODUCTION

IN Europe, the 'post-war period' after the General War of 1914-18 passed away in the course of the years 1933 and 1934. The first audible stroke of its death-knell was struck on the 30th January, 1933, when Herr Hitler came into power in Berlin; and, amid the gathering tumult of the next incoming age, a sensitive ear might still catch, on the 15th October, 1934, the last faint reverberation of a tolling bell in the announcement of the death of Monsieur Raymond Poincaré: the presiding genius of the outgoing period,¹ who had been tragically preserved alive, long after his eye had grown dim and his natural force had abated,² as though a Poetic Justice were unwilling to let him depart from this world until the Dead Sea Fruit of his statesmanship had unmistakably ripened into its predestined barrenness. What the theme of the next chapter of European history might be, no man living in the year 1934 could foretell; in particular, it could not be foreseen whether, or to what extent, the Covenant of the League of Nations, which constituted the first chapter of each of the four European Peace Treaties, would be involved in the ruin of the rest

¹ If we think of the years 1918-34 in terms of the years 1815-48, which were the 'post-war period' after the General War of 1792-1815, we shall find in Monsieur Poincaré our closest latter-day counterpart of Metternich; but the comparison is, of course, far too flattering to the Frenchman. The confrontation of these two statesmen suggests not so much a parallel as a contrast; and in this contrast we have the measure of the deterioration in the quality of European statesmanship in the course of a century. When we measure our Poincaré by a Metternichian standard, the poverty of the later statesman's ideas, as well as the crudity of his methods, becomes manifest; and the respective results of the two statesmen's endeavours are proportionate to the difference in the degree of their genius. The *tour de force* of imposing fixity upon a political flux, which a Metternich managed to keep up for thirty-three years, was only kept up for some fifteen years by a Poincaré. Monsieur Poincaré's mediocrity is exposed almost as effectively by a comparison of his post-war policy with Bismarck's policy after 1871. For Bismarck saw that, if it suited him that the Third Republic should endure in France, then he must allow—and even assist—this Third Republic to acquire prestige at home by winning at least a few laurels (e.g. in Africa). By contrast, Monsieur Poincaré ensured the downfall of the Weimar Republic in Germany by implacably meting out to it exactly the same measure of harshness that he would have meted out to the Kaiser Wilhelm II if the latter had retained his throne.

² Deuteronomy xxxiv. 7. Poincaré was, indeed, no Moses, though he had a greater opportunity than the legendary Hebrew Leader's in a period when the French people—who were usually as stiff-necked as the Children of Israel—were in a mood of unwonted readiness to follow the lead of a 'strong man'.

of the treaty structure.¹ On the other hand, it was by this time already possible to sum up a large part of the history of the chapter that was now over in a single sentence of proverbial wisdom: 'When the cat's away the mice can play'.

Since the 11th November, 1918, all the Powers and peoples of Europe outside the constricted post-war frontiers of the German Reich had been indulging in the licence conferred on them by the temporary eclipse of a Power which had overshadowed Europe during the preceding half-century. In their reaction from the nervous strain of the recent war-years, the momentary victors had closed their eyes to the future and had thrown themselves blindly into various children's games that served to ease their anxieties or to minister to their self-esteem. The French had been playing at a Napoleonic military preponderance which would absolve them from the need of agreeing with their adversary quickly while they were in the way with him.² The British had been playing at an insularity which would enable them to disentangle themselves from Continental European commitments with as clean a cut as if Great Britain had been North America. The Italians had been playing at an anti-Gallicanism which would demonstrate that Italy was the equal of France. The Russians had been playing at defying the united forces of an aggressively hostile Capitalist World. The states members of the Little Entente had been playing at being their own pre-war oppressor opposing an intransigent legitimism to an impertinent irredentism (with the Magyars now assuming the irredentists' rôle in place of the liberated Jugoslavs and Rumanians and Slovaks). And finally, the Slovaks had been playing at autonomism in Czechoslovakia, and the Croats at separatism in Jugoslavia, during this time of licence when the danger of their falling back again under Magyar rule did not appear to be immediate.

In the celebration of these 'post-war' Saturnalia most of the performances were rather half-hearted, even when the performers were playing their chosen parts with the greatest show of energy and conviction. The French, for instance, knew very well in their heart of hearts that, fundamentally and intrinsically, twentieth-century France was no match for twentieth-century Germany; and, at the very time when they were deliberately sacrificing their chance of reconciliation with Germany rather than forgo the pleasurable

¹ At this time, the principal index of the standing of the League was to be found in the fortunes of the World Disarmament Conference. The latest chapter in the history of this conference will be recorded in the *Survey for 1935*.

² Matt. v. 25.

sensation of their momentary military superiority over her, they were betraying their latent disbelief in the efficacy of their own unaided military strength in an incessant and feverish search for more and better military alliances. The English, again, were not really unaware of the fact that England had never, at any time in her history, been able to keep out of any major European conflict that might conceivably end in Europe falling under the military domination of some single Power. Indeed, by this time the English were even beginning to realize that Great Britain had ceased to be an island on the day when the first cross-channel flight had been made by an aeroplane. Their loud-voiced 'post-war' insistence that Great Britain was as much an island as North America, and that the British Europeans could therefore afford to be as indifferent to the fate of Continental Europe as the Canadians and Americans were, betrayed, instead of concealing, their secret recognition of the unpalatable truth that their prized and precious insularity had been taken from them by the latest step in the formidable progress of modern Western Physical Science. In a similar way, the loudness of the 'post-war' blasts that the Italians were perpetually blowing on Fascist trumpets proclaimed an anxiety lest a 'just great' Power that was aspiring to equality with France might turn out to be no more than a 'near great' Power of the calibre of Spain or Poland.¹

In 1934, these 'post-war' games of the European mice were being broken in upon by the reappearance on the scene of the German cat with newly grown claws and with an appetite that had been whetted to an unheard-of sharpness by a forcibly imposed fast.

The psychological effect abroad of events in Germany took the form of a succession of shocks which was cumulative. The first shock in the series was administered by the suddenness and unexpectedness of Herr Hitler's actual advent to power; the second by the 'raging tearing' campaign of brutal violence in which the victorious Nazi Movement swept all its political opponents or rivals in Germany away; the third by the abrupt announcement of Germany's intention to secede from the League of Nations. These first three shocks, which were all delivered within the year 1933, have been taken account of in the preceding volume.² In this place, some mention must be made of the fourth shock, which was administered by the sudden shooting of an unknown number of Germans—both Nazis and non-Nazis—by German hands on the 29th and 30th June, 1934.

¹ For the agonizing border-line between Great Powers and states of lower calibre, see the *Survey for 1933*, p. 206.

² The *Survey for 1933*, Part II, section (i).

While these killings were technically an internal affair of 'the Third Reich', they profoundly affected public opinion abroad because they were a startling breach of the accepted code of behaviour in the Western Society of this age, and because they seemed to provide Germany's neighbours with a foretaste of what they might have to expect if ever they were to fall under the domination of 'the Third Reich'. The shockingness of these events of the 29th-30th June, 1934, in West-European eyes was indeed manifold. It was shocking to see the head of a state—even when he was the leader of a recently victorious revolutionary movement—shooting down his own former henchmen in the style of an American 'gangster' (and the shock was not mitigated by the probability that the victims had been engaged in a conspiracy against their own chief, nor again by the virtual certainty that some of them were men of a criminal and immoral character). It was shocking, too, to learn that the shootings had taken place either completely without warning or after a nominal summary trial in which the verdict was a foregone conclusion. Most shocking of all was the undoubted fact that Herr Hitler's example, in taking this 'direct action' against his enemies in his own household, served as the signal for an orgy of similar killings on the part of gangs or individuals who seized this opportunity of making away with prominent persons whom they hated on political or even on personal grounds. It was startling both to find that a hatred keyed up to this murderous intensity was so rife in Germany, and to see it proved by the sequel that this German lust to kill could be indulged in so widely with impunity. The most eminent of the non-Nazi victims were the former Reichskanzler General von Schleicher, who was shot down, together with his wife, in his own house; his adjutant, General von Bredow; and a number of distinguished Catholic civilians and laymen: among them Herr von Bose (who was Herr von Papen's *chef de cabinet*), Herr Klausener and Dr. Beck.¹ It was impossible to discover whether the killing of these non-Nazi victims was inspired or authorized either by Herr Hitler himself or by members of his *entourage*; and it was also impossible to obtain a complete and exact list of the people who had been put to death—though it came to be known that the number ran into three figures.

The shock which was thus produced abroad by these killings in Germany, on and after the 30th June, 1934, was confirmed and accentuated by the moral effects of the murder of Dr. Dollfuss on the

¹ Dr. Brüning had already left Germany before this date; Herr von Papen, who was then still in Germany, escaped with his life and actually remained in office!

25th July; for though this crime was committed outside the frontiers of the Reich by hands which (like Herr Hitler's) were not *Reichsdeutsch* but Austrian, the moral responsibility for the outrage was placed on the shoulders of the National Socialist Party in Germany by an immediate and spontaneous consensus of world-wide public opinion.¹ The indignation which the murder of Dr. Dollfuss excited was proportionate to the peculiar pathos of his end and to the special admiration and affection which he had won by the attractiveness of his personality and by the gallantry of the political fight that he had been making down to the moment when the murderer's bullet cut his life short. Whereas the conspicuous victims of the 30th June had been infamous, and the respectable victims relatively obscure, Dr. Dollfuss was a victim with a reputable character in a prominent position. Even those Labour and Socialist circles abroad which had been bitterly alienated from him by his acquiescence in the forcible suppression of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party² found no satisfaction in seeing him removed from the scene by a Nazi act of criminal violence; and their personal resentment against him, if not appeased by the tragedy of his death, was at any rate not transferred in full measure to his successors in the government of Austria. In fact, in every quarter, the main reaction towards the murder of Dr. Dollfuss was one of horror at what was felt to be a further revelation of the Nazi *êthos*.

This, then, was the ferocious guise in which the German beast of prey presented itself, after an absence of sixteen years, in its old European hunting grounds; and in this disconcerting situation the rats and mice and such small deer, that had been keeping a common holiday, began to behave in diverse ways. While some of them tumbled to the situation at once and altered their behaviour in a trice, there were others which were slower to desist from their play—either because they were genuinely blind to the signs of the times or because they had not the hardihood to look an unpleasant fact in the face.

The quickest and most drastic action was taken by the Russians.³ The Bolshevik statesmen at Moscow perceived that the triumph of National Socialism in Germany in 1933, in conjunction with the triumph of militarism in Japan in 1931, had transformed the entire

¹ See pp. 474-8, below.

² The masters of the Soviet Union can hardly have been shocked, or even startled, by the killings in 'the Third Reich', either before or on or after the 30th June, 1934. They did, however, show themselves quickly and deeply sensitive to the indications of eastward military ambitions in the minds of the new masters of Germany.

³ See pp. 456-67, below.

international situation—not only in Europe but throughout the World—and had exposed the Soviet Union to a danger of aggression which was imminent and concrete. In face of this unexpected and unwelcome change in their environment, the Bolsheviks resolutely foreswore their cherished luxury of the Communist 'Holy War' and took energetic steps to secure themselves against a threat from two particular Capitalist Powers by making common cause with the rest.¹ In the teeth of their own convictions and words and acts, they now pushed their way into the comity of the 'sated' majority by purchasing the diplomatic recognition of the United States Government² and negotiating a non-aggression treaty with France³ and acquiring membership of the League of Nations.⁴ These transactions were evidence that the old-fashioned Capitalist countries had changed their attitude and policy towards the Soviet Union as greatly as the Soviet Union had changed hers towards them; and, whatever might be thought of the new Franco-Russian *entente*, the entry of the Soviet Union into the League could hardly be interpreted otherwise than as a notable gain (to be set off against losses in other directions) for the cause of the collective system of international law and order.

The Poles were as quick as the Russians to perceive, and act upon, the signs of the times as these displayed themselves above the narrower Polish horizon.⁵ The Polish *refroidissement* towards France and *rapprochement* towards Germany, which was one of the most remarkable of the political phenomena in Europe during the years 1933 and 1934, was, no doubt, brought about by the combined operation of several causes. One cause was certainly an eagerness to play at being a full-fledged Great Power which could now begin to fend for itself without French protection. Another cause was the personal idiosyncrasy of Marshal Pilsudski, whose bugbear was not Germany but Russia, and who therefore perhaps felt less acute misgivings than many of his compatriots about the prudence of accepting

¹ The piquancy of this Russian act of *Realpolitik* was heightened by the fact that the two Capitalist Powers against whom the Bolsheviks were thus seeking to make friends among the Capitalist Mammon of unrighteousness had both actually been moving away from the traditional nineteenth-century Capitalist order—and this in the Communist direction—in consequence of the very change of régime which had set them both so sharply at variance with the Soviet Union. The young Japanese militarists would have claimed, with the same sincerity as the young German National Socialists, that they were carrying out a social revolution on the home front, and that the programme of this revolution included everything that was of any value in the programme of Socialism.

² See the *Survey for 1933*, Part IV, section (vi).

³ Section B (i) (c) of this part of the present volume.

⁴ *Loc. cit.*

⁵ For Polish policy in the years 1933 and 1934, see the *Survey for 1933*, pp. 183-8 and the present volume, pp. 332-3, 340 *seqq.*, below.

the opening of a German offer of friendship as a means of escape from that Russo-German encirclement of Poland which had been the nightmare of every Pole during the post-war years.¹ But the principal cause was probably a swift appraisal of Germany's recovery of strength; a private prognostication that Germany was destined to increase and France to decrease; and a determination to be once more on the winning side—even if the Polish mouse, in putting itself at the German mouser's disposition, could scarcely hope to win any guerdon beyond that of being eaten the last (the boon which had once been wheedled from the Cyclops by Odysseus at the expense of his companions).

The Italians were perceptibly slower in reacting than either the Poles or the Russians. It was notorious that a *Gleichschaltung* of Austria with Germany (as an effective alternative to an *Anschluss*) was Herr Hitler's darling ambition; and the Austrian Führer of 'the Third Reich' lost no time, after his accession to power at Berlin, in putting his Austrian plan of campaign into execution.² It was also manifest that either the *Gleichschaltung* or the *Anschluss* of Austria would suffice to place Italy at Germany's mercy; and that, if Austria were thus to be engulfed at a time when Italy was still at feud with Yugoslavia, there was a possibility that Germany (with her *terra irredenta* in the Alto Adige) and Yugoslavia (with hers in Venezia Giulia) might be drawn into an anti-Italian *entente* which might expose Italy to mortal danger. Yet, in this grave hour, the realistic man of action in Signor Mussolini did not assert himself over the play-actor instantaneously. For many months after Herr Hitler's triumph in Germany, the Duce seems to have clung to the illusion that he would still be able to play the patronizing part of Führer's Führer, and so contrive to hold the German National Socialist imitators of Italian Fascism in leading strings. It took the assassination of Dr. Dollfuss to cure Signor Mussolini finally of this illusion; and, even then, the Head of the Italian State did not show the clear-sightedness and resoluteness and swiftness of his Russian *confrères* in drawing—and acting upon—the consequences of an unwelcome discovery. It took the assassination of King Alexander to awaken Signor Mussolini completely to the truth that he could no longer afford to allow his feud with Yugoslavia to drag on,³ and that the

¹ On this point, see further p. 342, below. At the time of writing, in the summer of 1935, it was still too early to tell whether the recent Germanophil policy of Poland was being pursued with less conviction since Marshal Pilsudski's death.

² See section C (i) of this part of the present volume.

³ There had been a *détente* between Italy and Yugoslavia in 1933 after the

time had come for selling out his anti-Gallicanism at whatever might prove to be the market price of the day. In the event, Signor Mussolini did prudently accept from France, in the agreements signed at Rome on the 7th January, 1935, a *parecchio* of about the same value as the offer which a previous Italian Government had rejected in 1915, when it was tendered by the Hapsburg Monarchy; and after this long-overdue settlement with France Signor Mussolini made a belated attempt to persuade King Alexander's successor in the management of Yugoslav foreign policy, the Prince Regent Paul, to smoke the pipe of peace with him. Yet, though the master of Italy thus steered clear of disaster in the year 1934, the margin of safety that he allowed to himself—and to his country—was injudiciously narrow; for in the July of that year, if not for the second time in the October,¹ he found himself almost on the brink of a war into which he could not have plunged with any prospect of an auspicious issue.

The history of the Italo-French agreements of the 7th January, 1935, will be recorded in the next volume in this series; but in this place it may be convenient, before passing on to consider the policy of other Powers, to mention certain indications of the change in the orientation of Italian foreign policy which gradually became apparent in the course of the year 1934.

This change shows itself, for example, in the difference in the tenor of two of Signor Mussolini's speeches which were delivered respectively on the 18th March, 1934, and on the 6th October. On the former date, he declared that the problem of settling Italy's outstanding differences with France and with Yugoslavia still remained to be solved; spoke as warmly as ever in favour of Hungary's demands for territorial treaty-revision; and laid down, in the matter of the limitation of armaments, that 'if the armed states do not disarm, they are violating Part V of the Versailles Treaty and cannot oppose a

initialing of the Four-Power Pact on the 7th June of that year in a form which seemed to indicate that Italy had gone far towards abandoning her championship of treaty revision (*Survey for 1933*, pp. 217 *seqq.*); but the ill-feeling had flared up again in 1934 when Yugoslav suspicions of Italian policy had been reawakened by the concentration of Italian troops towards the Italo-Austrian frontier after the murder of Dr. Dollfuss, and by the Italian naval demonstration at Durazzo on the 23rd June, 1934 (see pp. 535-6, below). At the same time, throughout the year 1934, and not only after the assassination of King Alexander, there was a markedly stronger desire on the Italian side than there was on the Yugoslav side to compose the Italo-Yugoslav quarrel; and all the overtures in this sense that were made during the year were of Italy's making. (On this point, see further section D (ii), pp. 557-9, below).

¹ For the reasons why, after the Marseilles crime, the danger of war was probably not so great in fact as it appeared to be on the surface, see section D (ii), pp. 353, 538-9, 566, below.

translation into fact of that parity of rights that was granted to Germany in December 1932.¹ In passing to the question of Italy's own action in the international field, he announced that 'Italy's historical objectives are Asia and Africa, with which Italy is linked by rapid means of communication'; and the concern which this announcement caused in Turkey (though not, it seems, in Abyssinia) was not allayed by the accompanying assurance to Italy's non-European neighbours, 'near and far', that 'there' was 'no question, for Italy, of territorial conquests, but only of a spiritual and economic expansion.'² On the other hand, on the 6th October, 1934, Signor Mussolini spoke of the Italo-French problem as being on the verge of settlement; made an unmistakable gesture of friendship towards Yugoslavia (in spite of the virulent war of words which was being waged at the time in the Yugoslav and Italian Press);³ and made no mention whatever either of Hungary or of treaty-revision.

The political settlement of accounts between Italy and France, which was in fact to follow immediately after the turn of the calendar year, had been anticipated, between the dates of Signor Mussolini's two speeches aforementioned, by economic negotiations in Milan during April 1934 and in Paris during May, which had resulted in the removal of some of the existing restrictions upon Franco-Italian trade. Thereafter, in September 1934, a French parliamentary mission had played a prominent and a friendly part at the Levant Fair at Bari; and the visit of an Italian air-squadron to Paris in June 1934 had been reciprocated by the visit of a French air-squadron to

¹ See the *Survey for 1932*, pp. 288-9.

² These passages in the speech evoked an inquiry at the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the part of the Turkish Ambassador. The Ambassador was informed (according to a statement made in the Great National Assembly at Angora by the Turkish Foreign Minister on the 5th April, 1934) that the remarks did not apply to Turkey as, in Italian eyes, she was a European and not an Asiatic state; and he also received a personal assurance to the same effect from Signor Mussolini himself. Yet an abiding fear of possible Italian ambitions at Turkey's expense may be divined in the subsequent course of Turkish policy: for instance, in the Turkish eagerness to establish a united front between the newly formed Balkan Group and the Little Entente, and in the seven years' plan of increased expenditure on armaments upon which the Turkish Government embarked on the 16th May, 1934. These Turkish defensive gestures were certainly evoked by a fear of Italy and not by a fear of Germany; and the unpleasant experience which fell to the lot of Albania, one of Turkey's European 'successor states', in June 1934 showed that a certificate of European-ness was not necessarily sufficient in itself to ensure a weak Near Eastern country against receiving embarrassing Italian attentions. For the visit of the first squadron of the Italian Adriatic Fleet to Durazzo without invitation or forewarning, see the additional note following section D (i) of this part of the present volume.

³ See pp. 556-7, 558, below.

Rome in October. Like the Franco-Russian exchange of air-visits in 1933,¹ this Franco-Italian exchange in 1934 provided an occasion for warm demonstrations of friendship between the two countries concerned.

The gradual transfer of Italy's hostile attention from Yugoslavia to Germany in the course of the year 1934 had its analogue in a corresponding and contemporary change of orientation in the policy of Czechoslovakia—in this case, to an anti-German from an anti-Hungarian front. In the preceding volume,² mention has been made of the special danger with which Czechoslovakia—a Slav peninsula projecting into a German ocean, and embracing a subject minority of 3,088,530 ex-Austrian Deutschböhmern within her own frontiers—now found herself confronted owing to the triumph in Germany of Herr Hitler with his programme of eventually bringing within the frontiers of 'the Third Reich' all German populations that had been placed, or left, outside them by the Peace Settlement of 1919-20.³ Indeed, the Nazi campaign in Austria was an even greater menace to Czechoslovakia than it was to Italy;⁴ and in these circumstances the Czechoslovak Government, if they had had a free hand, would probably have gravitated towards Italy as decidedly as Italy was gravitating towards France. In fact, Czechoslovakia might have gone the length of becoming a party to the Italo-Austro-Hungarian Pact which was concluded on the 17th March, 1934⁵—and this even at the price of granting Hungary some measure of the territorial treaty-revision on which the Magyars had never ceased to insist. Already,

¹ See Section B (i) (c) of this part of the present volume, pp. 385-6.

² See the *Survey for 1933*, pp. 196-8.

³ In formulating this programme, Herr Hitler explicitly excepted the German-speaking Alsations and tacitly excepted the German-speaking Swiss; but this was cold comfort for the Czechs.

⁴ It was not until after the Nazi conquest of Germany that the statesmen in control of the Czechoslovak Government came to take the view that the *Anschluss* of Austria to the Reich would be a deadly danger to Czechoslovakia. As late as the 21st March, 1934, in a speech on foreign affairs in the Parliament at Prague, Dr. Beneš was still taking care not to enrol Czechoslovakia in Monsieur Barthou's anti-German Grand Army, and he even reminded his hearers on this occasion that, during the General War of 1914-18, both he and President Masaryk had been advocates of the *Anschluss* (it was, indeed, the fact that President Masaryk, at any rate, had remained in favour of the *Anschluss* during the Peace Conference of Paris). The definite entry of Czechoslovakia into the anti-German camp is to be dated between the delivery of this speech and the signature of the Czecho-Russian pact of the 16th May, 1935. This anti-German orientation of Czech policy probably had the effect of accentuating the German peril which was the cause of it. It remained to be seen whether this orientation, which had been given to Czechoslovak foreign policy by Dr. Beneš, would be followed to the logical end by Dr. Beneš's countrymen.

⁵ See Section C (ii) of this part of the present volume.

in the past, Dr. Beneš had more than once thrown out a hint that he was not unalterably opposed to some eventual adjustment of the Czechoslovak-Hungarian frontier within modest limits;¹ and this conception had come to be known as 'the Masaryk revision' in contrast to the demand of the Hungarian 'Die-Hards' for an integral restitution of the pre-war dominions of the Crown of St. Stephen. It might have been supposed that, in 1934, the moment had arrived—if it was ever to come at all—for putting 'the Masaryk revision' into effect; and Dr. Beneš would certainly have had the French Government's blessing if he had embarked on this enterprise. He was restrained, however, by two considerations.

In the first place, the other two states members of the Little Entente, and Rumania in particular, were still as intransigently opposed as ever to retroceding to Hungary even so much as a square centimetre of their territorial gains in the Peace Settlement;² and Dr. Beneš could not afford to give his allies any pretext for alleging that Czechoslovakia had departed from a policy of solidarity with them *vis-à-vis* Hungary at a time when he had some reason for fearing that they might actually be under a temptation, on their part, to leave Czechoslovakia in the lurch *vis-à-vis* Germany. In the second place, the Italo-Austro-Hungarian Pact was suspected of being a step towards an attempt to restore the Hapsburg Dynasty in Austria and in Hungary;³ and in this matter Czechoslovakia herself was still just as intransigent as her partners, since a Hapsburg restoration in Vienna or in Budapest or, *a fortiori*, in both the former capitals of the *ci-devant* Dual Monarchy might be expected to put a formidable strain upon the inchoate Czechoslovak national consciousness by exerting a powerful attraction upon the Deutschböhmen separatists, upon the Slovak autonomists, and upon the peasantry of all nationalities to whom the newfangled idea of Nationalism was less familiar than the tradition of personal allegiance to an Emperor-King. These considerations made it difficult for Czechoslovakia to cover either her rear by compounding with Hungary or her flank by acquiring, in Italy, an additional ally who could be relied upon to be more zealous than Rumania or Jugoslavia in assisting Czechoslovakia to resist the realization of Herr Hitler's ambitions. When it is added that Poland's *rapprochement* towards Germany in 1934 went *pari passu* with a recrudescence of the post-war *mésintelligence* between Poland

¹ See the *Survey for 1933*, p. 216.

² For the policy of Rumania and Jugoslavia in 1934, see the present chapter, pp. 341 *seqq.*, and section C (ii), pp. 498, 501-3, 506-7, below.

³ See section C (ii), pp. 495-6, 498, 501-3, 506-7, below.

and Czechoslovakia,¹ it will be seen that Czechoslovakia now found herself in an extraordinarily difficult position.

Her difficulties can be illustrated from the events of her current history. For example, the dissolution of the German National-Socialist and Nationalist parties on Czechoslovak territory on the 4th October, 1933,² was followed up, on the 25th of the same month, by the enactment of a law enabling the Government to dissolve any political parties, or organizations connected with such parties, whose activities might be considered to be inimical to the interests of the Republic, and also to confiscate their funds. On the 11th November this law was applied to the Nazi Party, and several Nazi trade unions were dissolved on the 27th. In a speech addressed on the 31st October, 1933, to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Chamber, Dr. Beneš described the Nazi Revolution in Germany as being inimical to the establishment of European peace and security. A local repercussion of the Nazi Movement also made itself felt in Czechoslovakia, towards the end of the year 1934, in the 'communal' riots (to use the relevant Indian term) which broke out, on the 24th-25th November, 1934, in the universities of Prague, between Czech and Deutschböhmen students.³ On the Polish front, a promise of

¹ For the previous history of this Polish-Czechoslovak misunderstanding, see the *Survey for 1920-3*, pp. 210, 228, 281; the *Survey for 1924*, pp. 457-8; the *Survey for 1925*, vol. ii, pp. 247-50.

² For this, see the *Survey for 1933*, p. 197.

³ Already under the Hapsburg régime the infection of Bohemia with the virus of linguistic nationalism had led to a schism in the University of Prague. The historic university, which had been founded in A.D. 1348 by the Luxemburger King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor Charles IV, had become Germanized under a régime in which the Germans were the dominant nationality, and on this account it had been duplicated by the foundation of a Czech University at Prague in A.D. 1882. The break-up of the Hapsburg Monarchy and establishment of the Czechoslovak Republic, as a result of the General War of 1914-18, had subsequently inverted the positions of these two universities. It was now the Czech University's turn to be 'established' (to use the English ecclesiastical term) and the German University's turn to exist on sufferance. This reversal of rôles was symbolized in the passage of a law through the Czechoslovak Parliament in 1920 which decreed that the German University should hand over to the Czech University the insignia of the historic Charles University. The riots of November 1934 were the consequence of an order, issued by the Czechoslovak Ministry of Education, for putting the law of 1920 into effect.

The time-lag of some fourteen years between the order and the law is significant; for it was one among a number of contemporary indications that the Czechoslovak Government's original policy of moderation and conciliation towards the German minority in Czechoslovakia was now giving way to a policy of repression of the kind which had been applied to the subject national minorities from the outset in most other countries in post-war Europe. In considering this unhappy change in the domestic policy of the Czechoslovak

better relations which seemed to be implicit in the signature of a Czecho-Polish trade agreement on the 10th February, 1934, was belied on the 24th March, when twenty Czechoslovak residents in Poland were expelled, at twenty-four hours' notice, by the Polish police. On the home front, the perpetually simmering trouble between the Czechoslovak Government and the Slovak autonomists boiled over—in one of its periodical ebullitions—in September 1933, and on this occasion it involved the Czechoslovak Government in a brush with the Vatican, which was concerned in the affair in the persons of its *protégés*, the Slovak Clericals.

In this sea of troubles, Czechoslovakia clung tightly to the hand of France, which was already in her grasp, and at the same time clutched eagerly at the hand which Russia now held out to her. Monsieur Barthou received a warm welcome at Prague on the 26th–28th April, 1934,¹ and this diplomatic visit was returned by Dr. Beneš, in unexpectedly grim circumstances, when he conferred in Paris on the 13th–16th October, 1934, with Monsieur Barthou's successor Monsieur Laval after attending the murdered French Foreign Minister's funeral. Meanwhile, the exploration of the possibility of negotiating an East-European Pact, which had been started by MM. Barthou and Litvinov at their meeting in Geneva on the 18th May, 1934,² had been carried a stage further in a meeting between Dr. Beneš and Monsieur Litvinov at Marienbad on the 3rd September, 1934; and on the 11th December Czechoslovakia acceded to the Franco-Russian agreement of the 5th December, 1934, by which the contracting parties bound themselves, severally, not to enter—at any rate without previous consultation with one another—into any arrangements with another state which might be prejudicial to the ultimate conclusion of the Eastern Pact itself.³ In a statement on the international situation which he made to both Houses of the Czechoslovak Parliament on the 6th November, 1934, Dr. Beneš gave his blessing to the accomplished fact of the Soviet Union's entry into the League, and to the imminent prospect of the conclusion of an agreement between France and Italy. At the same time, the measure of protection which Czechoslovakia stood to gain from a Franco-Russian

Government in the year 1934, the foreign observer will be led to ask whether this was the effect or the cause of the contemporary conversion of the German minority in Czechoslovakia to a militant National Socialism; but the question is difficult, and perhaps impossible, to answer.

¹ For Monsieur Barthou's round of visits, in 1934, to the capitals of the Central and East European allies of France, see pp. 347–9, below.

² See Section B (i) (c) of this part, pp. 387–8, below.

³ For this Franco-Russian agreement, see Section B (i) (c), below, p. 387.

and a Franco-Italian *entente* did not suffice, in the Czechoslovak Government's eyes, to relieve Czechoslovakia herself from the urgent necessity of increasing her own national means of military self-defence. An extension of the term of military service from fourteen to twenty-four months was demanded, on the 14th November, 1934, by the Minister of Defence, from the Budget Committee of the Chamber; and a Bill which embodied this demand, and at the same time extended the reservists' annual period of training from twelve to twenty weeks, was duly passed by the Chamber on the 5th December. In an army order of the 29th of the same month, which was issued by President Masaryk as Commander-in-Chief, this step was explained as a purely defensive measure which had been forced upon Czechoslovakia by developments abroad and which had been deliberately delayed until 'iron necessity' had 'made it imperative to introduce it'.

In contrast to Czechoslovakia, France had probably nothing to fear for her own territorial integrity from the triumph of Herr Hitler in Germany—even on the assumption that the Prophet of National Socialism actually entertained the most far-reaching of the ambitions that were enlarged upon in his Qur'ān *Mein Kampf*.

Between his own accession to power at Berlin on the 30th January, 1933, and the taking of the plebiscite in the Saargebiet on the 13th January, 1935, Herr Hitler repeatedly declared that,¹ if the plebiscite were to result in the return of the Saargebiet to Germany, then 'the Third Reich' would have no further territorial claims to make upon France. A suspicious-minded Frenchman might be inclined to dismiss these assurances as a transparent device *ad hoc* for inducing France to refrain from any action which might prejudice Herr Hitler's chances of immediately gathering the Saargebiet into the Nazi fold; and he might prophesy that, if and when the re-incorporation of the Saargebiet into the Reich was once accomplished, Herr Hitler would promptly proceed to demand the return of at least the German-speaking parts of the former Reichsland in Lorraine and Alsace. To a neutral observer, such suspicions—however natural in French minds—would appear to overshoot the mark, and this for several reasons.

In the first place, the annexation of these French territories by Germany in 1871 had been proved to be a political mistake by the experience of the forty-seven years during which the Reichslanders—German-speakers and French-speakers alike—had remained subjects of Germany without ever becoming bone of her bone or flesh of her

¹ See pp. 591, 621, below.

flesh. Germany's failure to win their hearts had become a European laughing-stock, and the cause of this failure a European scandal. The Reichsland had brought its conquerors neither prestige nor strength; and now that the fortunes of war which had first associated the Reichsland with the Reich had proceeded to dissolve the partnership through the next turn of Fortune's wheel, even the most patriotic German might feel a secret sense of relief at this summary annulment of a forced political marriage which had brought happiness to neither party, and might be glad to say no more about so sore a subject. It was as reasonable to interpret Herr Hitler's assurances to France in this light as to discount them as being insincere; but the hypothesis that Herr Hitler really did mean what he said in this matter was supported by something more substantial than even the most plausible of inferences. In the canonical text of *Mein Kampf* itself, there was chapter and verse¹ for Herr Hitler's personal conviction that the Imperial German Government had made an egregious mistake of policy in fighting the War of 1914-18 on two fronts, and for the Nazi leader's intention, for his own part, to avoid a breach of the peace on the western front if ever he found himself in command of a Germany who had sufficiently recovered from the disaster of 1918 to make another bid for the eastern prize which she had held within her grasp in that fatal year.

On this showing, it has to be asked why the French could not sleep easy, as far as Herr Hitler was concerned—at any rate after the unexpectedly satisfying fulfilment of Herr Hitler's modest western aspirations in the Saar plebiscite of the 13th January, 1935. The announcement of the overwhelming vote in the Saargebiet in favour of immediate reunion with the Reich² might surely be taken as a sign that the frontier between France and Germany had come to rest at last after having fluctuated stormily throughout the thousand years and more that had passed since the first partition of the oecumenical Empire of Charlemagne. A frontier which had hitherto swayed to and fro in accordance with the fortunes of war could surely be stabilized if once it were anchored in the will of the people instead of being left at the mercy of their rulers' swords; and the people's will had been plainly manifested in the course of the sixty-three years that separated the 13th January, 1935, from the date at which Alsace-Lorraine had been ceded by France to Germany in the Treaty of Frankfurt. For forty-seven years, the people of the Reichsland had borne witness, under German rule, that they wished to return to

¹ See A. Hitler: *Mein Kampf* (München, 1930, Eher), chapter 4.

² See pp. 619, 626-7, below.

France; and thereafter, for sixteen years, the people of the Saargebiet, under an Allied occupation followed by the Versailles Treaty régime, had borne witness with equal constancy that they wished to return to Germany. Was not the Franco-German frontier now settled for ever, and the secular quarrel between France and Germany safely buried in the same grave as their thousand-years-long territorial dispute?

The disappointing answer to this question appeared to be that the territorial issue between France and Germany had indeed been eliminated, as far as could be seen, but that this did not necessarily imply the elimination of all cause for misunderstanding and strife between the two countries. The possibility of strife remained because territorial integrity and security was not the sole requirement of a national state in the twentieth-century Western World. Such states demanded, in addition, the security of their sovereign independence; and this meant in political terms that they should be safeguarded against the possibility of being dictated to by their neighbours, and in economic terms that they should be guaranteed sufficient elbow-room to enable their people to maintain whatever standard of living they regarded as their due. Unfortunately, this economic basis of sovereign independence might not be secured for Germany even if she were to succeed in uniting with herself not merely the Saargebiet but Austria and German Bohemia and the South Tirol into the bargain. And similarly the political basis of sovereign independence would not necessarily be secured for France even if she were assured of retaining, for ever, the restored frontiers of 1815.

The crux was Herr Hitler's—and Herr Rosenberg's—prescription for solving the economic problem of a German *Volk ohne Raum* by some form of German expansion overland eastwards which would re-establish Germany's control over all, and perhaps far more than all, the territories in this quarter which had actually been under Germany's military occupation at the moment when her military collapse in the west had compelled her to lay down her arms, and disgorge all her conquests, on the 11th November, 1918. No doubt *Mein Kampf* was the work of an irresponsible propagandist which might throw little more light upon the policy of a Reichskanzler Hitler than was thrown upon the ethics of a Pope Pius II by the writings of an Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini. Indeed, in 1935, Herr Hitler in office declared himself ready to give pledges of non-aggressive intentions *vis-à-vis* Germany's eastern neighbours which, if sincerely meant, would effectively debar Germany from expanding eastward by force, however far they might fall short of the Franco-Russian

ideal of an Eastern Pact.¹ At the same time, the presumptive evidence for the sincerity of this apparent renunciation of Herr Hitler's avowed dreams of conquest in Eastern Europe was distinctly weaker than the corresponding evidence for the sincerity of his renunciation of territorial ambitions *vis-à-vis* France; and indeed, down to the time of writing in May 1935, no explicit renunciation of the eastern policy of *Mein Kampf* had been made public. In any case, in 1934, French suspicions of Germany's designs in the east were unallayed; and, whether these suspicions were reasonable or unreasonable, they undoubtedly produced a profound and perhaps decisive effect upon French policy.

Nor, if the danger of an eastward expansion of Germany were serious, could the French be blamed for taking it tragically. For, after all, the means by which Prussia had ensured her military superiority over France in 1870-1 had been through the previous establishment of a Prussian hegemony over the whole of Germany up to the frontiers of Austria. Suppose that Bismarck's work in the seventh decade of the nineteenth century were to be emulated in the fourth or fifth decade of the twentieth century by Herr Hitler on a vaster scale; suppose that the hegemony of an internally consolidated 'Third Reich' were now to be extended over the 'successor-states' of the Hapsburg Monarchy and the Romanov Empire in Central and Eastern Europe: how would France be able to deal with a neighbour who would then have swollen into a Power of three or four times the calibre of France herself? A Germany whose domain stretched from the Saar and the Rhine to the Black Sea coast of the Ukraine and the White Sea coast of Karelia would dwarf and overshadow France so completely that she might be able to dictate to her without needing to go to war with her, and to dispose of all her resources without needing to annex any of her territory. This was the nightmare that tormented French imaginations in 1934.²

¹ The Franco-Russian project for an Eastern Pact, and the German counter-proposals, will be dealt with in the *Survey for 1935*.

² The same anxiety was weighing upon Italian minds in a lesser degree, whereas the English, characteristically, were still succeeding in shutting their eyes to the fact that they were in the same boat as the Italians and the French. The actual strategic position of Great Britain over against the resurgent military power of Germany was indeed quite as perilous as that of France and perhaps rather more perilous than that of Italy; for the Channel might prove to be not an appreciably better defence against a German attack by land than were the new fortifications along the eastern frontiers of France and Belgium, while London was as dangerously exposed as Paris, and more dangerously than Rome or even than Milan, to a German attack from the air. In an age when air-power appeared to be superseding sea-power as the decisive factor in warfare, mountain-ranges seemed likely to become more effective than straits as strategic

How was the nightmare to be exorcised? If Monsieur Daladier's Government had remained in office, it is possible that France might have sought at last, at this eleventh hour, that direct understanding with Germany which had been advocated by the British and the Italians for ten years past. This faint hope was quenched, however, by the violent internal upheaval in France which replaced Monsieur Daladier by Monsieur Doumergue in the Presidency of the Council, and by Monsieur Barthou at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on the 9th February, 1934. Monsieur Barthou was a veteran of Monsieur Poincaré's 'Die-Hard' political regiment.¹ Under Monsieur Poincaré's inspiration, he had been one of the architects of that structure of alliances between France and the Central and East European 'successor-states' which had been France's substitute for the abortive British and American military guarantees of the 28th June, 1919.² It was natural that Monsieur Barthou, when he found himself unexpectedly back in office at a critical moment of European history, should seek, first and foremost, to save his own previous diplomatic handiwork; and he appears³ to have taken the view that the maintenance of France's Central and East European alliances was not compatible with a direct understanding between France and Germany. On this view, any such understanding would be tantamount, in ultimate effect if not in French intention, to the delivery, by France to

insulators; and on this showing Italy might claim that the unique advantage of being the one insular Great Power in Europe was on the point of passing from Great Britain to herself. Nevertheless, in 1934, the English—with their traditional dislike of boarding the train before it was actually moving out of the station—remained as confident of their insularity, to all appearance, as they had been on the morrow of the Battle of Trafalgar. It is possible, of course, that this appearance was illusory and that the procrastination was due, not to any ill-founded confidence in a security which had ceased to exist, but rather to a prudent delay in deciding which train it was that it was desirable to catch! The rush for the anti-German train in 1934 was warningly reminiscent of the similar rush for the anti-Russian train in 1919; and if that train had turned out to be the wrong one, the same discovery might be made too late by passengers who impulsively boarded this anti-German train fifteen years later. A phlegmatic policy of wait-and-see might perhaps give the English time to make sure whether it might not, after all, be an anti-Italian or an anti-Japanese train that best suited their convenience! If this interpretation of the British attitude in 1934 proved to be correct, then the procrastination would have to be taken as a symptom of *sans froid* and not of inertia.

¹ Monsieur Barthou had been President of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Chamber of Deputies in 1920; he accepted office as Minister of War in Monsieur Briand's Cabinet in January 1921 and from January to October 1922 he was Minister for Justice under Monsieur Poincaré.

² See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (ii) (3) (f); the *Survey for 1924*, Part I A, section (ii); Part II B, section (vi).

³ See an interesting despatch, dated the 29th and published on the 30th November, 1934, from the Paris correspondent of *The Manchester Guardian*.

Germany, of a blank cheque for the satisfaction of Germany's eastern ambitions; and the inevitable result would be that France would lose her present friends. They would either seek a more zealous protector elsewhere or else, failing to find one whose protection would be effective, they would rush—every 'successor-state' for itself—to make the best terms that they could with the new German arbiters of their destinies. In either event, Germany—whether with or without having to fight for it—would enter into her coveted Eastern Empire; and therewith the dreaded dwarfing of France by Germany would be a *fait accompli*.

Could this fatal train of events be averted? It could, in Monsieur Barthou's belief, if a French policy of accentuated intransigence, *à la Poincaré*, towards Germany¹ were combined with a vigorous effort not merely to confirm the existing French system of alliances, but to enlarge it. In shaping this part of his policy, Monsieur Barthou was manifestly much impressed and influenced by the marked and rapid change in the international orientation of Russia and Italy. These two ex-Ally Great Powers, who had been gravitating more and more decidedly towards the German camp since the morrow of the Peace Settlement,² were palpably being stampeded, by Nazi antics, into repenting of their 'post-war' folly, and were casting about, once again, for some security against a German danger which had so truculently reasserted itself. Here, in Monsieur Barthou's eyes, was an opportunity which France could not afford to let slip. If she were to follow up the confirmation of her existing alliances by opening her arms to Russia and Italy and welcoming them back into the anti-German fold, she would have assembled such an overwhelming anti-German coalition that 'the Third Reich'—even if it re-armed to the uttermost—would find itself in a relatively far more unfavourable military position than that of its despised 'post-war' predecessor, the Weimar Republic. Such appears to have been Monsieur Barthou's calculation; but, if it was, the sequel showed that there were several pertinent facts that had escaped his notice.

The first of these facts was that the French alliance had been steadily losing popularity in at least two allied countries, namely Poland and Jugoslavia. In these two young national states, the prevailing emotion of the dominant elements was a national *amour propre*—a malady of political adolescence which was fostered in these

¹ Monsieur Barthou's studied intransigence towards Germany over the armaments question will be dealt with in the *Survey for 1935*.

² For this post-war tendency towards the formation of an anti-French bloc including Germany, Italy and Russia, see the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 125-30.

countries by a narrowness of political vision. The Poles and Jugoslavs were apparently more conscious of their own recovery of strength since the end of the War than of Germany's; and they therefore began to find a French tutelage and patronage intolerably irksome at the very moment when a more far-sighted statesmanship might have taken the view that the link with France was more necessary than ever for these countries' salvation. The irritation against France which sprang from this political root was also aggravated by economic circumstances; for, on the economic plane, France was no more natural a partner for Poland and the Little Entente countries than Italy was for Austria and Hungary. France could not be their principal market and source of supply; she could only be their principal money-lender; and the French did not possess the British knack of keeping on good terms with their debtors.

The second fact with which Monsieur Barthou failed to reckon was that a Franco-German understanding was by no means the only possible new departure in French policy that could alienate the existing friends of France. The event showed that a Franco-Russian understanding was quite as unpalatable as a Franco-German understanding to Poland, and a Franco-Italian understanding far more unpalatable than a Franco-German understanding to Jugoslavia. The Jugoslavs made it apparent that, while they would not easily be induced to march in order to prevent the *Anschluss* or *Gleichschaltung* of Austria to Germany, they would regard it as a *casus belli* if Italian troops were to trespass on Austrian territory for the purpose of keeping the Germans out. And it seemed possible that Marshal Pilsudski, at any rate (and he dictated Poland's policy to his countrymen), would prefer, in a future war, if Poland could not preserve her neutrality, to side with Germany against Russia and Czechoslovakia rather than with Russia and Czechoslovakia against Germany.

The third factor that militated against Monsieur Barthou's policy was the reaction of the majority of France's existing allies towards Germany's recovery of strength in so far as they were sensitive to it. For in this matter Czechoslovakia, whose reaction has been described above, was in a minority of one in taking Germany's resurgence as tragically as it was taken by France herself. The other three countries in question all seem to have dallied, at one time or another, with the idea of making their own arrangements with the resurgent Power.

In order to understand this at first sight inexplicable *insouciance*, it has to be borne in mind that, while the triumph of National Socialism in Germany placed Czechoslovakia under pressure from the outset, the first effect, for each of the three other countries, was to

relieve it of some other pressure to which it had previously been subject. Poland, for example, was released, by Herr Hitler's complete reversal of the philo-Russian policy of the Weimar Republic, from that menace of a Russo-German encirclement which had been overshadowing her ever since the conclusion of the Treaty of Rapallo;¹ and it is probable that, at any other time since then, the Poles would have been just as prompt to accept the offer which was now tendered to them by Herr Hitler—supposing that this offer had been anticipated by Dr. Brüning or by Dr. Stresemann.² Again, the secession of Russia, in the face of the militant hostility of 'the Third Reich', from the revisionist to the anti-revisionist camp released Rumania at last, in fact if not in form, from the obstinately maintained refusal of the Soviet Government to recognize the Rumanian title to Bessarabia.³ And the more gradual alienation of Italy from Germany in the course of the year 1934 brought with it a corresponding diminution of the post-war Italian pressure upon Yugoslavia in the Adriatic.⁴ Hence, Yugoslavia and Rumania and Poland, unlike Czechoslovakia, each actually benefited indirectly, at a certain stage, from the change of régime and temper and policy in Germany; and Yugoslavia and Rumania took advantage of this relief in order to luxuriate in their intransigence towards Hungarian irredentism,⁵ while Poland took advantage of it in order to pay off some old scores against a hard-pressed Czechoslovakia.⁶

In fact, the first reaction of these four countries towards the change in Germany was not auspicious for Monsieur Barthou's project of marshalling an all-inclusive anti-German front; and there were certain other considerations which were actually inclining these former French satellites towards arriving at positive understandings with Germany which would be in direct opposition to the French statesman's policy. In the economic field, all three countries stood to gain greatly by entering into commercial agreements with Germany if

¹ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, pp. 30-1; the *Survey for 1933*, pp. 183-6.

² On this point see p. 328 above.

³ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (ii) (4); the *Survey for 1924*, Part I C, section (vii); the *Survey for 1926*, p. 156 n., 159 n.; the *Survey for 1927*, pp. 297-300.

⁴ See footnote on pp. 328-9, above and section D (ii), pp. 557 *seqq.*, below.

⁵ Yugoslavia and Rumania remained equally intransigent towards Bulgarian irredentism; but in this case their intransigence, even on such a capital point, did not stand in the way of a marked improvement in the general cordiality of their respective relations with their irredentist neighbour. See section D (i) below.

⁶ It would be rash to assume that these scores were imaginary or fictitious. In the post-War friction between Poland and Czechoslovakia, the aggression had by no means been all on one side.

these were attainable; and the Yugoslav-German commercial negotiations, which were opened at Belgrade on the 15th March, 1934, duly resulted in the signature of a commercial treaty on the 1st May. In Poland, which was Germany's direct neighbour, and even in Yugoslavia, which would become her direct neighbour in the event of a *Gleichschaltung* of Austria, economic considerations were no doubt outweighed by political; and here an exaggerated estimate of their military strength may have betrayed both these fledgeling Powers into contemplating dangerous courses. In both Yugoslav and Polish minds, the growing impatience at being the satellites of France seems to have gone hand in hand with a belief that Poland or Yugoslavia (as the case might be) had now become strong enough to make her friendship or hostility a question of serious moment to Germany, and thus to enable the parvenue Power to come to an understanding with the resurgent Power on favourable terms.

To an outside observer such notions (if Polish and Yugoslav and Rumanian statesmen were really to be credited with them)¹ might seem rather naïvely optimistic. Supposing that Germany were really to succeed in overawing the three West-European Powers into passivity and then dealing a 'knock-out blow' to the Soviet Union, it was surely evident that, after that, she would hold every one of the 'successor-states' at her mercy. Poland, as it was, was already almost as dangerously exposed to attack by a rearmed Germany as was Czechoslovakia; Yugoslavia would find herself in as hopeless a strategic position if Germany were to absorb Austria and join hands with Hungary; and even Rumania was well within the reach of Germany's arm. What, then, would happen to these three countries if ever Germany became militarily dominant in Central and Eastern Europe? Perhaps they would not even then have to fear the complete partition and extinction which, in such circumstances, might be the fate of Czechoslovakia; and the territorial losses which would be imposed upon them might even be set off by territorial compensations in other directions—for Poland and Rumania at the expense of the Soviet Union, and for Yugoslavia at the expense of Italy. Nevertheless, the minimal territorial losses which they would have to expect would be serious enough; for Poland would certainly have to retrocede to Germany at any rate the Corridor and Polish Upper Silesia, while Rumania and Yugoslavia, as well as Czechoslovakia, might

¹ The evidence for a Germanophil trend of policy was much less strong and clear in Yugoslavia than it was in Poland, while in Rumania the success of Monsieur Titulescu in maintaining, or recovering, his ascendancy could be taken as an indication that in this country the Francophil trend was still prevalent.

have to pay their territorial toll to the demands of Magyar irredentism.¹

These possible penalties of playing Germany's game were so obvious to any open-eyed student of international affairs, and so odious to the nations from whom they were to be exacted, that in Polish and Yugoslav and Rumanian, as well as Czechoslovak, minds they might have been expected far to outweigh all the other considerations put together—the irritation against France, the hostility to Italy or Russia, the confidence of these young national states in their own callow strength, and the calculation that closer economic relations with Germany would prove to be good business. The Polish and Yugoslav statesmen who were showing signs, at this time, of veering towards Germany and steering away from France might perhaps have retorted to a British critic that the optimism of which he was accusing them was at any rate no more naïve than his own alarmist estimate of 'the Third Reich's' ambitions, and of her ability to achieve them. They might have argued that the notion of Germany's being either eager or able to attack the Soviet Union and deal it a 'knock-out blow' was quite as fantastic as the notion that, in such an event, either Poland or Yugoslavia would be able to put a spoke in Germany's wheel. It was no doubt true that 'the Rosenberg plan', as endorsed in *Mein Kampf*, could not be taken at its face value as a sure indication of Herr Hitler's policy now that he was in office. Yet, even if this retort were cogent in itself, it seems unlikely that it can have represented the real calculations of the statesmen of the 'successor-states', who hitherto had shown themselves prone to exaggerate and not to minimize the dangers besetting their respective countries. We can hardly suppose that Polish and Yugoslav observers were inclined to discount Germany's apparent resurgence as a piece of bluff. Some further explanation seems to be required for the extraordinary spectacle of the Polish mouse deliberately putting his head into the German cat's mouth at the moment when this redoubtable mouser was patently growing a new crop of teeth; and this explanation might perhaps emerge from a consultation between the historian and the psychologist.

¹ It would have been difficult, almost to the point of impossibility, for German diplomacy to purchase Hungary's whole-hearted support except at the price of committing itself to some, at least, of Hungary's territorial claims upon Rumania. Towards Yugoslavia, on the other hand, the Magyar irredentists might conceivably rest content with the recovery of a right of way to the Adriatic coast without insisting upon any retrocession of territory. Here, therefore, the task of German diplomacy was easier; and it is possible that the Yugoslav Government had been given to understand that Germany would not support any Hungarian territorial claims upon Yugoslavia.

The historian would point out that the 'post-war successor-states' in Central and Eastern Europe could not expect to enjoy, *de facto* and *en permanence*, that plenitude of sovereign independence that had been conferred upon them juridically in the Peace Treaties on the pattern of the sovereignty that had actually been exercised, by the Great Powers of the Western World, during the four centuries ending in 1914. As plenary sovereign independent states, these 'successor-states' were not *viables*; and the fateful question for their destiny lay in the choice between the two possible ways in which their inevitable 'mediatization' might be accomplished. Either they might surrender their untenable title to sovereignty voluntarily and partially, in a non-revolutionary way and on an equal footing with their older and stronger neighbours, by throwing themselves into a victorious effort to build up, out of pooled sovereign rights, a workable collective international order; or alternatively they would lose their sovereignty in a more old-fashioned and familiar way through being annexed or enslaved by some aggressive Great Power on the war path.¹ At this point the psychologist, taking up the tale, might suggest that it was actually easier for the nations concerned to reconcile themselves to a brutal and drastic curtailment of their sovereignty on traditional lines, than to a gentle modification of it in the novel shape of the collective system. For, to backward and untutored minds, the novelty and subtlety of the collective idea might prove to be an insuperable stumbling-block which would prevent them from ever considering it on its merits, whereas the habit of ages would incline them to bow their necks to brute force as soon as this confronted them again in overwhelmingly superior strength. On this showing, the psychologist might interpret the outward behaviour of the Central and East European 'successor-states' in 1934 as evidence of a subconscious resignation to the inevitability of a coming German hegemony in the souls of nations which had failed to rise to that ideal of a collective pooling of sovereignty which was their only practicable alternative destiny.

¹ The situation of the Central and East European 'successor-states' after the General War of 1914-18 may be compared with that of the minor states of Germany after the General War of 1792-1815. In this case, likewise, the permanent retention of a plenary sovereignty was not a practical possibility; the minor states of Germany had the choice between making a success of the new-fangled German Confederation or else being swallowed by Prussia; and, after failing to make the moderate sacrifice of sovereignty that was involved in the former alternative, they acquiesced tamely in the latter. In 1934 it looked as though Poland and Yugoslavia and Rumania might be destined to be the Saxony and Bavaria and Württemberg of the twentieth century, and Czechoslovakia perhaps the Hanover!

It is at any rate a fact that, in all these countries in the year 1934, a temper reigned which displayed itself in a passionate refusal of those minimal sacrifices of sovereignty which were manifestly necessary if the collective system was to survive. A case in point is Poland's unilateral repudiation of her minorities protection treaty at the sixteenth session of the League of Nations Assembly.¹ The immediate motive for this action may be found, no doubt, in a determination to make sure that the Soviet Union should have no handle against Poland on the League Council, of which the Soviet Union was on the point of becoming a permanent member. Yet, to any one who was not in a subconsciously suicidal mood, this consideration must have appeared trivial by comparison with the fact that Poland, in unilaterally denouncing one part of the 'post-war' treaty structure, was opening the way for Germany to destroy, by the same method, the entire juridical foundation on which Polonia Rediviva was established. A similar impression is made by the equally passionate fanaticism with which the Little Entente, under the lead of Monsieur Titulescu,² repeatedly inveighed, during the year 1934, against the idea of even an agreed and pacific revision of the territorial chapters of the Peace Treaties. No doubt, for all states everywhere at all times, the surrender of territory was a peculiarly painful sacrifice;³ and, no doubt, also, if once revision were begun, it would be difficult to be certain where it was going to stop. Yet, in thus vehemently ruling out the prospect of any voluntary retrocession of territory whatsoever, Monsieur Titulescu was exposing his country and her allies to the far greater risk of forfeiting their independence altogether; for, if Article 19 were wrongfully expunged from the Covenant of the League of Nations by the unilateral action of the 'satisfied' states, it was certain that Articles 10 and 15 and 16 would be swept away, sooner or later, with an equal high-handedness, by the states at whose expense the territorial Peace Settlement had been made.

Nevertheless, Monsieur Titulescu's preference for the greater but remoter risk, over the lesser but more immediate risk, was manifest in his words and deeds. In October 1933 the Rumanian statesman

¹ See section B (i) (c) of this part of the present volume, pp. 396-8.

² Monsieur Titulescu's anti-revisionist declarations during 1934 can be matched by corresponding pronouncements on the part of Dr. Beneš; but it may be conjectured that, by this time, the Czech statesman's heart was no longer in the rôle which he still dared not cease to play (on this point, see pp. 331-2, above).

³ This extreme repugnance to the cession of territory was a legacy from the primitive tribal feeling of which the modern Western institution of Nationalism was a revival. The Bolsheviks had been notably free from this superstition during the early years of their tenure of power, but they had succumbed to it in their attitude over Bessarabia and they were completely in its grip in 1934.

paid a round of visits to Warsaw, Sofia, Angora, Athens and Belgrade¹ and declared, at the end of it, that he had found a complete solidarity of aims and outlook as between the Little Entente and Poland. Monsieur Titulescu's statement to this effect at Belgrade on the 27th October, 1933, was promptly followed by a speech which Dr. Beneš delivered on the 31st of the same month. The Czechoslovak statesman intimated that his Government were only willing to consider making an economic *rapprochement* towards Hungary on condition that the Magyars refrained from all further agitation for treaty-revision, and this demand drew a sharp rejoinder from the Hungarian Foreign Minister on the 10th November. On the 10th-11th December, 1933, Monsieur Titulescu visited Dr. Beneš at Košice in Slovakia, and there broadcast a speech in which he denounced the 'infamous propaganda' that was being made in favour of territorial treaty-revision; declared that the demand for territorial revision meant war; and added that Rumania would assist Czechoslovakia to defend her territorial integrity if occasion arose. On the 12th December General Gömbös retorted that Hungary would not be asking for revision if she were contemplating war. On the Little Entente side, treaty-revision propaganda was denounced once again in the joint *communiqué* on the meeting of the Permanent Council of the Little Entente which was held in Zagreb on the 22nd-23rd January, 1934. Thereafter, in the Parliament at Belgrade on the 12th March, 1934, the Yugoslav Foreign Minister, Monsieur Jevtić, declared that any attempt to restore the Hapsburg Dynasty in Austria or Hungary would lead to bloodshed; and in the Parliament at Bucarest, on the 4th April, Monsieur Titulescu declared his dislike, and rejection, of both the Hungarian and the Italian brand of revisionism (while at the same time drawing a pointed distinction between the Italian brand, which was merely abstract and wrong-headed, and the Hungarian, which was concrete and criminal). To this, a speaker in the Hungarian Upper House replied on the 5th April by denying the moral validity of a treaty which had been imposed instead of being negotiated. On the 16th-19th April Monsieur Titulescu visited Paris to impress his point of view upon Monsieur Barthou on the eve of the French Foreign Minister's departure on his own round of visits to Central and East European capitals.

Monsieur Barthou showed his mettle by grappling first with Poland, who was the most powerful of the existing allies of France and at the same time the most recalcitrant of them all towards Monsieur Barthou's project for an anti-German grand alliance. His visit to

¹ See Section D (i), p. 524, below.

Warsaw lasted from the 22nd to the 24th April, 1934; and, to judge from the non-committal language of the final *communiqué*, the results were disappointing. Monsieur Barthou consoled himself by going on from Warsaw to Prague, where the success of his visit on the 26th–27th April was so much of a foregone conclusion that the visit itself might almost appear superfluous. After his return to Paris upon the completion of this first part of his itinerary, Monsieur Barthou was visited in his turn by Monsieur Jevtić on the 10th–13th June. This visit was followed, on the 18th–20th June, by a meeting of the Permanent Council of the Little Entente at Bucarest; and on the last day of this meeting, at which the Little Entente reaffirmed its veto upon a Hapsburg restoration, Monsieur Barthou arrived in Bucarest on the first stage¹ of the second part of the itinerary which he had undertaken. On this visit to Bucarest Monsieur Barthou let himself go—whether because his feelings were stirred by the magnetism of Monsieur Titulescu's kindred spirit, or because he divined, now that he was on the spot, that the public opinion of Rumania did not entirely abound in Monsieur Titulescu's sense (a painful discovery which might well stimulate the 'Die-Hard' French statesman to make a frantic bid for the retention of Rumania's loyalty to the cause of Franco-Rumanian solidarity). In a speech which he delivered on the 21st June, 1934, at a special joint session of the Rumanian Senate and Chamber of Deputies, Monsieur Barthou addressed his audience as 'My dear fellow-countrymen' (an allusion to the honorary citizenship of Rumania which had just been conferred upon him), and spoke the words:

know that, if a square centimetre of your territory is touched, France will be at your side.

Prefaced, as it was, by a speech from Monsieur Titulescu himself on the text of 'No, no, never', Monsieur Barthou's uncompromising guarantee of the 'post-war' territorial *status quo* produced consternation in Hungary,² annoyance in Italy and misgivings in France. In a second speech at Bucarest the French Foreign Minister drew a dazzling picture of pacts which stretched 'from Prague to Angora' and which created a zone of peace; but a sceptical-minded French

¹ On his way to Bucarest Monsieur Barthou had broken his journey at Vienna on the 19th June, 1934, and had there discussed the economic situation of Austria with Dr. Dollfuss.

² On the 25th June, 1934, an effigy of Monsieur Barthou was publicly burnt in Budapest during a demonstration by students; and on the 26th the Hungarian Prime Minister declared that Monsieur Barthou's words had disappointed Hungary of her hope that the foreign policy of France was based not on bayonets but on a conception of justice.

public was moved, by Monsieur Barthou's hyperboles, to ask itself whether the anti-German grand alliance was not being bought too dearly at the price of these unlimited French commitments. Meanwhile the indefatigable disciple of Monsieur Poincaré was completing his itinerary by the payment, on the 24th–26th June, 1934, of a visit to Belgrade, where he was likewise honoured at a joint meeting of both Houses of Parliament—a ceremony which gave the Prime Minister of Yugoslavia an opportunity of thanking his French guest 'for his answer to those who' made 'economic co-operation in Central Europe conditional upon the revision of frontiers'. After this Monsieur Barthou returned to Paris, where he was visited by Monsieur Tatarescu, the Rumanian Prime Minister of the day, on the 12th July, 1934, and by Monsieur Titulescu on the 31st August.

These French official visits to Warsaw, Prague, Bucarest and Belgrade—and Czechoslovak, Rumanian and Yugoslav official visits to Paris—in the later months of 1933 and the earlier months of 1934 had their counterpart in a parallel series of comings and goings between the capitals of the 'dissatisfied' countries. For example, in October 1933 the Hungarian Prime Minister and Foreign Minister, General Gömbös and Monsieur de Kanya, broke their journey at Sofia, on their return from a visit to Angora for the signature, on the 22nd of that month, of an instrument prolonging for a further five years the existing Hungaro-Turkish Neutrality, Conciliation and Arbitration Treaty. King Boris of Bulgaria was in Berlin on the 28th February–3rd March, 1934; and the Bulgarian Prime Minister also paid his respects there, as well as at Paris and at London, in the April of the same year, before breaking his homeward journey at Budapest on the 26th April (the date of Monsieur Barthou's arrival at Prague).¹ Thereafter Budapest received two visits from German statesmen: from General Göring on the 24th May, 1934, and from Herr von Papen (who was now Herr Hitler's Envoy Extraordinary at Vienna)² on the 28th September. A visit which General Gömbös paid to Warsaw on the 19th–21st October, 1934, ought perhaps to be mentioned in the same context, in view of Poland's virtual secession, by this time, from the French camp. On this occasion General Gömbös signed nothing but an innocuous convention for the promotion of intellectual co-operation between Hungary and Poland; but at the same time it was agreed to set up a committee for the development of Polono-Hungarian commercial relations; and Marshal Pilsudski was reported to have intimated to his Magyar visitor his unwillingness to involve Poland in any further political commitments

¹ See p. 348, above.

² See Section C (i), pp. 479–80, below.

(a communication which, for General Gömbös, must have taken some of the sting out of the late Monsieur Barthou's pronouncements at Bucarest four months before).

At first glance, these counter-demonstrations might appear almost pathetically unequal to Monsieur Barthou's impetuous triumphal progress; yet it may be doubted whether the veteran French statesman's abrupt and violent end came in time to save him from disillusionment over the results of his valiant efforts. As has been suggested above, the real state of feeling in the Central and East European 'successor-states' could not be gauged by the ostensible cordiality with which Monsieur Barthou was welcomed in their capitals. The actual effect of his activities could only be measured by the extent of his eventual success in inducing these existing allies of France to do those things which they would have to do—and leave undone those things which they would have to leave undone—in order to bring Monsieur Barthou's dream of an anti-German grand alliance into the realm of practical politics. For a mundane politician the dream was ambitious; for, in times past, it had required a prophet to coax the lion and the lamb into lying down together, and a god to hitch his chariot to a team of pards; and the feat of coachmanship which Monsieur Barthou was attempting was even more bizarre than the legendary miracle of the triumphant Dionysus. The wild beasts whom the French *virtuoso* was proposing to drive in double harness were not even carnivores of a uniform species. He was undertaking to yoke a Russian vulture to a Polish eagle, and a Lion-of-Saint-Mark to a Yugoslav unicorn; and nothing short of success in this pair of *tours de force* would entitle him to receive the victor's crown.

Could Monsieur Barthou induce Poland to join with France and Czechoslovakia and Russia in concluding an East-European mutual assistance pact (with or without German participation)? And could he induce Yugoslavia to open the way for a Franco-Italian *entente* by composing her own quarrel with Italy? Marshal Pilsudski's negative answer to the first question of the two must have become known to Monsieur Barthou, in effect, when he paid his visit to Warsaw in April 1934, though it was not until after Monsieur Barthou's death and the turn of the calendar year that this Polish refusal was publicly made explicit.¹ The answer to the question whether Yugoslavia would consent to make her indispensable contribution to a reconciliation between France and Italy was to have been given by King Alexander in that visit to France which was cut short, on the

¹ The history of the negotiations for an East-European Pact will be dealt with in the *Survey for 1935*.

threshold, by the assassination of the King himself—and the incidental killing of Monsieur Barthou—on the 9th October, 1934, when King Alexander landed at Marseilles.

The importance of this frustrated visit illustrates the difficulty that was inherent in Monsieur Barthou's uncompleted task; for King Alexander's purpose was to attempt, in co-operation with the French Government, to close the formidable breach between the policies of Yugoslavia and Rumania on the one hand and those of Czechoslovakia and France on the other hand which had been opened, since the beginning of the year 1933, by the violent explosion of National Socialism in Germany. While Czechoslovakia was now at one with France in being concerned above all to guard against a German peril, and was ready to make common cause with Italy for this purpose, Yugoslavia and Rumania were still obsessed by their quarrel with Magyar irredentism and Italian revisionism.

In fact, in the year 1934, the portent of Germany's resurrection as an armed and militant Power had not yet come to dominate the international politics of the whole of Europe; and there were at least two regions where some of the mice could still be seen indulging in their 'post-war' games. One such region was South-Eastern Europe—as will appear from the account, which is given in a later chapter,¹ of the relations between Yugoslavia, Italy and Hungary both before and after the crime of the 9th October, 1934. Another region which was behind the times was the Balticum, where the Lithuanians were singularly slow to awaken to the fact that they could not afford to embark upon a new feud² with a Germany who was recovering her strength and at the same time to carry on their old feud with a Poland who was now ominously gravitating towards the German camp.

Even in these two sluggish regions, however, the year 1934 saw certain constructive achievements. In the Balticum the outstanding positive event of the year was the establishment of the Baltic Union³ between Lithuania and her two Baltic neighbours Latvia and Estonia. This *rapprochement* between the three Baltic states was made possible by Lithuania's tardy relaxation of that implacable hostility towards Poland which had hitherto deterred Latvia and Estonia from taking Lithuania into partnership; and this change in Lithuania's policy was—like her great eastern neighbour Russia's *rapprochement*

¹ See section D (ii), below.

² The history of the relations between Lithuania and Germany over the Memelland, which has been dealt with in previous volumes (see the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (ii) (3) (c), and the *Survey for 1932*, Part IV, section (iv)), will be taken up again in the *Survey for 1935*.

³ See section B (ii), below.

towards France and entry into the League—a direct reaction to the triumph of National Socialism in Germany; for Herr Rosenberg was a Baltic German;¹ and the Balticum loomed as large as the Ukraine in the Rosenbergian gospel of the *Drang nach Osten*.² In South-Eastern Europe the outstanding positive event was the conclusion of the Balkan Pact, and in this transaction the influence of a reviving fear of Germany can scarcely be traced.³ The immediate object of the four signatories—Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia and Rumania—was to arrange for a mutual insurance against the irredentist aspirations of Bulgaria, and so to set Turkey, Greece and Yugoslavia free to concentrate upon defence against Italy,⁴ and Rumania and Yugoslavia free to concentrate upon defence against Hungary.

In its outward structure the new Balkan Group resembled the Little Entente (to which two of its members belonged) in being a ring of 'satisfied' states surrounding a 'revisionist' state at whose expense their own present satisfaction had been obtained at the Peace Settlement. In spirit, however, the younger East-European anti-revisionist alliance was happily distinguished from its model; for, while the moral gulf between the Little Entente and Hungary was still as wide in 1934 as it had been when the Little Entente was founded in 1920-1,⁵ the outlook for a reconciliation between Bulgaria and the original members of the Balkan Group was distinctly more promising. This pact between Bulgaria's four Balkan neighbours had arisen out of a series of non-official Balkan Conferences⁶ in which the Bulgarians had participated; the negotiation of the pact had been accompanied by a remarkable improvement in the relations between Bulgaria and Yugoslavia (the neighbour with whom Bulgaria had the biggest bone to pick); and Bulgaria's refusal to become a party to the pact in the first instance was not an irrevocable act any more than it had been a foregone conclusion. In particular the Bulgaro-Yugoslav *détente* was an

¹ Hence his name, which would have laid him under suspicion of being a non-Aryan if he had come from any other quarter of the German-speaking World except the Balticum.

² In Lithuania, apart from the Memelland, there was no German minority; but although Lithuania Proper was thus—unlike Latvia and Estonia—theoretically beyond the pale of German irredentism, it was obvious that, in practice, German irredentist ambitions in Latvia and Estonia could only be satisfied if the Lithuanian corridor, which insulated these two countries from East Prussia, were likewise brought under German control.

³ See section D (i) below.

⁴ For the abiding fear, in these countries, of possible Italian aggressive intentions, see p. 330, above.

⁵ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (iii) (2).

⁶ See the *Survey for 1930*, Part II B, section (ii); the *Survey for 1931*, Part III B, section (i); the present volume, section D (i) of this part.

auspicious feature in the situation in the Balkans which unhappily had no counterpart on the Middle Danube.

The foregoing survey of the history of international relations in Europe during the year 1934 would be incomplete without some reference to the question whether, in this critical year, the European states were moving towards another war. At the time of writing, in the May of 1935, the only genuine light on this momentous question that could be obtained by the anxious observer of events was to be found in the European reactions to the two sensational political crimes with which this year's annals were stained: the murder of Dr. Dollfuss and the assassination of King Alexander (in whose company Monsieur Barthou also lost his life). These two crimes of 1934 were comparable to the assassinations of Sir Lee Stack in 1924,¹ General Tellini in 1923,² and the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his wife in 1914; and, when these comparisons are made, it becomes evident that, in the short span of twenty years, a great and encouraging advance had been made towards safeguarding Mankind against the old danger of being plunged into war by irresponsible political crimes of this character. The sequels to the two crimes of 1934 were advantageously distinguished from the sequels to the three earlier crimes above mentioned in two ways. In the first place, a much greater self-restraint was now displayed in the countries which were emotionally affected; and in the second place an international diplomatic machinery for dealing promptly and wisely with such emergencies had now been created almost *ex nihilo*. Here was a bow in the cloud which even the most cautious and sceptical-minded observer might permit himself to take as a good omen. If it was true that the recrudescence in 1934 of an anarchic Nationalism was partly due to a disappointment with the apparent inadequacy of the League's achievements, it was not less true that the League now gave proof of an unexpected effectiveness as a means of coping with the crop of international crimes and crises which sprang, in 1934, from the sowing of the frenzied nationalists' dragon's-tooth seed.

¹ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, pp. 212 *seqq.*

² See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (iii), (11).

PART III EUROPE

B. NORTH-EASTERN EUROPE

(i) Relations between the U.S.S.R. and France and the Admission of the U.S.S.R. to Membership of the League of Nations.

(a) THE REVERSAL OF THE OUTLOOK OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION

THE admission of the Soviet Union to membership of the League of Nations, with a permanent seat on the Council, on the 18th September, 1934, was an epoch-making event in the history of the Union,¹ and therefore in the history of the World, of which the Soviet Union at this time represented so large a part.² This international transaction at Geneva completed and confirmed and avowed a change in the policy of the Union Communist Party³ which by then had been in progress for a decade (since it had begun immediately after the death of Lenin on the 21st January, 1924); and this change amounted, in its cumulative effect, to an entire reversal of the policy which the Bolshevik Prophet and his Companions had believed in and pursued when they seized dominion over the derelict domain of the former Russian Empire in A.D. 1917.

The immediate motives that prompted this final step are proclaimed by the date; for the day on which the Soviet Union entered the League was the third anniversary of the Japanese outbreak in Manchuria on the night of the 18th-19th September, 1931,⁴ and it was less than twelve months after the day on which Germany had declared her intention of withdrawing from the League—an intention which had been notified to the Secretary-General on the 21st October, 1933.⁵ The reaction in the Soviet Union to the successive erup-

¹ The one comparable event was the previous recognition of the Soviet Government by the United States Government on the 17th November, 1933 (see the *Survey for 1933*, Part IV, section vi).

² In A.D. 1934 about 15.98 per cent. of the World's land-surface and 8.12 per cent. of its population were to be found within the Soviet Union's frontiers (*League of Nations: Statistical Year Book 1933/34*). The percentage of land-surface might be as much as 16 per cent. or more if account were taken of all the Arctic islands under the Soviet flag.

³ The Bolshevik or Majoritarian wing of the former Russian Social-Democratic Party had been metamorphosed into the Russian Communist Party on the 6th-8th March, 1918, and this into the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in May 1924.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1931*, Part IV, section (iii) (b).

⁵ See the *Survey for 1933*, pp. 306, 311 *seqq.*

tions of a militant nationalism in the body politic of each of the two Great Powers that flanked the Union's far-flung territory has been described already in the preceding volume.¹ In order, however, to understand the full implications of the historic transaction of the 18th September, 1934, it is necessary to go back behind the events which gave the final impulsion, and to examine the deeper causes of a movement which had taken some ten years to reach this culmination.

When, some seventeen years before, the revolutionary Lenin and his companions had made themselves masters of the wreckage of the former Russian Empire, their policy had been governed by two fundamental beliefs: one inherited from their predecessor and oracle Karl Marx, and the other thrust upon them by the international situation of the moment. The traditional belief was that the Socialist revolution, which was, *ex hypothesi*, ultimately inevitable, would only achieve its destined triumph if and when it occurred on a world-wide range—or, at any rate, swept simultaneously, in a continuous wave, over all the principal industrial countries of the day.² The belief suggested by the momentary situation in 1917 was that this world-wide revolution was imminent, thanks to the deadly wounds which the Capitalist countries had been inflicting upon the whole Capitalist body social through their internecine war with one another.

It will be seen that the attitude of Lenin's Companions towards the World-Revolution was not unlike that of the first generation of Christians towards the Last Judgement; and whether there be an historical connexion or not between the outlooks of two bands of men who were separated by nineteen centuries of Time and by a vastly wider gulf of spiritual distance,³ it is at any rate certain that, as far as

¹ The *Survey for 1933*, pp. 174-83, 458, and 530-44.

² 'An economic *coup d'état* in any country of the European Continent or even in the whole of the European Continent without England is merely a tempest in a teacup'—dictum pronounced by Karl Marx on the 31st December, 1848 (quoted by M. T. Florinsky, *World Revolution and the U.S.S.R.* (London, 1933, Macmillan), pp. 161-2).

³ In favour of the view that the resemblance between the respective attitudes of the Early Marxians and the Early Christians was the effect of an historical connexion, rather than the effect of Chance or of the uniformity of human nature, it may be observed that the Marxian creed originally took shape in a society whose *Weltanschauung* was not only of Christian origin but had remained predominantly Christian from the Dark Ages until the eighteenth century of the Christian Era. The fundamental tenet of Socialism—'From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs'—was a genuine and important element of original Christian doctrine (for the practice, as well as preaching, of which, we have the unimpeachable testimony of Julian the Apostate); and although this moral axiom might, of course, have been rediscovered by an independent act of intuition, it cannot seriously be accounted

the parallel extended, the psychological effect was the same. Like the first generation of Christians, the Companions of Lenin felt that it would be inept, and indeed frivolous, to spend their energies upon erecting a temporary shelter for the Church of the Elect within the framework of a world order that was doomed to destruction within the next few months or years. What should this tiny vanguard of the elect be doing on the patch of ground that had come into their hands in anticipation of the supreme event—the universal change—that was to bring the whole World, and all Mankind, within the ambit of the New Kingdom? Surely they ought not to waste their time, and abuse their privilege of being in the forefront of the movement, by piling up on this cramped and limited site a structure which could neither be representative of the dawning aeon nor capable of surviving the collapse of the surrounding City of Destruction. Surely, rather, their allotted task, at this end of an age, was devoutly to await the advent of an overwhelming transformation to which they were bound to look forward as an inevitable, as well as an imminent, event, whether they had learnt to expect it, like the Early Christians, from an act of God, or, like the Early Marxians, from an ineluctable process of Historical Determinism.¹

Indeed the Early Marxian, according to his own lights, had even less excuse than the Early Christian for giving any hostages to the Fortune of an expiring age. For while the Christians, like the strictly Orthodox Jews, felt themselves bound to leave it to God to perform his own dynamic work, the Marxians, like the Jewish Zealots of the first century of the Christian Era or the Primitive Muslim Jāhids, for on this hypothesis when it occurs in a creed that sprang from the soil of Christendom and not from that of China or India. We may confidently trace back to the New Testament this cardinal doctrine of Karl Marx, as well as his apocalyptic scheme of world-history, which unmistakably belongs to a tradition known to have been derived by Christianity and Judaism from Zoroastrianism. On this showing, we may diagnose this Marxian Socialism as a genuine abstract of Christianity—but an abstract that was so fragmentary and jejune that it had become a ludicrous travesty of its great original. Marx had taken a single tenet from Christianity, applied it exclusively to the material plane of life (ignoring or denying the spiritual plane), and followed Muhammad in reintroducing the vein of revolutionary violence—the Islamic 'battling on the war-path of God'—which may have been implicit in the earlier apocalyptic tradition, and which came to a fatal harvest in the Jewish Zealotism of the first century of the Christian Era, but which had left only very slight vestiges of itself in the text of the New Testament or in the ethos of the Primitive Christian Church.

¹ This Marxian divinity, 'Historical Determinism', was of the same species as those primitive preanthropomorphic divinities of the old Roman religion—Fortuna, Sors, Robigo, Febris, and the rest—which appear to have been the sole content of the native Italic religious imagination before Ancient Italy came under the successive influences of Hellenism and Christianity.

were less logical in feeling themselves bound, just as stringently, to take the sword in order to help with their own hands in the attainment of an end which they regarded as inevitable by a Power which they believed to be omnipotent.

Yet the first chapter in the history of Marxism, like the first chapter in the history of Christianity, saw the eclipse of the apocalyptic vision, and with it the disappearance of the corresponding state of mind; and in both cases the consequence was a change of emphasis. While the dogma of a coming millennium was jealously guarded in the theological treasure-house of the Faith, the energies of the Church were diverted almost completely from preparations for an imminent advent of the great oecumenical change to the daily round and common task of 'serving tables' in the temporary dwelling-place which the Church had found for herself in an unregenerate World. This transformation of the Marxian Church in Russia has been described as follows, at the end of a close study, by an acute and objective-minded observer:

If we attempt to take a bird's-eye view of the entire course of Soviet foreign relations from 1917 to the beginning of 1933, and also of the leading ideas which underlie it, we are confronted with a curious situation. We see the gradual, painful, but unmistakable transformation of a group of professional revolutionaries who, by an extraordinary concurrence of economic, social, and political factors, found themselves at the head of a vast empire. They began by being the knights-errant of world revolution and they have become the artisans of the vast, if somewhat prosaic, tasks of constructing from the raw material of a desperately poor and backward nation the great industrialized socialist commonwealth of the future. The turning-point in this process of transformation is the adoption of Stalin's doctrine of 'socialism in a single country'. These builders of factories and plants, these matter-of-fact leaders in the colossal project of large-scale collective farms, these Communist tribunes who have banned religion as a vulgar superstition, owe allegiance to the revolutionary doctrines of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Their doctrines have been revised and readjusted in order to meet the requirements of a new order of things, but there is still a wide and, it would appear, an unbridgeable gap between the practical politics of the U.S.S.R. and the teachings of Communism.¹

In 1917 the Russian Communists who had swooped down upon the vacant site of the vanished Russian Empire regarded their prize with contempt, as a rubbish-heap which was of no value in itself. They set store by their capture of it simply because of the amount of inflammable matter that it contained; for they reckoned that, when once they had set this Russian wreckage alight with the flame of their revolutionary torches, the conflagration would immediately

¹ Florinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 248-51.

spread over the World, and would devour the factories and palaces and temples of Europe and Asia and perhaps even America in the same sheet of flame that would be consuming the refuse deposited in Russia by the Czardom. When the world-engulfing flames had flickered out, then the time would come for laying the foundations of the new oecumenical Communist social structure; and there was no reason, either in logic or in sentiment, why the first foundation-stone should be laid on the particular spot where the rouge dragon and pursuivants of Historical Necessity had accidentally found their opportunity of committing the preliminary act of ritual incendiarism. Indeed Lenin and his Companions had no particular love or respect for their native Russia. On *a priori* theoretical grounds, of Christian or perhaps ultimately Stoic origin, they were convinced cosmopolites; and this initial outlook had been reinforced by their personal experience; for the fortune of their war against the Czardom had made them almost lifelong exiles;¹ and most of them had spent the greater part of their exile in the cities of Western Europe. With a counter-Slavophil snobbery they opened their eyes wide to the technological and cultural backwardness of Russia, and gloried in proclaiming it. And so, after their revolutionary conquest of Russia in 1917, they made a point—just because they were Russians who had achieved honour in their own country—of announcing, with ostentation, that, as soon as the World-Revolution spread from Russia to one of the advanced countries of the West, the head-quarters of the Communist International and the capital of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be transferred, as a matter of course, from Moscow to Berlin or whatever the capital of the successfully converted Western country might be.

In anticipation of this next stage in the World-Revolution, the provisional camping-ground which the Marxian Church Militant had acquired on the site of the former Russian Empire was laid out on a system which would be capable of extension, without any essential change of ground-plan, from this limited area to a world-wide range.² Owing to the feats of Muscovite Imperialism during the previous four centuries, the domain of which the Bolsheviks now stood possessed presented a fair epitome of the world of the day—in spite of having shed the fringe of Western Christian subject territories which

¹ Lenin went to live in exile, outside the frontiers of Russia, for the first time in 1900; and he spent no less than fifteen years abroad out of the seventeen years that passed between that date and his final return in 1917. In this respect, Lenin was typical of the Russian revolutionary socialists of his generation.

² See the *Survey for 1924*, Part I C, sections (i) and (ii) (a).

the Czardom had acquired by conquest since the reign of Czar Peter the Great. Even after the loss of this Western zone, the Bolsheviks' heritage from the Czardom still comprised a rich variety of social types: Russians and non-Russians; sedentary populations and nomads; urban industrial workers and peasants; semi-Westernized cosmopolitans and primitive tribesmen. The Bolsheviks were as ruthless as the Czars had been in seeking, by methods of barbarism, to impose upon this large and varied sample of contemporary Mankind a rigid uniformity which was of the tyrants' and not their victims' choosing. The aspect of life selected for this Procrustean treatment was, however, a different one. The Czars had pursued, on the whole, a policy of tolerance, or at any rate of *laissez-faire*, in dealing with their subjects' social customs and economic institutions. The uniformity which they had been concerned to impose was a national uniformity, and their tyranny had taken the form of a forcible 'Russianization'. 'Communization', instead of 'Russianization', was the form of tyranny which the Bolsheviks had at heart; and they were, if possible, more atrocious than their Imperial predecessors in their pursuit of it; but by the same token they were indifferent in the matter of nationality; and, whereas the Czars had been socially and economically tolerant instinctively or unwittingly, the Bolsheviks were nationally tolerant deliberately¹—and this for two reasons.

In the first place, they were anxious not to provoke defensive nationalist movements among their subjects which might traverse, like red herrings, the trail of their own Communist propaganda. In the second place, they reckoned that their calculated generosity towards national idiosyncrasies might not only reconcile to the Communist régime the formerly oppressed nationalities who had passed under their dominion from that of the Czardom, but might also perhaps attract into the Communist fold the brethren of these Soviet citizens whose nationality was still being persecuted in neighbouring countries. Accordingly the Bolsheviks proceeded to re-map their

¹ For a detailed inquiry into the Bolshevik attitude towards the nationality problem, see H. Kohn: *Der Nationalismus in der Sowjetunion* (Frankfurt-am-Main, 1932, Societäts-Verlag). Stalin himself was a non-Russian from the Caucasus, and he was one of the pioneers in putting the policy of tolerance into effect after the Bolsheviks had made themselves masters of the heritage of the Czardom. One of Stalin's early experiments was a 'Soviet of Nationalities' in which the whole proletarian population of the Union was represented according to nationalities instead of being represented according to administrative districts, while all nationalities, from the Great Russians and Ukrainians to the Buriats and Ossetes, had equal representation—like the states of the American Union, from New York State and Texas to Nevada and Rhode Island, in the Senate at Washington (see Beatrice and Sidney Webb: *Soviet Communism, a New Civilisation?* (in the press)).

domain into an elaborate hierarchy of federated republics—with subordinate republics inside each of them, and autonomous districts inside those—which did justice, and often more than justice, to the legitimate national claims of the smaller and more backward nationalities in the matter of administrative and cultural self-expression. Although the Great Russian nation was proportionately still more preponderant in numbers in the Soviet Union than it had been in the wider Russian Empire, the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic was only given one place—at first out of four and eventually out of seven—among the direct constituents of the Union; the Russian national name was scrupulously excluded from the title of the Union itself; in the drawing of the internal boundaries between the different autonomous territories the non-Russian nationalities were usually given the benefit, as against the Russians, wherever it proved impossible on practical grounds to make the administrative boundaries coincide precisely with the actual lines of division between the peoples; and two of the direct members of the Union—namely the Ukrainian and the White Russian Soviet Socialist Republics—were alluringly displayed under the eyes of the oppressed Ukrainian and White Russian subjects of Poland.¹ In fact, the non-Russian ex-subjects of the Czardom, who had been looked upon by the Czars as raw material for Russianization, were seized upon by the Bolsheviks as a bait for expanding the original Soviet Union into a World-State, on a non-Russian basis, which was to enlarge its borders *pari passu* with the progress of the World-Revolution.²

It will be seen that the structure of the Soviet Union conformed to the demands of the apocalyptic vision which was constantly before the eyes of Lenin and his Companions in 1917. But at the same time the solid construction of the Union, even on this potentially oecumenical plan, is material evidence that the realization of the founders' world-revolutionary expectations was being delayed. For so elaborate and ingenious a structure could not have been, and in fact was not, built in a day; and, in the building of it, the Bolsheviks were already changing the character of their own activity. Instead of putting the match to a rubbish-heap which was to burn a whole world to cinders, they were cultivating a garden in which every ticket-holder

¹ On this point, see the *Survey for 1924*, pp. 177-9. For the consequent embarrassment of Poland at the prospect of the Soviet Union's admission to membership of the League, and for the step which the Polish Government took in order to disembarass themselves, see pp. 395-8, below.

² 'The international proletariat will not lay down its sword until Soviet Russia has become a link in the federation of the Soviet Republics of the World'—manifesto issued by the Second Congress of the Third International.

who presented himself in the conventional Communist wedding-garment was to sit in comfort under a collective vine and fig-tree. But this was no longer Alexander setting fire, in a Lyaeian rage, to Persepolis; it was Candide settling down after having sown his wild oats.

The truth was that, from the moment when they came into possession of the Czardom's heritage, the Bolsheviks had to pit their own 'ideology' against the hard facts of 'Historical Necessity' in the world around them, in which they had deliberately acquired a material stake; and the Goddess of their academic cult now maliciously displayed to them the wayward countenance of the Fortune to whom they had given hostages. 'Historical Necessity' lost no time in giving her too patronizing votaries a humbling intimation that she did not propose to run on the rails which Marx, her self-appointed hierophant, had so officiously laid down in front of her formidable driving-wheels. She duly appeared as a creature of 'the Machine Age'; but her epiphany was not in the likeness of a tram. She preferred to go her way in the fashion of an erratically driven motor-omnibus¹—as though to prove that, even in these mechanical days, 'the Spirit bloweth where it listeth'.

By the time of Lenin's death on the 21st January, 1924, little more than six years after he had taken his place in the seat of the Czardom, both of the assumptions with which he and his Companions had started in 1917 had been falsified by the march of events. In the first place, the General War of 1914-18 had not availed to bring about the downfall of the Capitalist régime all over the World. There was still, no doubt, a possibility that this great calamity might prove to have given the Capitalist régime a shock from which it would die in the long run; it was also possible, and perhaps more likely, that the particular calamity was one of a series, not yet at an end, which pointed to some spiritual malady, deeper seated than Capitalism, in the souls of which the Western body social was the institutional tenement; yet it was nevertheless evident, by 1924, that in the Western World the Capitalist régime had obtained a reprieve, however short the respite might turn out to be. The second point in which the Marxian 'ideology' had been falsified was illustrated by the fact that in 1924 the Soviet Union was manifestly still a going concern—which it had no business to be according to the orthodox Marxian doctrine. By rights, the smoking flax ought to have been quenched as soon as it had failed to set the World ablaze; yet here,

¹ In fact, the experience of the Bolsheviks was just the opposite of that of the young man in Father Ronald Knox's rhyme.

in a World unrevolutionized, was the Russian revolutionary tinder still smouldering on cheerfully. Having first been cheated, by the treachery of 'Historical Necessity', of enjoying the world-wide revolution which had appeared to be within their grasp in 1917, the Bolsheviks had taken a double-edged revenge upon their Goddess by cheating her in their turn. They had victoriously defended their locally successful Communist revolution in Russia against the counter-attacks of a world of Capitalist enemies who had bestirred themselves to stamp the fire out in the place where it had started; and in thus saving their own handiwork the Bolsheviks had disproved their own Marxian doctrine; for, according to Marx, the Capitalist counter-revolutionaries ought now to have succeeded, in their turn, in temporarily extinguishing the local Communist revolution in Russia, when once this Russian fire had failed to engulf the rest of the World.

It is not to be supposed that these vagaries of 'Historical Necessity' disconcerted Lenin himself; for that extraordinary genius was a rare, or perhaps unique, combination of an abandoned doctrinaire and a consummate man of action. Lenin had an unerring and unfailing intuition of the next practical step to be taken in any given situation; and his Hegelian dialectic would probably have led him to a constructive resolution of the thesis and antithesis in the controversy between Trotsky and Stalin which broke out upon the Master's death. If Lenin had deigned to listen to this disputation on the respective merits of Trotsky's 'Permanent Revolution' and Stalin's 'Socialism in a Single Country',¹ he would probably have snubbed both disputants—had they ventured to argue in his presence—by pointing out to Trotsky that a protracted world-revolution could not be carried on except from some well-secured base of operations, and reminding Stalin of his own admission that the existence of a Communist state—even on so large a scale as the Soviet Union—would always remain precarious so long as the rest of the world remained unconverted.² He might have added that in the long run the danger would be

¹ Stalin's conversion to this doctrine can be dated with certainty, on the evidence of Stalin's own published writings, to some moment between the April and the December of the year 1924 (see Florinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-6).

² This admission would appear to be implied in the series of three questions through which Stalin approached the problem: Is a victory for Socialism in Russia possible? If it is possible, could such a victory be called a complete victory? And, if such a victory could not be called final, what conditions would be required in order to make it final? Presumably Stalin would have admitted that the position of a Communist state in a Capitalist environment was precarious, and that it could be made safe only through a 'final victory' in the shape of a Socialist revolution in the rest of the World (see Florinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 131-2 *seqq.*, especially pp. 145-6).

greater if the Capitalist Powers had the prudence to refrain from further essays in military intervention; since intervention was unlikely to succeed in overthrowing the Soviet régime and at the same time certain to foster Communist zeal among the Union's citizens, whereas the spiritual poison of the Capitalist 'ideology' would have more chance of re-insinuating itself into the veins of the recently purged Russian body politic under conditions that would favour 'peaceful penetration'. Since the facts of the hour were on Stalin's side, it is perhaps likely that Lenin, under pressure, would have declared himself, at any rate for the time being, in Stalin's favour. We may infer this from Lenin's own acts in similar situations—his insistence in 1918 upon the conclusion of the Peace of Brest Litovsk, and his initiation, in 1921, of 'the New Economic Policy'.

The struggle between the two principal competitors for the dead prophet's mantle turned ostensibly upon the question which of them could show that he had the Master's authority behind his own policy. Their voluminous war of words was inconclusive, because the weapons with which it was fought were not Lenin's acts, which bore the imprint of a great man of action's singleness of aim and sureness of touch, but Lenin's writings, which were ephemeral and *ad hoc* and by no means self-consistent.¹ The outcome of the contest, which resulted in Stalin's victory and Trotsky's defeat, was, no doubt, mainly decided by the steady march of events both inside Russia and abroad. Here, again, the dates speak for themselves; for the struggle lasted from Lenin's death on the 21st January, 1924, until Trotsky's expulsion from the territories of the Soviet Union on the 11th February, 1929; and this span of five years saw the fate of the World-Revolution at least temporarily sealed and the survival of the Soviet Union at least temporarily secured. On the one hand, Germany—and, with her, Europe as a whole—was snatched out of the jaws of Communism by the French acceptance of the Dawes Plan on the 25th April, 1924,² the conclusion of the Locarno Pacts on the 16th October, 1925,³ the

¹ For this theological warfare of texts and counter-texts, see the *Survey for 1927*, pp. 255-6, and Florinsky, *op. cit.*, chap. 4. The *Corpus Lenineum* was a collection of the same origin and character as the surahs of the Medina period in the Qur'an. Both collections were afterwards treated by the Master's disciples as uniquely inspired sources for the elaboration of a systematic and comprehensive code of behaviour for the Master's followers. It is difficult to conceive of a greater mental *tour de force* than the attempt to construct such a code out of such unpromising materials. To the outsider it is manifest that, in dictating these surahs and these articles, the Prophets Muhammad and Lenin were wrapped up in the business of the moment and had no notion of providing finished blocks for the building of a permanent temple.

² See the *Survey for 1924*, Part II A, section (v), p. 359.

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. ii, Part I A, section (iii), p. 53.

entry of Germany into the League of Nations on the 10th September, 1926,¹ and the economic boom which Europe enjoyed from 1925 to 1929. In the Far East, again, where China was the key country for the Communist strategy, and where the Third International still hoped to kindle its world-conflagration after being disappointed of its German expectations in 1923, the old order was reprieved through the quarrel between the Third International and the Kuomintang in 1927.² On the other hand, the survival of the Soviet Union—which had been ensured *de facto* when General Wrangel evacuated the Crimea on the 15th November, 1920,³ and the Japanese evacuated the Maritime Province of Siberia on the 25th October, 1922⁴—was accepted *de jure* by a sufficient quorum of the Capitalist states of the World in the course of the year 1924, when the Soviet Union was recognized successively by Italy, the United Kingdom, Norway, Austria, Greece, Sweden, China, Denmark, Mexico, the Hijāz, and France.⁵ Thereafter the rulers of the Soviet Union found themselves at liberty to make the most of their Communist dispensation within the frontiers now recognized as lawfully theirs by the rulers of the Gentiles; and the year 1926 saw the launching of the Five Years' Plan.

The years 1924–9 were thus a time of transition between a situation in which the Bolsheviks had been principally concerned to accomplish the World-Revolution, with the Third International as their flaming sword and the Soviet Union as a humble grindstone for sharpening that sword's cutting edge,⁶ and a later situation in which the Soviet Union had been consecrated as a kind of Communist terrestrial paradise, while the Third International 'had . . . largely degenerated . . . from the militant and uncompromising general staff of the World-Revolution into an international organization for the defence of the U.S.S.R'.⁷ The conflict through which this subsequent situation was substituted for the antecedent situation in the course of the transitional period was apparent, during those years, in two fields: in the violent strife of parties and personalities within the bosom of the Bolshevik fraternity and in the correspondingly violent clash

¹ See the *Survey for 1926*, Part I A, section (i).

² See the *Survey for 1927*, Part III, section (ii).

³ See *The History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, vol. vi, pp. 318, 320.

⁴ See the *Survey for 1920–3*, Part VI, section (ii), p. 444.

⁵ See the *Survey for 1924*, Part I C, sections (iii)–(vi).

⁶ The Statute of the Third International declares that 'the Communist International has for its purpose the struggle by all available means, including armed force, for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie and the creation of an international Soviet Republic as a transition stage to the complete abolition of the state'.

⁷ Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 208.

between the propaganda of the Third International and the foreign policy of the Soviet Government, *vis-à-vis* the Capitalist World. In previous volumes of this series the history of the internal conflict has been carried down to the turn of the years 1927–8,¹ and the history of the clash between the Union Communist Party's two instruments—the Third International and the U.S.S.R.—down to the close of the year 1924 in Europe² and the close of the year 1927 in the Far East.³ Both these stories have to be carried to their conclusion as a preface to the history of the *entente* between the Soviet Union and France and the concomitant entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations. The internal struggle went through what had the appearance of being its last convulsion in the year 1934; the clash between the two Bolshevik institutions entertained the World with its last sensational display in the year 1933.

In the report on the activities of the Central Committee of the Union Communist Party which he presented at the Seventeenth Party Congress, on the 26th January, 1934, Stalin described the internal situation in the Party, as it stood at the time, in the following terms:

The present congress is meeting under the banner of the complete victory of Leninism⁴—under the banner of the liquidation of the last traces of the anti-Leninist group.

The Trotskyite anti-Leninist group has been beaten and broken up. To-day its organizers are on the other side of the frontiers bowing and scraping in the ante-chambers of the bourgeois parties.

The Right-Wing anti-Leninist group has been beaten and broken up. Its organizers have long ago repudiated their former tenets and are now seeking, by every means in their power, to cleanse themselves of their sins to the satisfaction of the Party.

The groups that had gone off the rails into Nationalism have been beaten and broken up. Some of their organizers have openly joined the ranks of the interventionist *émigrés*, and the rest have made an *amende honorable*.

The majority of the supporters of these counter-revolutionary groups have been forced to recognize the justice of the orthodox Party line and to capitulate to the Party's authority. . . .

The policy of industrializing the country has triumphed. To-day the results of it are manifest to every eye. In face of this accomplished fact, what criticism can avail?

The policy of liquidating the kulaks and of totalitarian collectivization has triumphed. Here, too, the results are manifest to every eye, and the accomplished fact puts the critics to silence.

¹ *Survey for 1927*, pp. 251–6.

² In the *Survey for 1924*, Part I C.

³ In the *Survey for 1927*, Part III, section (ii).

⁴ i.e. of Stalinism, according to the convention by which every good Bolshevik had to find authority for his own beliefs and conduct in the words and deeds of the Master.—A. J. T.

The experience of our country demonstrates that the victory of Socialism in one single country, taken by itself, is entirely within the realm of possibilities. The fact is there. What is left for the critics to say?

It is manifest that all these successes—and, above all, the victory of the Five Years' Plan—have definitely demoralized and pulverized all the anti-Leninist groups of every kind.¹

With characteristic caution, Stalin proceeded to qualify this *Te Deum* in praise of the wonderful works of Historical Necessity by observing to his audience that

While the enemies of the Party—the opportunists of every colour—have been beaten, there are traces of their ideology still to be found in certain members of the Party; these ideas are not only still alive but are perpetually manifesting themselves; . . . and it is obvious that these survivals necessarily afford a favourable field for the revival of the ideology of the beaten anti-Leninist groups in the minds of certain members of our Party.

Both this warning and the song of triumph to which it was appended were justified by the course of events before the end of the calendar year, when the last round in the internal struggle within the bosom of the Union Communist Party was opened by the assassination of Monsieur S. M. Kirov at Leningrad on the 1st December, 1934.

The victim of this crime was a serving member of the Political Bureau of the Union Communist Party and at the same time Secretary of the Committee of the Party's Leningrad Branch. As his tenure of these offices implied, he was in the inner circle of the ruling clique; and genuine feelings of grief and indignation at the murder of a trusted and valued colleague no doubt conspired with colder calculations in Stalin's mind to make him seize this opportunity for stamping out those last vestiges—whose lingering presence he had already denounced—of active opposition, within the borders of the U.S.S.R., to the orthodox Leninist—or Stalinist—régime.

Upon the receipt of the news at Moscow, Stalin himself—accompanied by Molotov, Voroshilov and other henchmen—proceeded to Leningrad at once in order to superintend the punitive measures personally. The Stalinist martyr's ashes were given a magnificent state funeral on the 6th December, 1934; and, in the interval between his death and his apotheosis, his *manes* were placated by the summary condemnation to death, and immediate execution, of sixty-six persons accused of 'counter-revolutionary activities',² while the actual execu-

¹ The above translation is taken from a French text of the speech (Paris, 1934, Bureau d'Éditions: 2^e édition, revue et corrigée).

² Thirty-nine persons were arrested in Leningrad and 32 in Moscow on the 2nd December. On the 4th December the Central Executive Committee of

tant of the crime, who was a young member of the Union Communist Party named Nikolaev, was reserved for a more searching trial. The next step was the arrest of twelve persons at Minsk on the 7th December, 1934, and thirty-seven at Kiev on the 10th; and since these two cities were the respective capitals of the White Russian and Ukrainian constituent states of the Soviet Union, it looked, for the moment, as though the Soviet Government had decided to attribute the crime to 'the groups that had gone off the rails into Nationalism' (to follow Stalin's own terminology). This seemed to be confirmed by the pronouncement of three death-sentences, and forty sentences of imprisonment, upon prisoners already on trial for industrial sabotage in Georgia; and, thereafter, nine of the twelve prisoners at Minsk were sentenced and executed on the 10th December, and twenty-eight out of the thirty-seven prisoners at Kiev on the 15th December.

Together with four persons who were sentenced and executed for the murder of two Communist girls at Tashla, in the Central Volga district, this brought the number of persons put to death within a fortnight of the murder of Monsieur Kirov up to the figure of 107; and these first targets of the Soviet Government's retribution were stigmatized as 'White rabble' by Monsieur Karl Radek in the *Izvestiya*.¹ On the 15th December, however, it was proclaimed simultaneously at Moscow and at Leningrad, in resolutions passed on that day by plenary conferences of the respective local Communist Party branch committees, that Monsieur Kirov was the victim of enemies within the Party household: 'the mean dregs of the former Zinoviev anti-Party group'. Nikolaev and thirteen other members of the Union Communist Party were sent for trial, on the charge of being Kirov's assassins, on the 21st December; they were charged, in addition, with having plotted to assassinate other leading personalities of Monsieur Stalin's régime with the object of disorganizing the régime by terrorism, and with having established for this purpose an illegal underground terrorist organization in Leningrad. This version of the crime was now expounded in the *Izvestiya*² by Monsieur Radek—apparently without any attempt to reconcile it with his previous account. On the 23rd December it was announced that Zinoviev, Kamenev, and five other 'Old Guard' party members had

the Soviet Union issued a decree forbidding tribunals to admit counsel for the defence at the trials of persons accused of connexion with terrorist organizations operating against Soviet officials, and forbidding either appeals or pardons in such cases if the verdict were a verdict of 'guilty'. By the 5th December 37 of the 39 Leningrad prisoners and 29 of the 32 Moscow prisoners had been both sentenced and put to death.

¹ 12th December, 1934.

² 21st December, 1934.

been arrested and banished to remote parts of the Soviet dominions. Immunity from capital punishment was one of the privileges of Lenin's contemporaries and companions according to an unwritten but sacrosanct Party convention. This privilege of 'the Old Guard' was not shared, however, by 'the Young Ruffians', as Nikolaev and his thirteen fellow prisoners were styled. These latter were now branded as 'counter-revolutionaries' and 'neo-Fascists'; and they were accused of having been in relations with a foreign consul (whose nationality was not disclosed); but no attempt appears to have been made to implicate them with the 107 persons who had already been put to death in the course of the month. The corrupters of the fourteen 'Young Ruffians' were declared to have been Zinoviev and his fellow deportees; and the fourteen themselves were found to have been Party members who had all been excluded, at one time or another, from the Party for the offence of having pursued opposition tactics, but had most of them been subsequently re-admitted and had then succeeded in passing the Party purge and forming their counter-revolutionary cell without coming under suspicion until after they had accomplished the first of their projected acts of terrorism. All fourteen were sentenced and shot on the 29th December, 1934; and by this single stroke the Soviet Union was made safe for Stalinism and the world outside its borders for Capitalism. The 'die-hards' of the lost cause of 'Permanent Revolution' in the ranks of the Union Communist Party had been crushed by the Party's own hand, just as, some six months earlier, in 'the Third German Reich', the 'die-hards' of militant National Socialism had been crushed by the hand of their Führer.

The chairman of the tribunal in Moscow which passed the death-sentences of December 1934 was the same Monsieur Ullrich who had presided over the trial of six British subjects in Moscow in the previous year; and this other *cause célèbre* had been the last sensational instance of that clash between the Soviet Government and the Third International of which the 'Zinoviev Letter' sensation¹ had been the classic example.

The six British employees of a British engineering firm, the Metropolitan Vickers Company, who were arrested on the 11th-12th March and tried on the 12th-19th April, 1933, were charged with espionage, bribery and sabotage in connexion with their work in executing a contract which had been made with their firm by the Soviet Government; and the ensuing trial made it evident that the old conflict of purposes within the bosom of the Union Communist Party was

¹ See the *Survey for 1924*, Part I C, section (iv), pp. 247-51.

still unresolved; for the trial was conducted on the assumption that the prisoners were combatants in a truceless warfare between the Capitalist and the Communist World, while at that very time the Soviet Government were making strenuous efforts to make friends of the mammon of Capitalist unrighteousness,¹ with an eye to securing allies in a war of defence against the wrath to come from an aggressive Germany and an aggressive Japan. Superficially it looked as though the ideology which had dominated the Union Communist Party in 1924 was still in the ascendant nine years later, in 1933. This superficial aspect of the situation turned out, however, to be delusive.

In the light of the precedents, the apparently unfounded allegation that certain Capitalist residents in Soviet territory had been taking the offensive against the Communist régime, would be most naturally interpreted as evidence that the Third International was contemplating a fresh offensive of its own against the Capitalist World and was accordingly setting out, in advance, to provide itself with the necessary justification and to rouse the necessary temper of fanatical indignation among its supporters—as usual, without regard to the exigencies of the foreign policy of the Soviet Government. It is certain that, in the victimization of the British engineers, these latter exigencies were once more flagrantly ignored; but in this case the explanation is probably to be sought, not in a clash of the familiar kind between the Soviet Government and the Third International, but rather in an inter-departmental *mésintelligence* (of a kind not unknown in Whitehall) within the actual framework of the Soviet Government. The power that was putting its spoke into the wheel of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs on this occasion was probably some sister department of state whose need to find scapegoats to bear the blame for miscarriages in the Five Years' Plan was even more urgent than Monsieur Litvinov's need to find Capitalist allies against Germany and Japan. This hypothesis is borne out by the Laodicean leniency (according to Bolshevik standards) with which these British prisoners were treated; and so far as the Soviet Government showed any obduracy in the face of the British Government's protests, this stiffness was sufficiently explained by the sensitiveness of a sovereign state in regard to its sovereignty, without its being necessary to suppose that the Soviet Government were once again subordinating their own interests to those of the Third International's Holy War against the Capitalist World.

¹ The Franco-Russian Pact of Non-Aggression had been signed in Paris on the 29th November, 1932, and was approved by a unanimous vote of the French Chamber on the 18th May, 1933 (see pp. 381-5, below).

The truth was that this diplomatic battle, which was conducted on both sides with such a show of zeal and energy, was one of those stage duels in which the actors do their best to provide their audience with the realistic spectacle that it expects of them, while they are privately in collusion to play for 'safety first'. The British Government had no more intention of sacrificing their trade with the Soviet Union than the Soviet Government had of pushing the British Government into the arms of Germany and Japan. In this trial on an indictment for an offence which was punishable by death, the Soviet Government just saved their face by condemning one prisoner to three years' and another to two years' imprisonment, as against one acquittal and three pardons disguised as sentences of deportation. Thereupon the British Government saved their face with equal economy by imposing a partial embargo on imports into the United Kingdom from the Soviet Union. These complementary histrionic gestures opened the way for a diplomatic settlement; and on the 1st July, 1933, by arrangement between Sir John Simon and Monsieur Litvinov, the Presidium of the Executive Committee of the U.S.S.R. in Moscow commuted the two sentences of imprisonment to sentences of immediate deportation, while the King in Council in London published a proclamation revoking the embargo which had been declared against Russian goods on the 19th April.

When this outcome of the trial of the six British engineers at Moscow in 1933 is brought into focus with the grimly different outcome of the trial of the fourteen Russian Communists at Leningrad in 1934, it becomes apparent that the two transactions have the same political significance, and the contrast between them makes their common meaning clear. They mean that the primitive force of *raison d'état* has won its victory over the newfangled notion of World-Revolution; or, in human terms, that those Companions of Lenin who have devoted themselves to the service of the Soviet Union, and have become fascinated by the field which the Union opens up for a local and immediate implementation of the Communist ideal here and now, have successfully revolted against those other Companions of the dead Prophet who have kept their eyes fixed all the time upon the World-Revolution and have never learnt to look upon the Union as anything but a vessel of destruction to be used—and, if need be, used up—for the attainment of a transcendental end.¹ Stalinism, as expressed in the passage, quoted above, from Stalin's own address to the Seventeenth Party Congress of the Union Communist Party,² has triumphantly prevailed over Trotsky's thesis that

¹ See the *Survey for 1924*, pp. 170 and 172.

² See pp. 365-6, above.

'a national revolution is not a self-contained unit' but 'just a link in the international chain';³ that 'the sacrifice of World-Revolution to the requirements of establishing a national socialist state is not only a betrayal of the Communist cause but also a suicidal and insane policy, which refuses to see existing conditions—the economic and political inter-dependence of the World—and' so 'prepares its own inevitable downfall';⁴ and that, on this showing, 'the economic reorganization of the country was . . . a matter of minor importance'.⁵ In a previous volume of this series, dealing with the year 1924, we ventured,⁶ on the strength of an analogy between the Russian Revolution and the French, to hazard the prediction that

the exploitation of the U.S.S.R. by the Third International might not continue for long, and that the Communist propaganda, when seen in historical retrospect, might seem significant, not as an international revolutionary movement, but rather as the strategy by which the U.S.S.R. obtained for itself that position in the World which had been lost by its predecessor the Russian Empire.

Now that we have arrived at the closing year of the next decade, we find that, in this year 1934, the foreshadowed reversal in the relations between the Soviet Union and the Third International has become an accomplished fact. This fact is proclaimed in the failure of the Third International to convene a congress after 1928. A new congress—which would have been the seventh—was eventually announced for the spring of 1934, but this was postponed—first to the autumn of the same year, and then to the spring of 1935—and it did not actually take place till the 25th July-21st August of that year.

The paramount mission of the Union Communist Party is now no longer the achievement of a World-Revolution but the maintenance of 'a new nationalism'.⁷ This Stalinian nationalism has, it is true, a wider basis than the Great Russian linguistic and racial nationalism of the former Czardom in its last phase.⁸ Based, as it is, upon no external or material criterion, but upon the common spiritual possession of the Stalino-Lenino-Marxian ideas and institutions and the common personal and social experience of the extraordinary events

³ Trotsky's own words, as quoted in Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

⁴ Trotsky's doctrine as interpreted by Florinsky in *op. cit.*, p. 28.

⁵ Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 129.

⁶ Florinsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-8.

⁷ *Survey for 1924*, p. 180.

⁸ This divorce of statehood, in the Soviet Union, from race and nationality is regarded by Beatrice and Sidney Webb (*Soviet Communism, a New Civilization?* (in the press)) as one of the creative achievements of the Bolsheviks, and especially of Stalin.

of which the Soviet domain has been the theatre since 1917, the new Soviet national consciousness embraces, without any invidious distinctions, the whole medley of peoples that dwell within the Soviet frontiers; and we have seen above that this population, in its multitude and its variety, is a fair sample of contemporary Mankind. Yet, vast and variegated though it is, this Soviet Union national state is now a parochial affair, and has ceased to be the World-state in embryo that it was originally designed to be. As a national state, it has become one local specimen of a species of which there are some sixty or seventy other representatives on the political map of the day; and its kinship with these neighbours is not obscured by its possession of distinctive traits; for although some of these neighbours—a Turkey and a Rumania and a Finland or an Italy and a Germany and a France—may differ from the Soviet national state in having a linguistic or racial basis, a number of them have an ideal or institutional basis as well. 'The Third Reich' is not only German but National Socialist; Italy not only Italian but corporative; France not only French but a child of 'the ideas of 1789'; and, in the nationalism—or nationalisms—of the British Commonwealth, parliamentary government and the liberty of the subject are more important ingredients than either the 'Anglo-Saxon' race or the English language. The Soviet Union of the year 1934 is a national state within the recognized meaning of the terms at the time; and not only so but, in its planned and regimented 'totalitarianism', it is far advanced along the formidable path upon which the feet of all the contemporary nations are set.¹ In fact, on the economic plane, Stalin's 'Socialism

¹ At first sight, the internal political and administrative map of the Soviet Union, with its federal structure and its far-reaching recognition of the distinct individuality of local national communities, might seem to be in direct contradiction with the fanatical and intolerant passion for centralization and standardization which was the key-note of contemporary 'totalitarianism' of the Fascist variety in Italy and Germany. Closer inspection shows, however, that the internal map of the Soviet Union, as it stood in 1934, was in some ways delusive. For example, the 'autonomous' republics and districts within the framework of the R.S.F.S.R. appear to have been only titularly autonomous, while in practice they were administered in just the same fashion as the ordinary provinces of the state in which they were embraced. Then, again, the Union Government had its own representatives on the local Governments of the several constituent states. Finally, the administration of all the socialized services was taken over by the Union Government instead of being assigned to the constituent Governments; and this was a potent unifying factor, since the socialized services covered a vast field and had an intimate bearing on the individual lives of citizens. These points are all taken from Beatrice and Sidney Webb's book, *Soviet Communism, a New Civilization?* (in the press). The authors point out that 'the great levelling influence of the economic relations exemplified in widespread industrialization and collectivism, which operate irrespective of race or nationality or any geographical boundaries, constitutes

in a single country' is simply the local name for the ubiquitous post-war 'economic nationalism'—a pursuit of the will-o'-the-wisp of *autarkeia* which had latterly stamped even the United Kingdom, that nineteenth-century mart and workshop of the World.

This unmistakable post-war tendency for all national states to become totalitarian, and for their common totalitarianism to conform to a uniform type, would perhaps at this time have been scouted with equal scorn as a paradox, or denounced with equal horror as a blasphemy, by the apostles of a national Communism and the apostles of a national Fascism; yet to a Christian philosopher the tendency towards uniformity would have seemed as natural as it was manifest. In both Stalinism and Hitlerism, an Augustine of Madaura or a Thomas Aquinas would have seen two closely related variants of a single process by which a latter-day society that had repudiated the *Respublica Christiana* was relapsing into the 'magnum latrocinium' of a congeries of tribal communities. In this generation, the *Civitas Dei* on Earth—with its animating principle of Love and its universal brotherhood of all men through the Fatherhood of God—was visibly withdrawing, like Astraea, to its heavenly place of origin and was abandoning the terrestrial stage to the primeval plurality of parochial states whose animating principle was Physical Force.

In Communism as well as in Fascism, an archaic glorification of force was a salient feature. Yet it was not so easy for any movement that had arisen in a Christian environment to repudiate its origins; and in its original gospel of World-Revolution Marxism was still trailing Christian clouds of glory—however perversely it might have caricatured its Christian source of inspiration by divorcing the brotherhood of men from its divine cause and sanction, and then substituting the pagan method of Force for the Christian method of Love as the sovereign means for attaining its mutilated objective. Nevertheless the Marxian conception of the World-Revolution did reflect a gleam of Christian universalism like the fading sunset glow upon a thundercloud in the evening sky; and though this element in the Marxian ideology was doomed, by its divorce from its Christian inspirations, to be as evanescent as the corresponding bourgeois ideal of free trade, a world which was relapsing into tribalism might be the poorer—though the quieter—for its disappearance, and a Christian observer might see some moral loss, as well as some material gain, in the victory of Stalin over Trotsky.

a silent but continuous unifying factor'. Another potent unifying factor was the unity of the Union Communist Party, which was 'the keeper of the conscience of the Proletariat'.

From a Machiavellian standpoint, however, the replacement of Trotsky's militant Communist universalism by Stalin's parochial Communist nationalism was to be reckoned as a definite and important gain for the cause of world peace. For a man who has settled down to cultivate his own garden is a man with a stake in the *status quo* who is no longer tempted to disturb his neighbours and indeed no longer concerned with these neighbours at all except in so far as they threaten disturbance on their part.

The Soviet Union, which has no territorial ambitions and is absorbed by the task of its economic socialist reconstruction, needs peace as one needs air; it needs it for the growth and development of the proletarian state.¹

In the post-war world, however, the sated—or even merely satisfied—Powers had found that peace was by no means automatically ensured to a state which was innocent of covetousness; for, in a tribal universe, such innocence was seldom the fruit of an ascetic virtue. It was more often the consequence of possessing 'natural resources' that were likely to excite the cupidity of other people if they were sufficiently abundant to allay the pangs of covetousness in the heart of their momentary possessor. 'We do not want a single bit of foreign land', declared Stalin himself at the Sixteenth Congress of the Union Communist Party (which was held in June and July 1930), 'but at the same time not an inch of our land shall ever be yielded to any one else.'² These words had hardly been uttered when the hypothetical menace began to take concrete shape in the Japanese military outbreak of 1931 and in the German National-Socialist Revolution of 1933; and, in face of this positive threat, the Soviet Union reacted in the same fashion as any other state member of the primaeval and rudimentary society of parochial sovereign states. It sought to supplement its own defensive force by entering into defensive arrangements with other states that felt themselves to be threatened likewise from the same quarters.

This emergence of the Japanese and German menace to the Soviet Union's security, immediately after the triumph of the new Stalinian nationalism in the Soviet Government's counsels, was followed in its turn by a profound change in the Union Communist Party's attitude towards the prospect of another general war. It was one of

¹ From a speech delivered at the Sixth Congress of the Third International (held in Moscow in July and August 1928) by the British delegate, Mr. Bell (quoted by Florinsky, in *op. cit.*, p. 200, from the verbatim report of the proceedings of the Congress, vol. ii, p. 24).

² Quoted by Florinsky in *op. cit.*, p. 233.

the established dogmas of the Bolshevik Faith that the Soviet Union was in perpetual danger of being attacked by the armies of Capitalism; but this dogma was not based upon any actual fact in the international situation as this had stood during the decade ending on the 18th September, 1931. The source of the dogma was partly the past experience of the Bolsheviks during the first four years of their régime, when their infant commonwealth had actually been invaded first by the Germans and afterwards by the victorious Allies. To a still larger extent, the dogma was derived from an ancient apocalyptic tradition which was familiar to all Jews and Christians in the Book of the Prophet Daniel and in the Revelation of Saint John the Divine. Armageddon was the traditional preface to the Millennium; and, in the conventional plot of this *Divina Commedia*, the final World-War which was to result in the triumph of the Saints, and the discomfiture of the Sons of Belial, was fore-ordained—whether by Divine Providence or by Historical Necessity—to be precipitated by the wanton aggression of the Children of Perdition. This was how the Capitalist menace continued to be conceived officially in the Soviet Union even after the voice of Trotsky had ceased to be heard in the land.¹ But when the indeterminate hosts of a legendary Capitalist Antichrist resolved themselves into the particular armies of two such formidable earthly Powers as the Japanese Empire and the German Reich, the Bolsheviks were far from being consoled by finding the numbers of their potential Capitalist assailants reduced from the mystic number of seventy to the modest number of two. Confronted with a threat of aggression 'in real life', the Bolsheviks appear to have lost their theological conviction that the aggression was bound to work out to the aggressors' undoing, and they accordingly ceased to view the prospect of the threatened assault with their old fanatical self-confidence. Conversely, the peace in which they had formerly acquiesced as a tedious deferment of their inevitable world-wide triumph now came to wear the appearance of a treasure which was to be sought and pursued for its own sake as the paramount object of the Soviet Government's foreign policy. With this preface, the successive stages in the development of this policy may now be recorded.

¹ The belief in the inevitability of war between a Capitalist and a Communist Society, so long as any relics of the old dispensation survived in the same world which had seen the birth of the rudiments of the new order, was of course logically irreconcilable with the policy of negotiating non-aggression pacts between the Soviet Union and its Capitalist neighbours. What was the use of such pacts if Historical Necessity decreed that war must be the result of Capitalist Imperialism? (On this paradox, see Florinsky, 'Soviet Foreign Policy', in the *Slavonic Review*, vol. xii, No. 36, April 1934. The article is reprinted in *International Conciliation*, June 1934, No. 301, pp. 214-33.)

(b) THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

The development of the Soviet Government's foreign policy, from Lenin's seizure of power over the wreckage of the Russian Empire in October 1917 down to the admission of the Soviet Union, rather less than seventeen years later, to membership of the League of Nations, can be traced through a series of distinct and definable stages.

In the first—and perhaps the shortest—stage, when the World-Revolution was believed to have been already inaugurated by Lenin's dramatic stroke on the banks of the Neva, the Bolsheviks' foreign policy was Ishmaelitish. The whole Earth was their battlefield, including the patch of Russian ground on which they themselves were momentarily standing; and all Capitalist states were their natural and irreconcilable enemies, whether they called themselves the Central Empires or the Allied and Associated Powers.

The second stage followed when the imminent cosmic event proved not to be a collapse of the Capitalist Society but a collapse of the Central Empires in their war with the Allies. The victors first cancelled the Peace of Brest-Litovsk, which the Central Empires had imposed upon the Bolsheviks, and then failed in their turn in their own more ambitious attempt not merely to despoil the Bolsheviks but to overthrow them. The Bolshevik régime succeeded, by demonic efforts, in preserving its existence in the Russian domain which it had already acquired; and thereafter it found itself confronted, beyond those borders, with a Capitalist World which had neither gone into dissolution nor yet overcome its own internal division into two hostile camps. These decisive events, which took place between the spring of 1918 and the winter of 1920-21, transformed the world-situation and compelled the Bolsheviks to revise their outlook and, with it, their policy. In the first place, they were forced to distinguish *de facto*, if not yet in theory, between a region in which the Communist Revolution was already an accomplished fact and an unreclaimed Capitalist wilderness in which the work of conquest and conversion had still to be accomplished—just as the early Muslims, after the failure of their attempt to engulf the whole of Christendom in their first sweeping onset, were forced to draw the distinction between *Dāru'l-Islām* and *Dāru'l-Ḥarb*.¹ In the second place the

¹ 'In the Capitalist countries the proletariat fights against the Capitalist state; in the U.S.S.R. the proletariat defends its government, it defends the proletarian state. In the Capitalist countries we are for revolution; in the U.S.S.R. we are for evolution, for internal peace, for the peaceful development of Socialism'—Report by Comrade Varga on the economic situation in the

Bolsheviks were forced to differentiate between at least two shades of murkiness in the undisputed outer darkness, and to adopt different tactics towards different divisions of the Capitalist hosts of Midian which continued to prowl around the successfully defended Communist citadel.

To take advantage of the flagrant and enduring split in those alien Capitalist ranks was an elementary maxim in the strategy of the defence of the Soviet Union which its Communist rulers could not afford to neglect. But some theoretical justification had to be found for this first rudimentary insinuation of *raison d'état* into the young Communist commonwealth's embryonic foreign policy. Was not the whole of the Capitalist Society equally unclean and therefore equally to be boycotted by the Children of the Covenant? This Rabbinical problem of reconciling expediency with the Law was solved, at this stage, by drawing a distinction between the Capitalist Society and the Non-Communist World. The Capitalist Society was now equated with the victorious Allied and Associated Powers, while the other elements in the Non-Communist World—that is to say, the remnants of the vanquished Central Empires, together with the Oriental and the primitive peoples who were actually or virtually subject to the victors' domination—were redeemed from the reproach of Capitalism by being sanctified as the victims of it. As fellow victims of Capitalism, these non-Communist portions of Mankind had a common bond and cause with the Communist elect in the Soviet Union; and it was manifestly lawful for the Saints to ally themselves with these non-sinners against their common enemy.

Accordingly, at this stage, the Communist rulers of the Soviet Union entered into treaty-relations with the Weimar Republic (incorrigibly bourgeois though this foremost victim of the Allied Powers might be),¹ and with a group of pre-Capitalist Islamic Powers—Turkey, Persia and Afghanistan—which were all of them up in arms against Western Imperialism.² This was followed up by a less formal co-operation with the likewise anti-Western and pre-Capitalist Kuomintang movement in China;³ and attempts were made—with some

U.S.S.R., addressed to the Sixth Congress of the Third International (which was held in July and August 1928). The passage is quoted from the verbatim report, vol. v, p. 4, by Florinsky, in *World Revolution and the U.S.S.R.*, pp. 195-6. The situation here described and accepted had been in existence, *de facto*, since 1921.

¹ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, pp. 30-1, and the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 125-7.

² See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part IV, sections (iii) and (iv); the *Survey for 1925*, vol. i, p. 525; and the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (xiii).

³ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. ii, Part III, section (ii); the *Survey for 1926*, p. 240; the *Survey for 1927*, Part III, section (ii).

success in Netherlands India¹—to stir up the Oriental subjects of Western Powers against their alien masters.

In the third stage—which overlapped chronologically with the second and was not logically incompatible with it—the Soviet Government enlarged their conception of lawful relations to embrace all *états limitrophes*, not excluding those which could not be acquitted of being Capitalist on any definition of terms. In this stage, the great landmark was the conclusion of a peace treaty with Poland on the 18th March, 1921.² The principal feature of this treaty was the settlement of frontiers; and the Soviet Government took similar steps to settle their frontiers on other sectors in treaties with Latvia, Estonia and Finland.³ Upon the completion of these agreed territorial settlements with these four Capitalist states, the Soviet Union found itself in possession of an agreed frontier along the whole of its European border except for the southernmost sector *vis-à-vis* Rumania; and the reason why an agreed territorial settlement with Rumania was not achieved was not because the Soviet Government retained any lingering Marxian scruple, in this instance, over dealing with a Capitalist *état limitrophe*, but for the mundane reason that they regarded themselves as the legitimate heirs to the defunct Russian Empire's possession of Bessarabia, and disputed the Rumanian Government's title to the ownership of a province which a Rumanian Army had occupied by *force majeure* at a moment when the Russian Empire was derelict.⁴ On its non-European borders—where the *états limitrophes* all fell within the category of non-Communist victims of Capitalism—the Soviet Government arrived at territorial settlements with Turkey in respect of Transcaucasia⁵ and with China in respect of Manchuria⁶ (though not in respect of Outer Mongolia).⁷

Though settlements of this kind with the *états limitrophes* were not achieved quite all along the far-extended line of the Soviet Union's European and Asiatic borders, the foundations laid in bilateral agreements between the Soviet Union and a number of its immediate neighbours proved sufficiently solid to carry a succession of multilateral diplomatic structures. In 1928-9, for instance, the Soviet Government succeeded in inducing all the *états limitrophes* from

¹ See the *Survey for 1926*, Part III B, section (iv).

² See *The History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, vol. vi, pp. 318-22, and the *Survey for 1924*, p. 203.

³ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (ii) (2) (d).

⁴ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part III, section (ii) (4) and pp. 501-3; the *Survey for 1924*, Part I C, section (vii); the *Survey for 1927*, pp. 297, 300.

⁵ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, pp. 370-3.

⁶ See the *Survey for 1925*, vol. ii, pp. 334-7, 342-4.

⁷ See the *Survey for 1920-3*, Part VI, section (i).

Estonia to Persia, including Rumania, to join with them in subscribing to 'the Litvinov Protocol' for anticipating, as between the states in question, the entry into force of the Multilateral Pact of Paris ('The Briand-Kellogg Pact') for the renunciation of war.¹ Similarly, in 1933, the Soviet Government succeeded in inducing the same set² of *états limitrophes*, with the addition of Finland and Afghanistan, to enter into another group of anticipatory regional agreements—this time for adopting the Geneva draft of the 24th May, 1933, defining aggression³ (a draft which was itself largely the Soviet Government's own handiwork).⁴

So long as the states with which the Soviet Government were entering into treaty relations all belonged to one, or both, of the two categories of *états limitrophes* and victims of Capitalist oppression, the Soviet Government were preserving their formal purity from the ritual offence of entering into contact with things unclean, and were at the same time keeping their own foreign policy in nominal harmony with the militant anti-Capitalist propaganda of the Third International in the Third International's war-zone beyond the Union's frontiers. The principle that the Soviet Government's foreign policy must not be such as to hamper the Third International's activities was abandoned, however, in the annex⁵ which was attached to the regional agreement of 1933 for adopting the Geneva draft of the 24th May, 1933, by anticipation; for in this annex the enumeration of circumstances which might not be taken to justify any act of aggression included

the internal position of any state, as, for example: its political, economic or social structure; alleged shortcomings of its administration; disorder following upon strikes, revolutionary or counter-revolutionary movements, or civil war.

This list embraced both the pretexts which Japan had already put forward in order to justify her accomplished acts of aggression against China, and the pretexts which Japan and Germany might be expected to put forward if they should ever embark, either severally

¹ *Survey for 1929*, pp. 63-9.

² The list of participants included Lithuania, who was a party to the protocols of 1929 and 1933 in spite of the fact that she had no direct territorial contact with the Soviet Union. In 1929, the list of parties was further increased by the participation of the Free City of Danzig. In 1933, Danzig was not a party, but on the other hand the list was completed this time by the inclusion of Finland and Afghanistan, who were the two missing *états limitrophes* in 1929, as well as Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, who were the two *non-limitrophe* members of the Little Entente.

³ *Survey for 1933*, pp. 181-3.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 234, 245-6, and 278 *seqq.*

⁵ *Survey for 1933*, p. 182; *Documents for 1933*, pp. 232-3.

or jointly, upon some aggressive adventure against the Soviet Union. In persuading his co-signatories of the regional anticipatory agreement to supplement the Geneva draft by this addition, Monsieur Litvinov manifestly had in mind the dangers threatening the Soviet Union and its girdle of buffer states. While China had already been victimized on the ground of her administrative inefficiency and disorder, the Soviet Union itself might be victimized on the ground that its Communist constitution automatically made it an outlaw and thereby debarred it from the enjoyment of any of the rights which Capitalist states possessed *vis-à-vis* one another under the Capitalist Society's system of international law. In this annex, the anxieties and aims of the Soviet Government are patent; yet in seeking to secure themselves against the danger of aggression on the part of certain particular Capitalist Powers, the Soviet Government were incidentally undertaking, on their own part, not to allow their own territory to be used in future as a base of operations for some of the most characteristic and effective activities of the Third International. Moreover, this incidental consequence of the Soviet Union's efforts at self-protection was neither overlooked nor concealed by the Soviet authorities. In the *Izvestiya* of the 8th February, 1933, in its editorial comment on Monsieur Litvinov's proposals of the 6th February, it was frankly admitted that

Litvinov's declaration not only is aimed against intervention in a country where there is a revolution, but in the name of the U.S.S.R. undertakes the obligation not to intervene in a country where there is a counter-revolution.¹

This admission was impressive; yet it was no more than the logical consequence of the declaration which had been made, as early as 1927, by the Soviet Government's representatives at the economic conference of that year,² and which had since been reaffirmed by Monsieur Molotov in a speech delivered in March 1931:

Socialism is not merely a system of economic and social equality. Socialism, first of all, means peace. The contradictions between the two economic systems, which during a certain historical period must unavoidably exist, do not exclude the possibility of some practical arrangement between them.³

This declaration opened the way to the fourth stage in the development of the Soviet Government's foreign policy—a stage in which the Soviet Union began to behave simply as one parochial sovereign state in a world of states of the same species, and no longer scrupled

¹ *Izvestiya*, 8th February, 1933, quoted by Florinsky in *op. cit.*, p. 238.

² *Survey for 1929*, p. 97.

³ Quoted in Florinsky, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

to enter into relations with any state, of whatever political or social complexion, whose good will or friendship or support might seem of value to the Soviet Government as they steered their course through international seas that were yearly becoming more and more perilous. It was this fourth stage that saw the *rapprochement* between the Soviet Union and France, and that culminated in the entry of the Soviet Union into the League of Nations.

(c) THE CONCLUSION OF NON-AGGRESSION TREATIES WITH FRANCE AND OTHER EUROPEAN POWERS, AND THE ENTRY OF THE SOVIET UNION INTO THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS (1931-1934)

The method by which the Soviet Government slipped back into a system of normal foreign relations was through the conclusion of a number of bilateral non-aggression treaties. This type of diplomatic instrument, which Soviet diplomacy had made peculiarly its own, had been worked out—in a network of treaties which the Soviet Government had concluded with its three Middle Eastern neighbours, and had induced these neighbours to conclude with one another—between 1921 and 1928.¹ Within the same period, the Soviet Government had entered into corresponding treaty relations with Germany.² The negotiation of non-aggression treaties with other countries began in 1931; and treaties of the kind were duly signed with Finland on the 21st January, 1932; Poland on the 25th January, 1932; Latvia on the 5th February, 1932; Estonia on the 4th May, 1932; France on the 29th November, 1932; Italy on the 2nd September, 1933. In this series of treaties, the Franco-Russian treaty was by far the most important. Its signature was as epoch-making an event in the international history of Europe as was the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States, on the 16th November, 1933,³ in the international history of the Far East and the Pacific.

The negotiations which eventually resulted in the signature and ratification of this Franco-Russian treaty appear to have begun in June 1931, simultaneously with a parallel series of negotiations for an improvement in the commercial relations between the two countries. The commercial negotiations were admittedly entered into on the Russian Government's initiative. In regard to the political negotiations, there was at first a certain unwillingness on either side to admit responsibility for having broached the idea of keeping such queer company as an *entente* with Capitalist France still seemed

¹ See the *Survey for 1928*, Part III B, section (xiii).

² See the *Survey for 1927*, pp. 301-10; the *Survey for 1930*, pp. 126-7; the *Survey for 1933*, p. 180.

³ See the *Survey for 1933*, Part IV, section (iv).

in Russian eyes and an *entente* with Communist Russia in the eyes of the French. The truth may be that the emergence of the National Socialist cloud in Germany had inspired the idea of a Franco-Russian *entente* in French and Russian minds simultaneously and independently.¹

The trade negotiations did not run smoothly or quickly. On the other hand, the political negotiations resulted, before the end of December 1931, in the initialing—as a token of provisional approval—of an agreed draft text for a Franco-Russian non-aggression treaty.

Further progress in this political field was, however, still being impeded, at the turn of the years 1931 and 1932, by a hesitation, on the French Government's part, to enter into a non-aggression treaty with the Soviet Union without the negotiation, *pari passu*, of corresponding treaties between the Union and two allies of France, Poland and Rumania, who were also two of the Union's *états limitrophes*. This French hesitation was overcome when Poland duly signed her non-aggression treaty with the Soviet Union on the 25th January, 1932;² and the continued failure of Rumanian and Russian diplomacy to achieve a Russo-Rumanian treaty of the same pattern³ was not, in itself, a sufficiently serious obstacle to prevent the Franco-Russian negotiations from being consummated.

The Russo-Rumanian negotiations—with the old Bessarabian stumbling-block still in their path—proved extremely difficult; for when, in September 1932, a formula which was satisfactory to the Soviet Government, as well as to the Rumanian Government of the day, had been found with the assistance of the Polish Government's good offices, a settlement was prevented, at the eleventh hour, by the personal intervention of the Rumanian Minister in London, Monsieur Titulescu, who proved strong enough to overthrow Dr. Vaida-Voivod's ministry at Bucarest and to win his own way to office. Thereafter, Monsieur Titulescu attempted to induce the Soviet Government to accept, through the mediation of France, a new formula in regard to Bessarabia which was satisfactory to the new Rumanian Government; but this time it was the Soviet Government's turn to be intransigent. In these circumstances Monsieur Titulescu—who was the principal Rumanian champion of the Franco-Rumanian *entente* and was therefore anxious not to obstruct the execution of the French Government's policy—made it known in Paris that he did not wish to ask for any further postponement of the conclusion of

¹ On this question see a despatch from the Paris correspondent of the *Journal de Genève*, published on the 3rd September, 1931.

² See the *Survey for 1931*, p. 155.

³ See the *Survey for 1932*, p. 608.

the draft Franco-Russian treaty. Thereupon, the French Government asked the Soviet Government for a special assurance confirming their previous undertakings (under 'the Litvinov Protocol' and 'the Kellogg-Briand Pact') that the Soviet Union would not have recourse to violence for the solution of their outstanding controversies with Rumania; and the Soviet Government promptly gave the French Government the assurance which they sought.¹ The way was now clear for the signature of the Franco-Russian draft treaty; and it was duly signed in Paris—not much less than a year after the date on which it had been initialed—on the 29th November, 1932.

The text of this Franco-Russian treaty of the 29th November, 1932, need not be analysed here, since it will be found in one of the volumes of documents in this series,² and it did not differ in any notable respect from the standard pattern of treaties of the kind. The importance of the treaty consisted in the fact of its signature and in the sequel.

Ratifications were exchanged at Moscow on the 15th February, 1933; and on the 18th May, 1933, the Chamber of Deputies in Paris debated the treaty and passed a unanimous vote of approval.

In the course of this debate, the following observations were made by Monsieur Édouard Herriot:

What has happened is a happy thing for France. Do I need to remind the House of the broad lines of our national policy—the traditional policy, as I will make bold to say, of the Kings of France? Remember how Francis I allied himself with Turkey not only in the face of, but actually against, the whole of Christendom, because this was what the interests of France required [*interpellation by the Prime Minister, Monsieur Daladier*: 'That is likewise the tradition of the Revolution'].

The Red Army [Monsieur Herriot continued] is, as an Honourable Member has already pointed out, a very important organization. We are well aware of that: the period of military service and the number of the military formations are a sufficient proof. . . . The Russian army, as another Honourable Member has shown, is potently equipped with aircraft and with chemical weapons. The Soviets devote considerable sums to research of all sorts.

Would you call it patriotism to shut one's eyes to these solid facts? [*Applause.*]

In the same place, eighteen months later, in a debate on the military estimates, one of Monsieur Herriot's Socialist-Radical associates, Monsieur Archimbaud, who was then serving as *rapporteur* for the

¹ For these Franco-Russo-Rumanian transactions see *Le Temps*, 27th November, 1932. The next attempt to arrive at a Russo-Rumanian settlement was made in October 1933, this time on Polish ground (see the *Survey for 1933*, p. 204).

² *Documents on International Affairs*, 1933, pp. 233-6.

Chamber's Army Committee, expressed the same idea in still blunter language:¹

Russia has a strong and well-equipped army which she will offer us in the event of a conflict between us and Germany. Why should we be worried if bourgeois France comes to an agreement with Communist Russia? Did not Richelieu come to an agreement with the German Protestant princes?

On the Russian side, Stalin, addressing the Seventeenth Congress of the Union Communist Party on the 26th January, 1934, declared—by way of rebutting the allegation that the Soviet Government's foreign policy had changed its orientation—

To-day, as in the past, we orient ourselves towards the U.S.S.R. and towards it alone [*frantic applause*]; and, if the interests of the U.S.S.R. demand a *rapprochement* with such and such countries which are interested in the preservation of peace, we make the necessary *rapprochement* without hesitation.²

In an article published in the American periodical *Foreign Affairs* in the same month of the same year, Monsieur Karl Radek wrote that

The Soviet Union does not close the door to the possibility of a deal, an agreement with imperialistic powers which are waging a struggle against other imperialistic Powers, if the latter attack the Soviet Union. . . . Against attacking imperialism, an agreement is permissible with any opponent in order to defeat the enemy invading the Soviet territory.

On the 15th May, 1935, the French Government were able—no

¹ Monsieur Archimbaud's speech was interpreted as meaning that by this time France and Russia had secretly entered into an actual military alliance. This interpretation was publicly repudiated both by Monsieur Archimbaud and by the French Government.

² In an earlier passage in the same speech, Stalin mentioned four points 'on which the U.S.S.R. counted in its difficult and complicated struggle for peace:

(a) On its own growing political and economic power;

(b) On the moral support of the millions of proletarians in all countries, who are vitally interested in the maintenance of peace;

(c) On the good sense of the countries which, for various reasons, have no interest in seeing peace compromised, and which are inclined to develop commercial relations with a partner which is as punctual in its payments as the U.S.S.R. is;

(d) And, finally, on our glorious army, which is ready to defend the country against foreign attack.'

Of these four points, all but the second might have been cited equally well, on his own account, by the head of the Government of any Capitalist Great Power of the day. As for the Soviet Union's second source of strength, it was no different in kind from that which Turkey had possessed (before her self-secularization) in the support of the Muslim subjects of other Powers, or, again, from the strength which the Irish Free State derived from the sympathy of the Irish-Americans.

doubt, with Monsieur Stalin's previous knowledge and consent—to deal the French Communist Party a prostrating blow by announcing, in an official *communiqué*, that

Monsieur Stalin understands and fully approves the policy of national defence adopted by France to maintain her armed forces at the level required for security.

In these French and Russian voices that were speaking the same pagan language naked and unashamed, we seem to hear Antichrist calling to Antichrist across the breadth of Europe.

The French and Russian *Realpolitiker* who in 1933 were thus setting their feet on a path which had led their countrymen in the preceding generation to the precipice of 1914, lost no time now in entering upon the traditional exchange of courtesies. On the 20th May, 1933, Monsieur Litvinov sent to Monsieur Paul-Boncour, the Minister for Foreign Affairs in the French Government of the day, a telegram¹ expressing the Soviet Government's gratification at the unanimity of the vote in the French Chamber, and declaring that 'this gesture considerably' increased 'the value of the pact—the importance of which' had 'already grown, as it was, since the time of its conception and signature'. Monsieur Paul-Boncour hastened to reply² in the same strain. On the 6th July, 1933, Monsieur Litvinov visited Monsieur Paul-Boncour and Monsieur Daladier in Paris; and, at a banquet in the same city on the 8th, he spoke of the Soviet Union's innocence of Imperialism, freedom from ambitions for territorial expansion, concern for peace, and devotion to the principle of national independence.

In the August and September of the same year, Monsieur Herriot went on a visit to Russia (*via* Bulgaria and Turkey)—not as an emissary of the French Government, yet as the Soviet Government's official guest—and was given a magnificent reception, which he fully earned by the diplomatic prowess that he displayed in his intercourse with his hosts. 'I am profoundly convinced', he declared in an interview with the Soviet Press, 'that the Russians are a peaceful people.'—'I admire', he wrote in the visitors' book of a military school, 'these fine young men under arms, and I give them the greetings of a republican Frenchman.'—'I hope,' he told his fellow citizens upon his arrival home at Lyons on the 13th September, 'that my journey has given me the opportunity to put in some good work . . . for the benefit of France and of peace.'

On the 12th September, 1933, the Air Minister in the French

¹ Text in *Le Temps*, 22nd May, 1933.

² Text of telegram in *Le Temps*, 24th May, 1933.

Government of the day, Monsieur Pierre Cot, left Le Bourget for Moscow accompanied by a suite of officials of the French Air Ministry. The three French aeroplanes duly reached their destination on the 15th September, after having broken their journey at Kharkov and at Kiev. In a speech which he delivered in Moscow during his visit, Monsieur Cot expressed the opinion that 'the interests of our people and of world-peace' would be promoted by the establishment of technical co-operation in the air between France and the Soviet Union; and in a statement which he made, upon his return home, to the French Press, he told his countrymen that he had

visited a great number of aviation establishments, institutes, laboratories, factories, schools, industrial enterprises and social institutions such as dispensaries, kindergartens and crèches. But [he added] I will not conceal the great interest and the high regard that I have brought away with me for the Russian achievements in the air. I believe that, in the course of our visit, we have prepared the ground for a technical collaboration and for a closer contact between the experts of the two nations. . . . I am convinced that, in working on the plane of science, technique and industry (which are the fundamental preoccupations of the Soviet Union), we shall be making some small contribution to the insurance of mutual understanding and general peace.

A return visit was paid in the following year by a flight of three Russian aeroplanes which arrived in Paris on the 7th August, 1934. And this Russian air mission was entertained by Monsieur Herriot in his capacity as mayor of his native city of Lyons. During the same calendar year, a French air mission spent six months in the U.S.S.R.

In the meantime, the Franco-Russian trade negotiations which had been running parallel with the political negotiations had been making a slow progress which at length bore fruit in the initialing of a provisional Franco-Russian trade agreement at Paris on the 11th January, 1934, and in the signature at Moscow, on the 9th December, of a protocol which was to provide the basis for the conclusion of a permanent commercial treaty.

It will be seen that, after the signature of the Franco-Russian Non-Aggression Treaty of the 29th November, 1932, the relations between the two parties continued to grow more intimate and more cordial; and in the year 1934 this well-known tendency for a *détente* resulting from a common anxiety to transform itself into an *entente*, if the anxiety persists, received a fresh acceleration and impetus from two events: the signature, on the 26th January, 1934, of a German-Polish Non-Aggression Pact in which the contracting parties pledged themselves, for the next ten years, to abstain from the use of force

as a means of settling their differences with one another;¹ and the replacement, in France, of Monsieur Daladier's Government by Monsieur Doumergue's Government on the 9th February as the result of an outbreak of disorder in Paris.

This sudden and extreme political change in France, which seems to have been almost entirely due to internal stresses and strains, produced a profound and rapid effect upon the international situation inasmuch as it placed the conduct of the foreign policy of one of the key-countries of Europe in the hands of a Ministry which was predominantly composed of old men of the generation and outlook of Monsieur Poincaré. A characteristic figure among them was Monsieur Barthou, who now succeeded Monsieur Paul-Boncour at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The new French Foreign Minister was a man who had acquired the mental rigidity of age without having lost the animal spirits of youth; and though he only held office for eight months in the year 1934 before his activities were cut short by his tragic end on the 9th October, he contrived, during this brief period, to make a mark upon international history which seemed certain to endure and likely to prove unfortunate.

The history of the project, which Monsieur Barthou initiated, of building up an East-European pact of mutual assistance, to balance the Locarno Pact in the West, will be dealt with in the following volume; for, though the project can be traced back to a meeting between MM. Barthou and Litvinov at Geneva on the 18th May, 1934, the negotiations did not reach their decisive stage until long after Monsieur Barthou's death and the turn of the calendar year. In this volume we can only record two transactions which grew out of the Eastern Pact project, but which were both completed before the close of the year 1934. One of them was the signature, on the 5th December, 1934, of an agreement² between Monsieur Litvinov and Monsieur Barthou's successor, Monsieur Laval, to the effect that neither France nor the Soviet Union would enter into any political negotiations with other Powers which might prejudice the conclusion of the proposed Eastern Pact without first consulting one another.³ (This Franco-Russian agreement was acceded to by Czechoslovakia on the 11th December, 1934.) The other, and greater,

¹ For the change in German-Polish relations which led up to the conclusion of this agreement, see the *Survey for 1933*, pp. 183-6. The German-Polish pact of the 26th January, 1934, will be dealt with further—in relation to the counter-project for an Eastern Pact—in the *Survey for 1935*.

² Text in *The Times*, 19th December, 1934.

³ See Monsieur Litvinov's commentary on this agreement which was communicated to the Tass Agency and published in *Le Temps* on the 9th December, 1934.