

ISSUE #26  
2016

# THE LONDON JEWS SOCIETY AND THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

THE UNEXPLORED  
CONNECTION



AN OLIVE PRESS  
RESEARCH PAPER

BY  
PAUL HAMES

Welcome to the Olive Press Research Paper – an occasional paper featuring articles that cover a wide spectrum of issues which relate to the ministry of CMJ.

Articles are contributed by CMJ staff (past and present), also by Trustees, Representatives, CMJ Supporters or by interested parties.

Articles do not necessarily portray CMJ's standpoint on a particular issue but may be published on the premise that they allow a pertinent understanding to be added to any particular debate.



Telephone: 01623 883960

E-mail: [enquiries@cmj.org.uk](mailto:enquiries@cmj.org.uk)

Eagle Lodge, Hexgreave Hall Business Park, Farnsfield, Notts NG22 8LS

# THE LONDON JEWS SOCIETY AND THE BALFOUR DECLARATION

## THE UNEXPLORED CONNECTION.

2017 marks the centenary of both the signing of the Balfour Declaration and the Battle of Beersheba. CMJ historian Kelvin Crombie, in his documentary film and book “*Gallipoli - The Road to Jerusalem*”<sup>1</sup>, describes these two happenings as “events that were to radically shape the destiny of the Middle East, the Jewish people and indeed, the entire world”. By tracing the history we will follow the political path that led to the Balfour Declaration and the theological thinking that undergirded it, and we will discover the unexplored connection between The London Jews Society and the Balfour Declaration.

## BIRTH OF A MISSION SOCIETY

On an evening in 1808 in London a group of Christians met for prayer and discussion. Those attending the meeting had some clear objectives and, as was the custom in those days, formal minutes were taken. The minutes show that they resolved to form a society to be known as “*The London society for visiting and relieving the sick and distressed and instructing the ignorant, especially such as are of the Jewish nation*”<sup>2</sup>. The group allied itself initially with the London Missionary Society, but in 1809 the group became an independent missionary society -- ‘*the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews*’ (known colloquially as *the London Jews Society or LJS*). Today of course we know it as the Church’s Ministry among Jewish People or CMJ.

It was 109 years later on the afternoon of the 31st October 1917, in Whitehall, that the text of an important document was agreed by the War Cabinet and signed by the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Arthur Balfour. These two events - the birth of CMJ and the signing of the declaration - were to become inextricably linked and together became tied to the foundation of the modern State of Israel.

## WORLD WAR ONE

By 1917 the First World War had reached a critical point. The focus of attention had shifted from the stalemate on the bloody battlefields of France and Belgium to the deserts of the Middle East. The Allied Powers desperately needed a victory to maintain public support for a war that was becoming a liability and the government saw that a victory might be more likely on the Eastern front. So on that October day, as the British government agreed the text of Arthur Balfour's document, Australian, New Zealand, Indian and British forces were engaged in attacking Turkish positions in the ancient desert town of Beersheba. The battle was won, Beersheba was captured, and the way was now open for the Allied powers to capture Jerusalem and the Holy places, Damascus and Mesopotamia; and for the eventual fall of the Ottoman Empire. Back in London, following the discussions in the War Cabinet, Lord Balfour was authorised to relay the government's decision to representatives of British Jewry. This communication became known as "*The Balfour Declaration*". It took the form of a short memorandum, and was presented to Lord Walter Rothschild on 2nd November. Lord Rothschild was a prominent member of the Jewish community and an active Zionist. (We will define a Zionist here as a person seeking the establishment of a sovereign Jewish state in the old Biblical homeland.) The written communication stated that the British government "viewed with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people", and that it would "use its best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this objective..."

## GEO-POLITICS

The reasons for Britain's interest in this restoration project are complex, comprising a mixture of geo-political considerations and theological beliefs which we will explore. In the mid 19th century Great Britain was at its zenith; the British Empire stretched all around the globe. It was also a time of other great Empires. The French, the Russians, the Germans/Prussians, the Turks, and the Austro-Hungarians all also maintained expanding global empires. The British government believed her assets around the world needed protection, and she kept a careful eye on the aspirations of other foreign states operating within her spheres of activity. The British army and navy were posted to wherever there was a perceived threat, and foreign policy and international diplomacy were at the top of the British government's political agenda. Any foreign enterprise in the Eastern Mediterranean that was seen as potentially damaging to Britain's Far-Eastern interests was of particular concern, as by the

1880's the Suez Canal was a strategically important link in the British supply chain. Raw materials from Britain's colonies in the East fuelled the engine of Empire at home, and, without Suez, sea born transport would have to travel around the Cape of Good Hope and along the west coast of Africa, adding over 4000 miles of travel and six weeks to the journey time. The government's view was that the Suez canal must be protected for both economic and strategic reasons.

## THEOLOGY AND FAITH

At the same time evangelical Christianity was still a dominant strand of religious thinking in the nation. Since the 1790s the spread of the gospel message had gone hand-in-hand with the spread of British influence and culture. Around this time many of the great mission organisations were born. *The Baptist Missionary Society* (1792), *the London Missionary Society* (1795), *The Church Mission Society* (1799), *the British and Foreign Bible Society* (1804), and importantly, as we have seen, *the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews* (1809) were all founded in response to an evangelical movement that recognised the importance of spreading the gospel around the world

The French Revolution, and the resulting rapid changes to social conditions and ruling hierarchies, had led many Christians to believe that the return of Jesus was imminent. (Indeed some, including Leo Tolstoy in *War and Peace*, had even identified Napoleon as the Anti-Christ!) This apocalyptic view of the times was made popular in a book called '*Signs of the Times*' written by a Baptist minister named James Bicheno in the 1780s. Bicheno argued that the upheaval in Europe was a beginning of the "End of Days" foretold in the Bible, and a precursor to the return of Jesus. Bicheno believed that part of the lead up to Jesus' glorious return would be a restoration of His own Jewish people to their Biblical homeland and a subsequent Jewish national spiritual revival, all as foretold by the Prophets in the Hebrew Bible, notably **Ezekiel 36:8–12 and 24–30**.

*"But you, O mountains of Israel, shall shoot forth your branches and yield your fruit to my people Israel, for they will soon come home. For behold, I am for you, and I will turn to you, and you shall be tilled and sown. And I will multiply people on you, the whole house of Israel, all of it. The cities shall be inhabited and the waste places rebuilt. And I will multiply on you man and beast, and they shall multiply and be fruitful. And I will cause you to be inhabited as in your former*

*times, and will do more good to you than ever before. Then you will know that I am the Lord. **I will let people walk on you, even my people Israel. And they shall possess you, and you shall be their inheritance, and you shall no longer bereave them of children.** I will take you from the nations and gather you from all the countries and bring you into your own land. I will sprinkle clean water on you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. And I will give you a new heart, and a new spirit I will put within you. And I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to obey my rules. You shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers, and you shall be my people, and I will be your God. And I will deliver you from all your uncleannesses. And I will summon the grain and make it abundant and lay no famine upon you. I will make the fruit of the tree and the increase of the field abundant, that you may never again suffer the disgrace of famine among the nations”.*<sup>3</sup> (Emphasis mine)

and **Isaiah 43:5–7**

*“Fear not, for I am with you; I will bring your offspring from the east, and from the west I will gather you. I will say to the north, Give up, and to the south, Do not withhold; bring my sons from afar and my daughters from the end of the earth, everyone who is called by my name, whom I created for my glory, whom I formed and made”.*<sup>4</sup>

British Christians saw their support for both Jewish national aspirations and Jewish evangelism as key parts of this “end of time” scenario. Many notable Christians subscribed to what was called “Restorationism”, John Newton, the Wesley brothers, Charles Simeon, Bishop J C Ryle, William Wilberforce, Lord Shaftesbury, George Whitfield, and Charles Spurgeon among them, as well as members of royalty, the aristocracy, business people and other prominent government officials. In his book ‘*For the Love of Zion*’<sup>5</sup> Kelvin Crombie comments that “the list of LJS vice presidents in the 1800s consisted of a duke, seven earls, five viscounts and several members of parliament, as well as prominent churchmen’. Evangelical Restorationism in the 19th century (as opposed to the restorationism espoused by the Mormon Church or the later charismatic restorationism/ dominionism of the 1970s and 80s) was not on the theological fringe, but a broad mainstream movement amongst evangelicals. English Jewish historian Leonard Stein in his classic book ‘*The Balfour Declaration*’

commented that “The real force behind the movement for the restoration of the Jews to Palestine was the ‘religious party’ ... a body of devout and high-minded English Christians who, looking at the ferment in the East, believed that the time was at hand for the fulfilment of prophecy by the return of the Chosen People to the Holy Land, and that it was God’s will that the British nation should be the instrument for achieving this purpose”.<sup>6</sup> British Christians believed that the British nation would be used by God to further that restoration just as he had once used King Cyrus of Persia to bring about the Jewish return after the Babylonian exile.

It should be noted that one reason for restorationism’s popularity was that it was never a “single theology” movement. Some of its supporters favoured the new “dispensational” trend, others held to a more classical pre-millennial position, some to a post-millennial position, believing that Jewish restoration signalled an increase of God’s government on the earth, and still others held a less explicit view of an end time itinerary. The common bond between the restorationists was the desire to see Jewish people reached with the gospel and for them to have the opportunity to return to their Biblical homeland. The LJS/CMJ was at the forefront of this restoration movement and the society’s medical and educational work in Jerusalem, in conjunction with British Consular policies emanating from the office originally located at the Christ Church mission base in Jerusalem, played an important role in the founding and building of public institutions in the land that was eventually to become modern Israel. The first British vice-consul in Jerusalem, William Tanner Young (an LJS/CMJ associate), became the first foreign government representative to be given the task of protecting the rights of Jewish people living in the Ottoman Empire. Under the Turks the Jewish population was a “dhimmi”, or protected, second class community, forced to pay a tax to the Ottoman government just to be allowed to live. The British government’s order to Young to protect the interests of the Jews was a significant change to the existing order of things and reflects CMJ’s influence on government policy and its pioneer status in the mission world.

## MISSION ACTIVITY

At the same time as the British government was taking steps to provide support for the Jewish population in the Ottoman province, CMJ mission workers were

establishing the first school for Jewish children and the first hospitals for the Jewish sick and infirm. These institutions were originally located in the Old City of Jerusalem but, owing to their success, they soon required bigger premises. The mission pioneers took the injunction in Isaiah 54:2 to “*enlarge the tents*” as their commission. The new state of the art buildings planned to meet these increased needs were the first to be constructed outside the city walls, much against popular wisdom, and much against the wishes of the Jewish religious authorities who resisted any Christian influence on the Jewish community. Local Jewish response to the work of the missionaries was to seek financial support for their own rival institutions from rich European and American Jewry. The resulting initiatives gave rise to the Bikkur Holim Hospital and a school which became the embryonic Hebrew University of Jerusalem. Both of these institutions were begun in direct competition with CMJ’s mission schools and hospitals. This pattern of building rival institutions was replicated around the country, notably in Safed, where the old Rothschild Hospital (now a technical college) still bears a sign on the gate attesting to the impetus given by the Mission Hospital to build a Jewish counterpart. It was this mix of geo-political and theological motivation that gave rise to the sentiments held by many British Christians that culminated in the Balfour Declaration.

## BISHOP ALEXANDER

Many influential people were involved in CMJ’s work at this time, but the figurehead was a Jewish believer in Jesus from Prussia named Michael Solomon Alexander. It is vitally important to understand that the roots of the Balfour Declaration lay in the appointment of Alexander, an Anglican Minister, as the first Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem. Alexander’s consecration service in 1841 was the result of a joint LJS/British government proposal, put forward by Lord Palmerston under the combined influence of his son-in-law Lord Shaftesbury, and the Society. The proposal was that Britain should work towards a future restoration of the Jewish people to their own Land. The proposal was, not surprisingly, rejected by the ruling Turks and other international Powers, and was subsequently shelved. In spite of the rejection, however, the principle behind the proposal remained in the minds of prominent British statesmen and churchmen, and eventually influenced that Cabinet meeting in October 1917.<sup>7</sup> Once more CMJ was in the vanguard of actions that laid the basis for a revived nation of Israel. It is an interesting aside that for a few short years between 1840 and 1887 there was a four-way agreement between the British government, the Prussian government, the Anglican church, and CMJ that the



first protestant Bishop (Alexander) would be an Anglican, and that his successor would be a German Lutheran (Samuel Gobat). During this period the interests of the local Jewish population were protected, first by the British and then by the German Prussians. As we have seen, this was the first time that such a thing had happened to the Jewish people, certainly in the modern era. Sadly 40 years after the accord began, political and religious priorities changed in Prussia and the Bishopric agreement was ended in mid-1882, ostensibly following a debate about the relative importance of the German language service over the English service! In practice the bishopric continued until 1887 when it was finally dissolved and by 1914 Britain and Germany were at war. It was the only time that the two nations co-operated in protecting and encouraging the Jewish people, and we can only speculate as to what may (or may not) have happened had the agreement continued and borne fruit.

## POST-WAR POLITICS - THE MANDATES

As World War I came to an end, delegates representing the victorious nations convened at the Paris Peace Conference in January 1920 and founded the '*League of Nations*', an intergovernmental organisation aimed at maintaining world peace by "preventing wars through collective security and disarmament, and settling international disputes through negotiation and arbitration"<sup>8</sup>. Even before it was officially founded, the League was tasked with disposing of former German colonies in Africa and the Pacific, and former Ottoman provinces of non-Turkish origin. The adopted principle was that "these territories be temporarily administered by different governments on behalf of the League - a system of national responsibility with international supervision"<sup>9</sup>. The plan was defined as the 'Mandate System' and was adopted in 1919 by the 'Council of Ten' nations (made up of the main Allied powers that were to become the League of Nations a few months later).

Among the mandates thus formulated was the 'Mandate for Palestine'<sup>10</sup>; a legally binding agreement that laid down Jewish legal rights in Palestine, and clearly defined the area of land under consideration. This agreement was officially conferred at the San Remo Conference in April 1920, unanimously agreed by the 51 members of the Council of League of Nations in 1922, and made operational in 1923. This was a separate legal agreement from what has become known as "*the British Mandate*", which was essentially the League handing over of responsibility to Britain for the administration of the area of land delineated in the '*Mandate for Palestine*'. It may appear confusing but it is important to understand these two aspects of

the decision reached by the League of Nations regarding the area delineated as Palestine. The 'Mandate for Palestine' was a Trust document, and Great Britain was a Trustee called to administer the terms of the Trust. This administrative task became known as the 'British Mandate'. It is vital to recognise that the way Great Britain is perceived to have handled her responsibilities during the administration of the Mandate in no way affected the legality of the Mandate terms. Criticism of Britain's handling of her mandate responsibilities cannot make the sovereign nation of Israel illegitimate. The League introduced three types of mandate. 'Type A' specifically referred to the former Ottoman colonies which had "...reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognised subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory"<sup>11</sup>. Syria, Lebanon and Mesopotamia (Iraq) were three such communities. It has been erroneously assumed that Palestine was a fourth. In fact there is no reference to Palestine having a 'Type A' classification in the mandate terms. Had this been so, the majority population of Palestine of the time, the Arabs, would have been the beneficiaries of such a Mandate. This was never the League's intention. Article 2 of the Mandate document clearly speaks of the Mandatory as being "solely responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home."<sup>12</sup> Many have claimed that the Mandate for Palestine was of a Type A classification, and is thus invalidated by Britain favouring the Jewish people at the expense of the local Arab population. Palestinian Arabs claimed that in favouring the Jewish people the British violated the terms of the Mandate. However, the Palestinian (British) Royal Commission Report of July 1937 made clear that these claims were not valid. The terms of the Mandate clearly reference the policy undergirding the Balfour Declaration, (which by then had been accepted by the United States and the other Allied powers). The policy objectives made it clear from the beginning that "Palestine would have to be treated differently to Syria and Iraq"<sup>13</sup>.

## ENTER THE UNITED NATIONS

In 1946 the League of Nations was dissolved and responsibility for the 'Mandate for Palestine' was transferred to a new body the United Nations. This would have

been the ideal time to modify the objectives of any outstanding League of Nations' business. The Mandate was transferred unchanged, however, thus reaffirming the objectives and the terms of the original Mandate, in spite of by now obvious Arab opposition. Britain continued to oversee the Mandate, and presided over the land until 1948, when, unable to manage the disparity between Jewish and Arab aspirations for the land, it handed administrative responsibility back to the United Nations. As British Mandate executors left Palestine and her armed forces withdrew, the surrounding Arab nations, having rejected a 1947 United Nations partition proposal, attacked the Jewish population residing in the Mandate territory. A short war of independence was fought and the local Jewish administration, under the leadership of David Ben Gurion, proclaimed Israel an independent nation on 14th May 1948.

## THE LINK

These are the historical facts and we have seen that there is a strong, often unrecognised, link between the aims and objectives of LJS/CMJ and those of the British government with regard to the establishment of a Jewish state. Arising from a theology with the joint aims of Jewish outreach and restoration, with roots going back to the Puritans and beyond, we see the creation of a mission society whose objectives were furthering those aims. Those same aims and objectives became an integral part of influencing British government policies in the Middle East. The joint venture between the British government and CMJ eventually led to Jewish investment in Zionism/restorationism, which in turn produced Jewish medical and educational institutions that were to become foundational to the state of Israel.

## INTERPRETING THE FACTS – NEW HISTORY

The facts of history can be interpreted in different ways. As we approach the centenary anniversary of the Balfour Declaration it is apparent that the world has changed, and the way we look at what happened in the past has changed too. Modern historians attempt to impose a template of what is socially, politically and religiously acceptable today onto yesterday's events and people. There is not a universal view on whether this is acceptable or not but one of the results of this revisionist history is that decisions made by governments, religious organisations and individuals a century or more ago may be called into question if they are incompatible with today's ways of thinking.

A number of threads feed into current critical thinking about the Balfour Declaration:

1. Imperialism is fundamentally wrong. Great Britain's attitude to other nations and peoples, and the way she related to them politically and religiously was paternalistic, self-seeking and did not take account of local customs and aspirations. An Imperial worldview led to Britain imposing an alien culture on other cultures perceived then as inferior or more primitive.
2. Britain's Imperial ambitions were designed to bolster her world standing by appropriating people, resources, and territory in unacceptable ways.
3. Britain's imposition of a Western brand of Christianity across the Empire was inappropriately intervening in local culture and beliefs and this resulted in the destruction of local intellectual achievement.
4. Restoration theology in the time leading up to the Balfour Declaration was wrong. Those people that subscribed to it were at best "naive", and at worst "heretical". (This criticism is levelled at those who until now have been seen as Christian "heroes" - Charles Spurgeon, The Wesleys, Charles Simeon, J C Ryle, William Wilberforce et al).

These ideas about the negative effects of British colonialism are grounded in post-modern concepts of universal human rights to self-fulfilment, self-determination and self-expression. In the Western Christian world some of these ideas have been embraced, resulting in an overly-critical examination of Britain's behaviour during the Empire period. This has led to a move among some within the church that rejects the theology that gave birth to the Balfour Declaration. It also casts doubt on the validity of the beliefs and motives of restorationism's prime movers, and this ultimately leads to attempts at de-legitimising the State of Israel. As we have seen, even the foundational terms of the Mandate have been called into question. Among the charges levelled at the British government and the British Church by the post-modern revisionist school are that Britain's promises to Jewish and Arab residents of Palestine were broken, agreements on the division of lands following the defeat of the Ottoman Empire were not fulfilled and favouritism towards the Jewish people was indulgent and merely a way of hastening the return of Jesus! A website devoted to promoting an alternative view of The Balfour Declaration is contributed to by historians, politicians and churchmen who believe the declaration was a mistake and that it ultimately gave rise to the conflict in the Middle East that continues today<sup>14</sup>. We would do well to consider the words of British historian and

Cambridge Professor, Sir Herbert Butterfield, who wrote in 1931 “The study of the past with one eye on the present is the source of all sins and sophistries history. It is the essence of what we mean by the word “unhistorical”.<sup>15</sup>

## A CHALLENGE

As Christians who hold positive views about the State of Israel, are motivated by the need to share the Gospel with Jewish people, and who look for the imminent return of Jesus, should we care about this alternative reading of history? Since its foundation in 1809 CMJ has held views on these things that went against the flow (not all 19th century Evangelicals were restorationists, not all politicians subscribed to the Balfour Declaration, and not all Jewish people were Zionists). As CMJ supporters we need to consider these alternative theological positions, and run the rule of scripture along them, as well as noting the original intentions of the decision-makers, and then make a prayerful, considered judgement. If after this we continue to believe that God still has a place for Israel and the Jewish people in His universal salvation plan, then we should make our voices heard and say what we believe.

## ALTERNATIVE HISTORY?

Another, more traditional, view of history is that Great Britain’s Imperial motives brought a Judaeo-Christian rule of law to a non-Christian world, the gospel of Jesus Christ to pagan people, and set the scene for a miraculous fulfilment of prophetic promises made to the Jewish people as they re-established themselves in the Biblical homeland after an absence of almost 2000 years. To be sure, British political considerations meant that not every action in the Middle East (or elsewhere in the Empire) was “pure and holy”; towards the end of Britain’s administration in Palestine some promises made to both Jewish and Arab people in the land were broken, but for the first 30 years of the mandate Britain had endeavoured to make the land suitable for Jewish immigration and eventual self-rule. In the 80 years before that British consular staff in the Ottoman Turkish province of South Syria (modern Israel) sought to protect and nurture the local Jewish residents and support and encourage those Jewish people in the Diaspora wishing to emigrate to Israel.

After more than 100 years of restoration theology and its associated political influence, The Balfour Declaration was the British Government’s considered contribution to both political and religious aspirations of the Jewish people. As God

had used the Persian government as an instrument of Jewish restoration 500 years before Jesus<sup>16</sup>, so British Christians believed He was using the British government similarly 2000 years after Jesus. We should be celebrating the anniversary of this declaration and our part in its formulation, not decrying it as some in the church are doing.

To be sure the last ten years of the Mandate period were not Britain's finest hour. British attitudes to Jewish people, to politics, and to Christianity had changed dramatically. In order to see why a change in attitude towards Jewish people occurred, we need to look at what happened to Britain in the lead up to 1948. Two world wars and the subsequent aftermath had a negative effect on the Christian faith of the nation. Questions such as "Where was God?" and "How could God have let this happen?" led to a more secular worldview, and the idea that God was important in world politics was no longer fashionable. Generally the established church became more liberal in its theology and the non-Anglican denominations engaged less and less in "the world". As a result Great Britain became less enamoured of Israel and the Jewish people. As a Jewish Israeli colleague working for CMJ puts it "The British didn't treat Jewish people especially badly at the end of the Mandate, they just began to treat them like the rest of the world does!" It is time for the British to stop berating ourselves over the way we treated the Jewish people and Israel and recognise that our government, our national church and CMJ played a pivotal and important role in the re-establishment of Israel. Israel in turn has played a pivotal role in the world since 1948. It is the only political democracy in the Middle East, it has contributed many Nobel prize winners, pioneered research and development in information technology, is a world leader in agricultural fertility and irrigation methods, it regularly contributes highly-skilled rescue services to countries that have experienced natural and man-made disasters, as well as making many contributions to medical research and techniques. Many Jewish people are unaware of Great Britain's positive contribution to the State of Israel in times past. They see only criticism of their government and broken promises made to their forbears. As the Balfour centenary approaches, at CMJ we are offering them an alternative view.

## 2017 RESTORATION

In 2017 in conjunction with delegates from Australia and New Zealand, CMJ UK will be hosting a tour of Israel<sup>17</sup>, visiting both Biblical places and places of note from the Mandate period. The trip will culminate in a re-enactment of the Battle

of Beersheba on 31st October, the very day the Balfour Declaration was ratified in London. As we have seen the battle proved a turning point in the Near East campaign, as allied forces comprising British, Australian and New Zealand, Indian, and Jewish troops were victorious over the Turkish and German armies, thus opening the way for the capture of Jerusalem in December, and contributing to the end of hostilities. This is a chance to show Jewish people our love and appreciation, as well as reminding ourselves of the forgotten link between CMJ and the Balfour Declaration.

## ENDNOTES

- 1 Book and DVD - K Crombie, Gallipoli–The Road to Jerusalem, Heritage Resources, (Mundaring, 2014)
- 2 Minutes of the meeting are held in the CMJ archive at the Bodleian Library, Oxford, England
- 3 Bible texts - English Standard Version (Anglicised), (Crossway, 2001)
- 4 Bible texts - Ibid
- 5 K Crombie, For The Love of Zion, (London, 1991)
- 6 L Stein, The Balfour Declaration (London, 1961)
- 7 K Crombie, A Jewish Bishop in Jerusalem, (Jerusalem 2006), Foreword p. viii. quoting L Stein The Balfour Declaration (London, 1961) p 8
- 8 Covenant of the League of Nations
- 9 F S Northedge, The League of Nations: Its Life and Times, 1920-1946, (Holmes and Meier 1986) pg 192 - 193
- 10 “Palestine” was an area of land delineated by the League of Nations under the mandate. It was not and had never been a sovereign nation, nor had it been the name of a province in the Ottoman Empire.
- 11 The Covenant of the League of Nations - Article 22.
- 12 E Hertz, This Land Is My Land, (Myths and Facts, 2008)
- 13 Ibid, pg 20.
- 14 Web address - [balfourproject.org](http://balfourproject.org)
- 15 Butterfield, The Whig Interpretation of History, (New York 1965) p 12
- 16 **Ezra 1:2,3** <sup>2</sup>“Thus says Cyrus king of Persia: The Lord, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. <sup>3</sup>Whoever is among you of all his people, may his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and rebuild the house of the Lord, the God of Israel—he is the God who is in Jerusalem.







© Paul Hames 2016

The right of Paul Hames to be identified as the author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright Design and Patents Act 1988. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reprinted or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Editorial team: Paul Hames and Rev. Alex Jacob  
Concept and design: 18TWO Design  
Printed through: A-Tec, Broxbourne, England

