



Candidates must complete this page and then give this cover and their final version of the extended essay to their supervisor.

Candidate session number

Candidate name

School number

School name

Examination session (May or November)

MAY

Year

2012

Diploma Programme subject in which this extended essay is registered: HISTORY

(For an extended essay in the area of languages, state the language and whether it is group 1 or group 2.)

Title of the extended essay: The Impact of World War One on Arab-Israeli Relations: Was the Balfour Declaration an incautious and ambiguous document that harmed Arab-Israeli relations in the Post War world?

Candidate's declaration

This declaration must be signed by the candidate; otherwise a grade may not be issued.

The extended essay I am submitting is my own work (apart from guidance allowed by the International Baccalaureate).

I have acknowledged each use of the words, graphics or ideas of another person, whether written, oral or visual.

I am aware that the word limit for all extended essays is 4000 words and that examiners are not required to read beyond this limit.

This is the final version of my extended essay.

Candidate's signature:

Date: 23/02/2012

Supervisor's report and declaration

The supervisor must complete this report, sign the declaration and then give the final version of the extended essay, with this cover attached, to the Diploma Programme coordinator.

Name of supervisor (CAPITAL letters) _____

Please comment, as appropriate, on the candidate's performance, the context in which the candidate undertook the research for the extended essay, any difficulties encountered and how these were overcome (see page 13 of the extended essay guide). The concluding interview (viva voce) may provide useful information. These comments can help the examiner award a level for criterion K (holistic judgment). Do not comment on any adverse personal circumstances that may have affected the candidate. If the amount of time spent with the candidate was zero, you must explain this, in particular how it was then possible to authenticate the essay as the candidate's own work. You may attach an additional sheet if there is insufficient space here.

The candidate had no difficulty in finding appropriate sources for this investigation. She was passionate about the subject and completed the foundation reading for the subject independently. The student struggled to master her sources and needed assistance in organising the structure of her essay. Once she had been given guidance in this area she was able to complete her investigation with minimum support. The one area where the student remained limited was in her ability to evaluate her findings. Perhaps her lack of higher order thinking skills contributed to an essay which lacks depth in its conclusions. The student was passionate but the work was pedestrian.

This declaration must be signed by the supervisor; otherwise a grade may not be issued.

I have read the final version of the extended essay that will be submitted to the examiner.

To the best of my knowledge, the extended essay is the authentic work of the candidate.

I spent hours with the candidate discussing the progress of the extended essay.

Supervisor's signature: _____

Date: _____

23/2/2012

Assessment form (for examiner use only)

Candidate session number

Achievement level

Criteria

	Examiner 1	maximum	Examiner 2	maximum	Examiner 3
A research question	2 ✓	2	2 ✓	2	
B introduction	1 ✓	2	1 ✓	2	
C investigation	2 ✓	4	2 ✓	4	
D knowledge and understanding	1 ✓	4	2 ✓	4	
E reasoned argument	1 ✓	4	1 ✓	4	
F analysis and evaluation	1 ✓	4	1 ✓	4	
G use of subject language	2 ✓	4	2 ✓	4	
H conclusion	1 ✓	2	1 ✓	2	
I formal presentation	2 ✓	4	1 ✓	4	
J abstract	1 ✓	2	1 ✓	2	
K holistic judgment	2 ✓	4	2 ✓	4	

Total out of 36

14

16

Name of examiner 1: _____
(CAPITAL letters)

Examiner number: _____

Name of examiner 2: _____
(CAPITAL letters)

Examiner number: _____

Name of examiner 3: _____
(CAPITAL letters)

Examiner number: _____

IB Cardiff use only: B: _____

IB Cardiff use only: A: 104035

Date: 25/4

The Impact of World War One on Arab-Israeli Relations:

Was the Balfour Declaration an incautious and ambiguous document that harmed Arab-Israeli relations in the Post World War?

Word Count : 3978



should be here

Table of Contents

Abstract 3

Introduction 4

Placing the Balfour Declaration in its Historical context 5-9

- Why was Britain making promises to the Zionists in 1917?
- Did Britain have a clear understanding of the Zionists to whom the promises were made?
- Was the Balfour Declaration ambiguous?

Assessing the Nature of Arab-Israeli Relations Prior to World War One 10-11

- How hostile were Jews and Arabs towards each other prior to World War One?

Assessing the Impact of the Balfour Declaration in the Period 1918-1948 12-14

- Following the Paris Peace Treaties how did Arabs and Jews react to the promises made to them during World War One?

Conclusion: To what extent did the Balfour Declaration impact on Arab-Israeli Relations in the post war period? 15

Bibliography 16

P3



Abstract

This extended essay will investigate: The Impact of World War One on Arab-Israeli Relations. The Research question that I have chosen is: Was the Balfour Declaration an incautious and ambiguous document that harmed Arab-Israeli relations in the Post World War? The reason for the selected topic was to present an argument which looked at the external factors of the Arab-Israeli conflict proving it to have a deeper meaning than the conflicting beliefs of the religions. This topic will prove to be of interest to historians which want to delve into the reasons for the Arab-Israeli relations to have formed in such conflicting attitudes. Additionally the origins of their relationship and the development over the years will be taken into consideration.

The sources chosen reflect the nature of the topic as they are there to support the evidence given. In this investigation there will be particular reference to Eric Hobsbawm's argument that British policy towards Arab and Zionist nationalism was, "incautious" and "ambiguous"

To conclude, the essay shows how the British were not entirely to blame for the tensions caused later within the 20th Century but they were a contributing factor.

Concl

Insufficiently developed essential requirement to gain full marks.

I?
which one?

RP

scope

+

elements of method

RP note presented here but clear enough in title page + presumably scannable as EE.

Introduction

The Arab-Israeli relationship, throughout the years has shown resilience, stubbornness and at times support and loyalty. Like a plane flight the Arab-Israeli relationship can be seen as having turbulence in parts and there have been many chances of not landing smoothly due to external factors. The external factors in question are the British policies involving both the Arabs and Israeli's. The British showed both the promotion of Arab nationalism through the McMahon letters and also Zionism through the Balfour Declaration. Eric Hobsbawm argues that British Policy was "incautious"¹ and "ambiguous"² towards the Zionist movement up till now there can be a generalization made that British policy was not only incautious and ambiguous towards the Zionist but to the Arab as well in a sense of the contradictory promises made to both people. sources? SO??

only???

importance not explicit
+ insufficient development of points in B altogether.

¹ Hobsbawm, Eric, The Age of Extremes, p.32 ✓

² Ibid page

Placing The Balfour Declaration, 1917, in its Historical Context

Why was Britain making promises to the Zionists in 1917?

In 1917 the success of Germany's submarine warfare had put Britain in a fairly desperate position; supplies were short and the USA were now more focused on fighting their own war against Germany than on helping Britain. *sources? evidence?*

On November 2nd 1917 Arthur Balfour agreed to Lord Rothschild that the British government would support, "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people"³. The Jewish Lord Rothschild was extremely wealthy and also very influential in the USA. This appealed to Britain's best interests as she felt that victory was slipping further away although by Britain asserting herself only to *her* best interests she was provoking incautious factors towards the later affects that could have potentially harmed her relation with the Israelis. *Is this term appropriate for 1917 - 1945?*

~~✗~~ The Balfour Declaration written to Lord Rothschild is an agreement to support the Zionist movement yet due to the previous evidence, it can be suggested that Britain was supporting Zionism in order to gain backing towards winning the First World War. Never the less Zionism was an extreme political movement which can be considered a risk when put into the context of Britain winning the war as the Balfour Declaration does not give any feedback towards the Zionist movement becoming of help to the British. By becoming in agreement with an extremist movement this could have created risks for Britain as when the conflicts between the Arabs and Israeli's started to occur she was "condemned...for what they (the Israeli's) regarded as her failure to implement the Mandate in favour of the national home."⁴ Another factor which would make the invitation towards Zionism a risk could be the McMahon letters written 2 years previous⁵ which almost pleads for the Arab support against the Ottoman Empire which could create bad relations between the Jews and the British *How may evidence? TB*

Did Britain have a clear understanding of the Zionists to whom the promises were made?

Relevance? Nationalism can be defined as a patriotic feeling⁶ shown towards a country. Throughout history nationalism can be seen from one extreme to the other within context to the time period, leader and location of the country. In 1919 Italy became a Fascist state under the rule of Benito Mussolini yet Germany where the National Social Party, Nazism, came to power in 1933, was more widely recognised as a fascist state. For the Fascist Europeans nationalism toys with the publics emotions by inserting the feeling of prevalence. Nationalism also convinces people that war is socially acceptable. Within Germany and Italy at the time when Fascism was in power people presented great nationalistic

³ The League of Nations Mandate for Palestine, July 24th, 1922 found at <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1922mandate.asp>

31/01/2012 14:52

⁴ Litvinoff, Barnett "Makers of the Twentieth Century : Weizmann and Ben-Gurion" History Today Volume 30 page 5

⁵ In a series of letters written by Sir Henry McMahon, The British High Commissioner in Egypt, Arab Nationalism is encouraged in return for support against the Ottoman Empire <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1915mcmahon.asp>

31/01/2012 15:00

⁶ Thompson, Della "The Oxford Compact English Dictionary" Oxford University Press 1996, page 661

Not in Bibliography

views as by supporting their country they were able to forget about their own problems and indulge themselves into an impregnable nation. *Italy?*

According to Barnet Litvinoff, Jews saw, "Zionism as a heresy, the secularisation and politicisation of God's Promise as revealed to the prophets."⁷ In comparison to the nationalism seen in Fascist Italy and Germany, Zionism presented the religious movement of Judaism to gain a homeland for their people. The Zionist movement wanted to gain back the city of Jerusalem which was originally seen in a biblical context. Although Mussolini's fascists embraced the Catholic church, this had nothing to do with religion but more with consolidating his power by getting the support of the Vatican and the Italian people. Hitler directed Nazism towards the working class of Germany and was in favour of creating a superior "Arian" race. The Zionist movement shows us how Judaism promoted nationalism based on faith and the difference between the white European nationalism and this Middle Eastern movement is that Zionism was not created in order to gain more power, but to claim back what they believed was their rightful homeland. *So? Why the comparison??*

Theodor Herzl greatly encouraged, "the formation of a political movement to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine"⁸ by the pamphlet created in 1896, "On the Jewish State". In 1897 this pamphlet was presented in the first Zionist Congress which was assembled by Herzl⁹. It presents Herzl's ideas on what he claims to be opinions of his "fellow-citizens" and he talks about the people as "one people". Additionally, Herzl suggests ways in which the homeland can be taken in order to restore the rights of his people. Notwithstanding the clarity of the vision of Zionism can be challenged through the analysis of Herzl's opinions. The source itself is full of patriotism revealing the strength of the Jews stated how the "the distinctive nationality...neither can, with, nor must be destroyed" By emphasising their strength and their indestructibility Herzl presents himself with an underlying counter claim to his argument which is that if the Jewish people "cannot be destroyed" then what is the necessity for a homeland? Herzl also states that "The plan" is "...simple in design, but complicated in execution"¹⁰ which indicates that the complexity of Herzl's plan may jeopardise its execution. The proficiency of Herzl's aims "will be gradual...and will cover many decades."¹¹ Producing a plan taking space over many years can cause uncertainty to the fulfilment as through the years aspects may start to seem more ambiguous if the steps are not carried out in the correct order. Herzl's pamphlet can also suggest the backward thinking as the quotation, "It is useless...to be loyal patriots...if only we could be left in peace," presents the idea that Herzl wants to be given the land instead of the modern notion which would be to have a demanding approach. Once again, the pamphlet proposes the biblical context in which his ideas come from as the mentions, "Whoever...must perish, let him perish." The backward thinking of Herzl's pamphlet shows support towards Bell's opinion that Jewish nationalism is, "a far cry from modern notions of national self-determination."¹² Litvinoff shares a different interpretation than that of Herzl where, "...few Jews wanted...an organised voice"¹³ There is a contradiction towards the pamphlet which supported a defining moment within the Arab-Israeli conflict as many Jews were now "seeking social equality".

⁷ Litvinoff, Barnett "Makers of the Twentieth Century : Weizmann and Ben-Gurion" History Today Volume 30 Issue 1980 *page*

⁸ Theodor Herzl, On the Jewish States, 1896 (A pamphlet) <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1896herzl.asp> *date of access?*

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Ibid

¹¹ Ibid

¹² Bell, P.M.H, "The World Since 1945 an International History" p. 166 ✓

¹³ Litvinoff, Barnett "Makers of the Twentieth Century : Weizmann and Ben-Gurion" History Today Volume 30 Issue 1980 page 1

This conveys the notion that Herzl had created the pamphlet in aspects largely involving his own opinions which "ran counter to the aspirations of the vast majority of people."¹⁴

*And evidence for
this view?*

In light of the above, Britain could not have comprehended the nature of Zionism when she appealed to the movement in 1917 as the ambiguity of Theodor Herzl's pamphlet¹⁵ meant that the message behind his ideas of creating a homeland for the Jews was unclear. The idea was ambiguous and incoherent even for some of the Jews so even more so for Britain. There is also the nationalism aspect where white Europeans show a different understanding of the concept than the Middle Eastern Jews. Nationalism towards the white Europeans was to show patriotism towards your country whereas nationalism within Zionism is shown towards Judaism.

homeland for it?

not clear enough

¹⁴ Litvinoff, Barnett "Makers of the Twentieth Century : Weizmann and Ben-Gurion" History Today Volume 30 Issue 1980 page 1

¹⁵ Herzl, Theodor "On the Jewish States." 1896 (A pamphlet)
<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1896herzl.asp>

Was the Balfour Declaration ambiguous?

The Balfour Declaration¹⁶, written by Arthur James Balfour¹⁷ could be viewed as an "incautious"¹⁸ and an impulsive document which was completed in a time of panic for the British. The Declaration was written in 1917¹⁹ to present the Zionist movement with an offering of British support. In addition, 1917 was the year in which the Germans had proceeded to use unrestricted submarine warfare in order to limit British export supplies from America and Canada across the Atlantic. The risk of being defeated made the Balfour Declaration incautious as although there cannot be judgement towards the fact that if the British were victorious would they have appealed to support the Zionist movement? *But really situation of adversities?*

Should explain better

The meaning of the Balfour Declaration can be viewed as unclear as within the introduction Arthur Balfour states that the declaration is one "of sympathy"²⁰. This suggests that the British sympathise with the "Jewish Zionist aspirations"²¹ yet sympathy can have an ambiguous meaning. It could signify that the British simply sympathise with the Zionists. It could also mean support them as they attempt to gain Palestine as a Jewish homeland. The promises which have been made within the Balfour Declaration²² can be that, "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."²³ This can prove indication that the British are in agreement that Palestine should be dubbed the Jewish homeland yet there is still no actual promise being made. The Declaration²⁴ then proceeds onto say that the British will use their, "best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object"²⁵ This can once again pose an unclear notion as there has been no actual promise made towards the Zionists in order to fully gain control of Palestine as the Jewish homeland. *limited analysis*

In contrast to the Balfour Declaration, the McMahon letters²⁶ during the time periods 1915-1916 can be viewed as contradictions towards the Declaration. With reference to the following excerpt, which was written in October 24th, 1915,²⁷ there is awareness that, similarly to the Balfour Declaration, Britain had attempted to create alliances in order to gain more support. The fact that the letter was written in 1915 reveals that at this time there was desperation to gain support from other nations. In 1915 the Treaty of London was also held in hope of gaining the courtship of Italy. The British Government also appealed to Ali Ibn Husain²⁸, the sheriff of Mecca during the First World War²⁹, in order to gain Arab support, which would fight against the Ottoman Empire in return for a number of British promises involving them as an ally of the Arabs. The letters which McMahon wrote to the *egs??*

should propose

¹⁶ Halsall, Paul, The Balfour Declaration, Internet Modern History Sourcebook <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/balfour.asp>

date of access?

¹⁷ Ibid

¹⁸ Hobsbawm, Eric, The Age of Extremes, p.32

¹⁹ Halsall, Paul, The Balfour Declaration, Internet Modern History Sourcebook <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/balfour.asp>

date

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ Ibid

²² Ibid

²³ Ibid

²⁴ Ibid

²⁵ Ibid

²⁶ In a series of letters written by Sir Henry McMahon, The British High Commissioner in Egypt, Arab Nationalism is encouraged in return for support against the Ottoman Empire

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1915mcmahon.asp>

date of access?

²⁷ Ibid

²⁸ Ibid

²⁹ Ibid

?

more analysis of the source 'value/ circulation should be provided' 100

Sherif of Mecca amounted to 10 thus there can be a suggestion of the desperation which McMahon and the British felt to gain the Arab support at the time.

The letter written on 24th October 1915 displays hardly any encouragement of Arab nationalism in the Middle East considering the statement that the Arabs must "seek the advice and guidance of Great Britain only". This submits a rigid view of the British and unlike the Zionist attempting self determination in a timeworn fashion, the British aims for the agreement with the Arabs was to create an autocratic agreement which benefitted Britain more than the restricting aims which she had in store for the Arabs.

The Balfour Declaration³⁰ and the McMahon letter written 24th October³¹ present contradictions and this reveals Britain's aims did change throughout the years of 1915-1917. In the McMahon letter it states how, "Great Britain will guarantee the holy Places against all external aggression"³² Whereas the Balfour Declaration declares that Britain will "endeavour to facilitate"³³ which provides us with evidence that Britain is showing dubiousness towards Zionism. The McMahon letter also presents the request that if Britain are to support the Arabs in return they must perform, "the expulsion of the Turks from the Arab countries"³⁴ whereas Britain is able to give support to the Zionist movement without any need for something in return.

Some contradiction to page 5 3rd paragraph

British policy towards the Arabs and Israeli's can be classified as "ambiguous"³⁵ and "incautious"³⁶ because as the evidence suggests the British government were unaware of the particular nature and terms of both Zionism and the Arab relations towards the Ottoman Empire including how they felt about the British. Hobsbawm's judgment can be seen as being accurate to a certain extent yet we must also take into consideration that Zionism was not made with a definite structure for its citizens. So there would be some confusion for the nation watching the events.

term??

which our hope the Declaration?

³⁰ Halsall, Paul, The Balfour Declaration, Internet Modern History Sourcebook <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/balfour.asp>

unnecessary reference

³¹ In a series of letters written by Sir Henry McMahon, The British High Commissioner in Egypt, Arab Nationalism is encouraged in return for support against the Ottoman Empire <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1915mcmahon.asp>

repeated

³² Ibid

³³ Halsall, Paul, The Balfour Declaration, Internet Modern History Sourcebook <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/balfour.asp>

³⁴ In a series of letters written by Sir Henry McMahon, The British High Commissioner in Egypt, Arab Nationalism is encouraged in return for support against the Ottoman Empire <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1915mcmahon.asp>

✓

³⁵ Hobsbawm, Eric, The Age of Extremes, p.32

³⁶ Ibid

(circle)

Assessing the Nature of Arab-Israeli Relations Prior to World War One

How hostile were Jews and Arabs towards each other prior to World War One?

P.M.H Bell states, "The Middle East is an area where the present can never be separated from the past."³⁷ With this statement the historian could then develop a preconceived idea that there has always been conflict involving the Arab-Israeli Relations yet this is not the case. "A Path to Peace Inspired by the Past" by Martin Gilbert³⁸ gives an insight to the positive and negative aspects of relations between the Arabs and Jews throughout history and also presents us with the argument that the conflict between these two peoples is not simplistic enough to be named a long standing religious-historical conflict.

"Hostility has unquestionably been a part of the long historical narrative of Arab-Jewish relations."³⁹ Among the historians Bell and Gilbert there is agreement in the two quotations used, through delving into Gilbert's essay there is noticeable counter claim to this argument. Under the title named "A New Jerusalem"⁴⁰ Gilbert mentions events in which the Muslims and Jews did not just work alongside each other but worked together as a unit. An example of the "cross-cultural engagement"⁴¹ can be shown in 1234 when a jointly owned house "in Cairo (was) lived in by Jews and Muslims." This demonstrates how the relations can be dubbed "too simplistic" to be a religio-historical conflict as many of the events during the time of the New Jerusalem show events of support and togetherness. Another example of their relations is shown through times of war where in 1431⁴², "Jews continued to fight as companions-in-arms with Muslim soldiers against the Christians."⁴³ So throughout 1400 years there have been times of peace and shows of togetherness among the Arabs and Jews.

It would be too condensed to state that the only conflict between the Arabs and Jews was a long standing religious-historical conflict and as Bell argues that, "The Middle East has...a magnetic effect...partly for religious reason, partly as a result of geography, strategy and economics."⁴⁴ As we have seen throughout history, imperialism has caught the eye of many of the European countries. Britain had been reluctant to lose her empire and did everything in her power to preserve it, Germany also shows signs of imperialism through the 1st and 2nd Moroccan Crises. The effect of an extreme movement such as Zionism can also be linked to the Jews wanting a colony for themselves. Palestine was marked as a place upon which the Jews religiously believed that it had belonged to them but with an extremist movement such as Zionism, it would be difficult for the movement not to want to gain power like the fascist movements of Italy and Germany. Thus in agreement with Bell the Palestine problem can be viewed as a post-colonial problem as well as a religious one.

Although Gilbert states how, "No Muslim country was free from periods of anti Jewish sentiment"⁴⁵ he argues a point previous that, "There is nothing in Islamic history to parallel the Spanish expulsion and Inquisition, the Russian pogroms, or the Nazi Holocaust"⁴⁶ This testifies the notion that although

³⁷ Bell, P.M.H, "The World Since 1945 an International History" p.166

³⁸ Gilbert, Martin, "A Path to Peace Inspired by the Past" Volume 60 Issue 8 2010

³⁹ Ibid p.3

⁴⁰ Ibid p.3

⁴¹ Ibid p.4

⁴² Ibid p.5

⁴³ Ibid p.5

⁴⁴ Bell, P.M.H, "The World Since 1945 an International History" p.166

⁴⁵ Gilbert, Martin, "A Path to Peace Inspired by the Past" Volume 60 Issue 8 2010 p.5

⁴⁶ Ibid p.2

Zionism = socialist-type ideas, so leads
K & U movement as claims "extremist" = "fascist"
would suggest.

why?
really?
?

not a
clear
connecting
long
period

when?
endemic?
link
needs to
specify

why connection between
2 movements? No
messy
provided

Source
if
what is it?

9.7 x
colony
not same!
evidence?

page?

there has been hostility between the Jews and Arabs, throughout history there have been incidents which have shown shocking acts of violence and in comparison, the Arab-Israeli relations seem somewhat minor.

Jews

? other states

fully argued

Prior to World War One, there have been tension exerted yet the extent of which tension was present was very little in comparison to the tension during and after the war. By looking back on the history of this complex relationship, this essay has also been able to reflect upon the importance of studying World War 1 and the decisions made regarding the Arabs and Jews. Through discovering the historical context of their relationship there is an awareness of the fact that the Balfour Declaration of 1917 did harm the Arab-Israeli relationship.

When did the Balfour Declaration become known to all?

NA very clear, overall.



Assessing the Impact of the Balfour Declaration in the Period 1918-1948

Following the Paris Peace Treaties, how did Arabs and Jews react to the promises made to them during World War One?

The Paris Peace Treaties were produced in order to create settlement and comfort to particularly the victors but they also affected much of the World's current state as many empires lost and gained spheres of influence over the countries and empires which were allies to Germany.

The Treaty of Sevres, 1920 resulted in the division of the Ottoman Empire. At the time of World War One the Ottoman Empire had been an ally of Germany. The one question was: Who was going to become the main leader for Palestine? ??!

It was agreed that the USA and Great Britain were going to become the mandates for Palestine, 1922⁴⁷ yet as this was agreed the Jewish were hopeful that with "Britain as Mandatory Power"⁴⁸ Palestine "would eventually become a Jewish National Home, a state in everything but name..."⁴⁹ As Britain was seen as the main mandate for Palestine, she held a lot of responsibility within Palestine with the including factor that the region contained "virtually her entire oil reserves"⁵⁰ As time progressed the Arabs realised that the Jewish had become the dominant race in a country they were also meant to be a part of thus "Periodic outbreaks of Arab violence...caused...Britain (to find herself) involved in inter-racial conflict of increasing ferocity" This indicates how Britain did not fully apprehend the responsibility she had gained until after the signing of the Balfour Declaration and becoming the mandate to of Palestine. It could not have been estimated when the Arab's and Israeli's were to clash within conflict yet it was sure as Britain being the mandate the blame would fall onto her. How? Numbers? No situation! Confusion in language.

Chaim Weizmann even before Britain becoming a mandate was "already thinking further ahead that Britain's own government"⁵¹ and wanted to make Britain an ally so after Britain had become a mandate over Palestine he "occupied a world role"⁵² advancing towards developing a friendship with Winston Churchill. This suggests that the British promises made in favour of Palestine were of importance to Weizmann as he felt that with the support of the British a Jewish homeland could be a reality. Although as the evidence suggests that later when there was no sign of development the Jewish "regarded her as a failure"⁵³. ? Palestine British

In contrast "Ben-Gurion was placing his faith in developing Zionist self-reliance with Palestine itself" this creates the point that although both Weizmann and Ben-Gurion were wanting the same results Litvinoff argues that Ben-Gurion became more militant and presented opinions of self determination whereas Weizmann was counting on British support. reference?

The promises made in WW1 such as the McMahon letters and the contradictory Balfour Declaration present the fact that this did increase tensions between the Arabs and the Israeli's. As Jewish influence

⁴⁷ Modern History Sourcebook : League of Nations : The Mandate for Palestine, July 24 1922

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1922mandate.asp> 31/01/2012 16:03

⁴⁸ Litvinoff, Barnett "Makers of the Twentieth Century : Weizmann and Ben-Gurion" History Today Volume 30

Issue 1980 p. 4

⁴⁹ Ibid

⁵⁰ Ibid p.5

⁵¹ Ibid p.4

⁵² Ibid p.5

⁵³ Ibid

evidence?

became more apparent and this panicked the Arab which is why there was violence occurring between two nations who had had 1400 years of peace prior to the involvement of foreign powers.

too general vague!
poorly connected

Is it possible that the events of World War Two had a great effect on Arab-Israeli relations?

The events in Germany during World War Two caused great upset throughout the world and in particular among Jewish communities all over. Bell argues that, "the question of creating a Jewish state in Palestine acquired a new urgency and an intense emotional impetus from the Nazi death camps."⁵⁴ It caused chaos within the world and especially for the Jewish communities within Europe. There was now, more than ever a feeling of segregation, persecution and unfairness which urged there to be a national Jewish homeland created even more so.

rather more than that!

Bell's argument can be, to a certain extent, justified by David Cesarani's paragraphs⁵⁵ which state that, "the persecution and mass murder of the Jews always overshadowed Israel" although there is a debate as to whether or not this was the event that presented the main concern as to why the Jews should have a national homeland, it can be shown that this was the event that lead to the Jews demanding one. The persecution of the Jews throughout World War Two can be seen as a catalyst to the events after the Holocaust. As Cesarani states, "Throughout the 1950s, Israeli politics were roiled by issues from the recent catastrophe...violent debates in Israeli Parliament...riots in the streets" This evokes the message that World War Two was the main cause of Israeli conviction in wanting a homeland.

obtaining it

not the full actually - title's dates ambiguous?

reference

Through the rebellious attitudes of the Jews after World War Two this stirred the relationship between both races as the fight for Palestine to become a homeland became more intense, the Arabs had to become more durable in having their voices heard. It is fair to say that British policy in World War One towards the Middle East worsened Arab-Israeli relations as both sides were given ambiguous interpretations from the British which would have angered the Arabs and the Israeli's even more. While post World War Two there is would have been an angered opinion of the British as to why they did not intervene into German extermination of the Jews.

Not quite true... as possible reference to restrictions as immigration to Palestine then??

The argument is not developed with clarity.

⁵⁴ Bell, P.M.H, "The World Since 1945 an International History" p.166

⁵⁵ Cesarani, David, "Coming to Terms with Past:Israel" Volume 54 Issue 2 p.3

Conclusion: To what extent did the Balfour Declaration impact on Arab-Israeli Relations in the post war period?

WWI? or WWII?

Eric Hobsbawm's argument that the British policies involving the Arabs and Israeli's during World War One were incautious and ambiguous can be seen as an accurate description for the policies made. By producing the McMahon letters prior to the Balfour Declaration indicates how the British were unaware and to an extent, ignorant to the Arabs and Israeli's in terms of their relationship status and as individuals.

The need to win World War One was worthier for the British than it was for the need to satisfy Zionist and Arab nationalism. There are two reasons as to how this statement can be justified; if the British had been fighting a war where there was no doubt that they would lose then the Britain would not have given their support to either the Zionist movement or the Arab nationals. Secondly, it was unlikely that white Europeans would understand the nature of Zionist and Arab nationalism because for white Europeans it is a different concept involving patriotism and promoting a positive image of warfare and it was difficult for the white Europeans to comprehend nationalism of a belief like the Zionist movement did. It was inevitable that the collapse of empires in World War One would have a significant impact on the Arab-Israeli relations yet the British policies caused a significant amount of turmoil towards the negative attitudes which both the Zionists and the Arab adopted. The long term history of the Arab Israeli conflict could have reduced the significance of Britain's role within the conflict yet it is Martin Gilbert's analysis in "A Path to Peace Inspired by the Past"⁵⁶ which provides us with the knowledge that the relationship between the Arabs and Israeli has seen positive highlights for example the 1400 years of peace⁵⁷.

means non-Jewish?

Finally, it is possible to argue that the horrors of World War Two fundamentally changed the way in which a Jewish homeland had to be viewed as prior to this it was a Zionist movement which saw the Jewish homeland as something which would be convenient to have yet post World War Two it became a necessity in which the Jews were willing to fight for a safe homeland. The Holocaust made it impossible to judge fairly the impact of British policy on Palestine prior to 1941 yet there is a perception that due to the ambiguity of the British policy with the Arabs and Israelis, it did affect their relations within a negative light.

not directly answered to Q

Conclusion not actually consistent & relevant.

not actually addressed

Not always very clear argument, though permeable ±, all the more serious lack of evidence in claims. Some K+U & shows some awareness of an academic context.

⁵⁶ Gilbert, Martin, "A Path to Peace Inspired by the Past" Volume 60 Issue 8 2010

⁵⁷ Ibid

Bibliography

Book Sources

- ✓ • Bell, P.M.H The World Since 1945 An International History
-Bloomsbury Academic 4th May 2001
- ✓ • Hobsbawm, Eric The Age of Extremes
-Abacus New Edition Edition 12th October 1995

city?

city?

Internet Sources

- ✓ Herzl, Theodor "On the Jewish State 1896" Modern History Sourcebook
<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1896herzl.asp> *dates of access?*
↓
- ✓ Cesarani, David
History Today: Coming to Terms with the Past: Israel
-Published in History Today Volume: 54 Issue: 2
<http://www.historytoday.com/david-cesarani/coming-terms-past-israel> *dates*
↓ +
- ✓ Gilbert, Martin
History Today: A Path to Peace Inspired by the Past
-Published in History Today Volume: 60 Issue: 8 2010
<http://www.historytoday.com/martin-gilbert/path-peace-inspired-past> *+*
↓
- ✓ Litvinoff, Barnet
History Today: Makers of the Twentieth Century – Weizmann and Ben-Gurion
-Published in History Today Volume: 30 Issue 1980
<http://www.historytoday.com/barnet-litvinoff/makers-twentieth-century-weizmann-and-ben-gurion> *+*
- ✓ Sir Henry McMahon "Letter to Ali ibn Husain 1915" Modern History Sourcebook
<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1915mcmahon.asp>
- ✓ The Balfour Declaration 1917

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/balfour.asp>

David Jaccott

✓ The Mandate for Palestine, July 24th 1922, League of Nations, Modern History Sourcebook

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1922mandate.asp>

There are some details in
bibliography omitted. Indeed a
1 reference was listed here either but references
provide correct information mostly (even if superfluous
in places) Above all, however, several
citations lack the reference/source indispensable.
(So: $\frac{1}{4}$.)