

### III-31. A Peace to End All Peace

Conflicts are inevitable. Wars are variations on the theme of imperialistic designs motivated to bypass equitable, just and rational solutions to conflicts. In order to understand the genesis of wars and instabilities in the 20th century, consider the fact that through Balfour declaration *One nation solemnly promised to a second nation the country of a third*. Then the allied governments engaged in massive propaganda to mobilize the public opinions so that the flow of petroleum could trigger progress towards an unsustainable way of life. While the countless innocents paid heavy price, the oil-economy has benefited some without having to deal with the dirty business of colonial rule. This experience shows that to disguise the real objectives, the politics of aggression is guised as democratic by catering to wide-ranging constituencies.

A short letter written on November 2, 1917 (reproduced below) has come to be known as Balfour declaration. It is addressed to Lord Rothschild an international financier. On the behalf of the British government it formally recognized the idea of Jewish homeland in Palestine. It clearly stated that *nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country*. It is ironical that the British 'design' for the petroleum resources in Middle-East built on decaying Austro-Hungarian Empire was not very different than the Ottoman Empire the German alliance for the same purpose. The conflict is a root of the First World War in which 60 million people perished.

Foreign Office

November 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1917

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy With Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to, and approved by, the Cabinet.

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours sincerely,  
Arthur James Balfour

This letter from Balfour is not merely a part of a war time strategy. It was to shape a post-colonial new world-order. It has spawned scores of conflicts since then. As a geopolitical and economic policy document for the Middle-East (referred to as the Mideast or Palestine) it is far more important in terms of what it leaves unsaid. Also it did not deliver a large part of what it said it would. Even the standard History texts talk little about the historical context. This document has been widely used for the

propaganda purposes as evidenced by the several thousand hits on a Google search.

The factual basis for my article draws heavily but not exclusively from the work of Robert John:

(a) The Journal for Historical Review (<http://www.ihr.org>):  
Volume 6 (4) 389 (1985-6). Behind the Balfour Declaration:  
Britain's Great War Pledge To Lord Rothschild.

(b) Behind the Balfour Declaration: The Hidden Origins of Today's  
Mideast Crisis, The Institute for Historical Review, 18221/2  
Newport Blvd., Suite 183 Costa Mesa, California 92627 (1988).

**Balfour Declaration.** This declaration evolved out of the Colonial practices where designs of the military might were coded into agreements and declarations. Such Eurocentric transactions during the last 500 years have annihilated millions and uprooted billions of people as the territorial claims, including the people living in such territories, were sold and bought for few pennies for a square mile. The same end-result of *chilling and killing* in the twentieth century is achieved by carving out puppet-states in the guise of democracy, human right, and worse.

Some of the considerations and the forces that could have shaped the basic premise of the letter by Balfour are outlined below. It is probably interesting, but largely irrelevant, to consider how the factors outlined below weighted in the actual decision. Yet the fact remains that all the eleven factors prevailed during the decade when the letter was written. More important is the fact, although not explicitly acknowledged, that such factors still continue to shape the perceptions of the decision makers as well as the opinion makers. The main thrust of my article is to list the geopolitical and economic circumstances surrounding the Balfour declaration. Understanding of the origins and the

consequences of the declaration provide insights into several interesting aspects of the policies laid down by the British imperialism and its geopolitical consequences.

### **1. British duplicity and rise of the Western axis of deception.**

Reasons for the World-War I range from finding ways to consolidate decaying Empire on which sun was beginning set to monopolize business potential of Middle Eastern petroleum and its transportation to Europe. The far-flung empire was already engaged in unilateral games of international colonialism. The public law announcement by Balfour on behalf of the British Cabinet is legally invalid because British did not have sovereign right over Palestine. The mockery of the situation in the words of Arthur Koestler is: "*One nation solemnly promised to a second nation the country of a third.*" More than that, the country was still part of the Empire of a fourth, namely Turkey for the preceding 400 years. In 1917 the region was under the Ottoman rule.

Later the statement of the "British intention in secret deal with French" was accorded the status of a multilateral "mandate." At the League of Nations it had assent of United States with its own imperialist designs to pick the economic pieces (markets) of the disintegrating empires. The cold war provided a new thrust for the evolution of this axis of deception. In the same decade the British made overlapping commitments to the Arabs as a way of getting them to support the war against the Turks. When the Turks were defeated, Britain went back on its word to the Arabs and divided the region up between itself and France. They finally pulled out in 1948, leaving many Arabs state and a nascent Jewish to fight it out while making the region unsuitable for economic development. French did the same in their ex-colonies and in 1961-1963 murdered almost 90% well educated citizens before

leaving Algeria. It continues in other ways which prevent the natives to build on their enormous riches and resources.

**2. Control of the energy resources.** With the development of engines for a variety of purposes it was clear that the energy supply had geopolitical consequences. The world was becoming increasingly aware of the potential of the energy resources. Recognition of the importance of petroleum as a unique energy resource was the beginning of balancing the geopolitical influences for the long term economic decisions and planning. By 1916 it was clearly evident that the disruption of supplies could be a major set-back to economic stability.

Unknown to the people of the region, the British were aware of the great abundance of oil in the Middle East. In May 1908 petroleum is discovered in Persia (Iran). British adventurer William Knox D'Arcy strikes oil in 1908, seven years after obtaining drilling rights to the land from the Persian government. In 1909, D'Arcy joins with Burmah Oil to form the Anglo-Persian Oil Company in 1909. The unique qualities and commercial potential of cheap “black gold” as a finite resource for the energy needs were widely recognized. For example around 1911 the British Navy had switched from coal to oil. It was important for the British Empire to reconfigure its policies in the light of its dependence on oil.

By 1917, the British government, which owns 51 percent of the company, is the most influential power in Persia. Britain uses the company's reserves during the 1914-18 War. In this decade several American robber-barons were also taking their hold on the oil wells and the supply chains. The robber-baron model, *a la* the Standard Oil, for the economic control of resources was also an enticement for the European royalty that was loosing grip on power. The newly formed oil companies provided the royalty

with an opportunity to retain and invest their wealth. Since 1912 the model, seeded as uprisings through spies like “Lawrence of Arabia,” has “invented” the figureheads like King of Iraq, Saudis of Arabia, and Shah of Iran. The descendants of these companies remain in collusion with the certain Governments and as the king-makers in the other countries. Institutions to express political aspirations and economic potential of people had no realistic chance in such environments.

**3. Connection to the other parts of the Empire.** The historical context for the letter in 1917 has several interesting aspect for the British. Before the end of the 1914-1918 War British hopes were buoyed by their invasion of the Middle East. General Edmund Allenby decided that the "declaration" should not then be published in Palestine where his forces were still south of the Gaza-Beersheba line. This was not done until after the establishment of the Civil Administration in 1920. Moreover during the War and soon after the British also promised to the Pan-Arabic intellectuals, for their support against the Ottoman Empire, that the territory would become a Pan-Arabic state. Needless to say these secular groups were short-changed.

The policy of Divide-and-Rule is apparent in the political geography left by the colonial lords as they withdrew after WW2. The cold-war policies promoted systematic destruction of all Nationalistic aspirations virtually throughout the Asia, Africa and South America. Note that none of the ex-colonies, with the exception of India thanks to the likes of Gandhi and Nehru, emerged as viable democracy. Instead, driven by the anti-communist phobia of the Europeans and Americans, dictators and despots were installed in the guise of progress, modernization, Human rights, free market, and democracy.

**4. The Road to India.** Before the commercial aviation the British government had a great desire to maintain an open channel through the Middle East to its extensive possessions in India and East Africa. Members of the British ruling class thought that their control of India was eternal as the Jewel of the Crown. Both Egypt and Palestine were on the road to India. Possession of major parts of the Middle East was necessary to maintain their hold on the subcontinent. Introducing a Jewish State into Palestine was part of the British "divide-and-rule" policy. It could also help them in maintaining a permanent presence near the Suez Canal.

**5. The timing.** The declaration in 1917 coincided with the rise of the Bolsheviks in Russia and the potential for the fall of the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East. The British government wanted to keep the Russians in the war and persuade the Americans to enter the war. This London-Washington axis continues to target for fall and instability the secular and nationalistic governments in Middle East and other resource rich regions of the globe: Chile, Vietnam, Ghana and others.

**6. An appeal to the economic power of the European Jews.** The fact that the letter is addressed to the Zionist Federation through an international financier and a major shareholder of the petroleum interests speaks for itself.

**7. The Jewish-problem.** For virtually all considerations 1916 was a disastrous year for the war efforts of Allies. The goodwill of Jewry was paramount to British because money and credit were needed for the war. For decades Herzl had propounded the idea of "Jewish homeland" which spawned movements in Europe, Russia and America to solve the problem of European prejudice against the Jews there (the so called Jewish-problem). These movements had recognized the need of working with one of the major powers and *be fully prepared to take advantage of any occasion*

*that offers itself.* A British decision to favor the Zionist cause would encourage both Russian and American Jews to influence their governments to join with Britain and the Allies in the fight against the Germans and Turks.

**8. Messianic connection.** A secular historian concludes: *Biblical prophecy was the first and most enduring of the many motives that led Britons to want to restore the Jews to Zion* (David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace*, p. 298). According to these believers *the day will come when the words of the prophets will become true, and Israel will return to its own land.* The major members of the British cabinet were motivated by such Christian beliefs. Lloyd George, the British Prime Minister, was a puritan who was brought up on Bible and was not educated in more modern tradition. In support of the Jewish homeland he declared: *It was undoubtedly inspired by natural sympathy, admiration and also by the fact that, as you must remember, we had been trained even more in Hebrew history than in the history of our own country. I could tell you all the kings of Israel. But I doubt whether I could have named half a dozen of the kings of England!*

Interestingly, the later day politicians like Jimmy Carter, Tony Blair and George Bush are also “inspired” by the Scriptures and Messianic beliefs. Protestant fundamentalism supported by means of mass destruction is one of the worst threats at the dawn of new millennium. Such thoughts, words, and practices of mass deception are invariably used for molding public opinions at crucial junctions. Recall that Holy Wars by the crusaders were initiated in 11<sup>th</sup> century through lies invented by a French Pope. Believers continue to invent plights of white man’s burden, manifest destiny, and human rights to assemble allies to target the resources of weak and the unsuspecting.

**9. Raw material for explosives.** Early in the war, the British were desperately short of timber, from which acetone is distilled.

Acetone is the key ingredient for the manufacture of explosives. At the recommendation of the Zionist friends Dr. Chaim Weizman, a Russian immigrant to Britain, was given responsibility for solving this problem. Weizman developed in 1915 a method to obtain natural acetone by fermentation of horse chestnuts. It was used to make ammunition. However, Weizman never mentioned it in his autobiography *Trial and Error*. He was to become a Zionist leader and the first president of Israel.

**10. Coincidences of association.** Invocations of God and such ideas and words are cues to garner support from certain interest groups. The wartime British Prime Minister Lloyd George was also a staunch supporter of the colonial policies. For many years he had served as the lawyer for the World Zionist Congress and also the lawyer for the Shell Oil Company headed by Marcus Samuel. Lloyd George's rise found sympathetic ear and a close political ally for the Zionist aspirations.

**11. Cultural cloud of racism.** As a British advisor to the region in 1920s put it *locals weren't capable of running their own show*. Local self-governments under colonial mandate could not carry out any policy against the advisors with imperial designs. Many of these are now backed up with secret international agreements. Even to this day institutionalized biases built into religion, race and tribe are used as a matter of policy to tilt perceptions (propaganda), seed political dissent and social instabilities to foment revolts.

Such methods are hall-mark of the colonial mind. Crotched in scientific theories blessed by the church such practices had propelled the Industrial revolution. Empowerment that followed from it was used to justify warped theories of social and political change imposed on the unsuspecting and weak. Such practices were institutionalized with full participation of the Church for the benefit of few in the Edwardian England. Consider the fact that

just before the 1914-18 War, more than 40% of the Britons did not earn enough to provide for food. One in three young men who applied for war jobs did not meet minimum standards of health. Also one in two who were lucky enough to become soldier died within a year. With over 20% unemployment, most jobs did not have time off from work, or medical care or pension. With such conditions at home, British elsewhere looked down on their brown, black and yellow subjects as inferior and not capable of self-rule. It is not unlikely that they thought little of uprooting few barefoot, camel-herding Arabs running about in what they believed was an almost empty Palestine. This has propagated the Zionist myth of *land without people for people without land*.

**Does the evolutionary fitness lie in sneaky and devious behaviors?**

Have you ever wondered why humans as a group display sublime as well as reptilian behaviors? It is not that those who are fit survive in the long haul, but those who survive are fit for some reason. Consider the zeal with which the strongest dung-beetle guards its property. It keeps its harem under the dung-pile. While the strong male guards on the surface, weaker males gain access to the harem through tunnels. Think twice before you conclude that attributes of sneaky and devious behaviors are seen only in the animal kingdom: Princess Diana of England had relationships with her horse trainer and others.

**Unhappily ever after.** Consider the consequences of a long line of half-backed notions such as: Humans are naturally cast into races, survival of the fittest (George Spencer and Darwin), Laissez-faire human interactions (Adam Smith), natural antagonism between capital and labor (Karl Marx). Are they part of sneaky and

devious behaviors? As strategies, such behaviors have to be couched in more grandiose terms because they will be ineffective if everybody relied on them.

As a way to rationalize human aggression in the guise of individualism, the strategy is part of imperialism, industrial conquest, and monopolistic markets. Their futility became apparent with the war of 1914-18 and ensuing collapse of the Victorian values and the Czarist and Austro-Hungarian-Turkish empires. Against this backdrop the Balfour declaration provided a basis for implementing the devious divide-and-rule policies in a new garb of the Zionistic humanism and Evangelism. It furthered the cause of royalties, robber-barons, and now the DC beltway bandits in the guises of international corporations. Such operations continue to be conduit for the smart money that defies the democratic controls within national boundaries. They extended the Colonial control into unholy alliance of finance and business interests that seem to change every few decades. With little regard for national boundaries and controls, the smart-money relies on undemocratic means. Concentrated power and business values in markets promote unsustainable behaviors of over-consumption, and encourage conformity that threatens perceptive consumer.

**Unholy alliances of economic reality.** A profound policy outcome of Balfour declaration has been the push to set up tribal and theocratic states in many parts of the world by pitching one group against the other. The 1920 Treaty of Sevres, settling borders after the 1914-1918 War, carved Kurdish and Armenian states partly in what is now Turkey. Its outcome continues to create instability in the region. Similarly, the mess created during 1930 to 1950 in Europe was a direct consequence of the terms of settlement of the 1914-1918 War. Such moves essentially ignore

the needs of people. Even to this day the people who have been adversely affected remain suspicious of the perfidious intents of the Western powers. Many of these "dissidents" continue to be nurtured by the intelligence agencies to be "used" at opportune moments.

Recent history of the Middle East is a mix of alliances to share the loot by disenfranchising the aspirations of the local populations. In the years since 1920 the region has been dominated by forces designed to secure a stable supply of oil for an unsustainable way of life enjoyed by less than 10% of the human population. The collusion between a stooge (Faisal) and Lawrence of Arabia was initially glorified and then secured through massive military investment and treaties. Stability of the supply chain also secured personal enrichment of tribal chiefs. At the same time the countries are burdened with international debt and most of the population remains dispossessed.

There are several disturbing social consequences of this policy model. Concentration of capital in few hands has undermined all rational aspirations of the common people throughout the Middle East as well as large parts of Africa the Latin America. These are resource rich regions. Yet any new government in these regions will have empty treasury and remain debt-burdened for the foreseeable future. It is not surprising that without any significant exception the region from Pakistan to Nigeria is dotted with impoverished countries that are propped up with aid-packages (additional yearly debts) of 1 to 3 billion dollars. Typically, two thirds goes for Military hardware for "peace keeping" which is euphemism for suppression of the local populations through police state. The rest goes for payment of interest on the old loans to give appearance of solvency for the bankrupt governments.

The national boundaries in the Middle East were drawn arbitrarily, if not deliberately, to keep the feuds simmering. The economic interests of the colonial powers dominate at the expense of the cultural cohesiveness and viability. Conflicts are easily implanted in an environment of diverse cultural backgrounds. Some of the dissenting minorities are courted and trained in subversion. The story is the same as diamonds wreak havoc in Southern Africa, tin and rubber did that to the South East Asia, copper to Chile and bananas to Guatemala. Hallmark of such 'operations' for nefarious ends are forked-tongue, dagger, smoke-and-mirrors.

**Is it all behind us?** Certainly no. As one empire dies it becomes "poodle" of another with imperial aspirations. Unipolarity is the hall-mark of imperialism ([publicintegrity.org](http://publicintegrity.org)). Although Winston Churchill was the last avowed imperialist, British for example used the strategy of 1917 in 1970s to "declare" Diego Garcia as an "uninhabited Island." The food supply for several thousand of its natives was shut off first. Then with a day's notice, all the inhabitants (about 6000) were herded into a ship and dropped off in the slums of Mauritius. A case was brought to a British court against British Government after the "secret" documents were made public in 2002. It was decided against the Government. However, the judge did not institute any remedy. Meanwhile, these displaced people are not even allowed to visit graves of their ancestors by the new landlord.

British had sold the "uninhabited" Island to get a 40% discount on the purchase price of the Polaris missiles. It saved them about 5 million dollars. These wielders of mass deception (WMD) invented the excuse of the weapons of mass destruction to justify their attack on Iraq from the forces based in Diego Garcia in

the Indian Ocean. The attack was planned years before the honorable mission of was launched with fog of mass deception.

So what is the relationship between actions of the alliances and consequences for the nations? Changes occur as dictators replace fiefdoms Puppets possessed of certitude rule at the mercy of the external aid. As the capital leaves the boundaries, little wealth is created for the nations whose resources are depleted. Debt-burdened nations have little capital for nation building. In many of these places those who are concerned have fallen in the traps of mindless assumptions about what is good for most. Often it is what is in the interest of a few. Such developments reduce chances of bringing back any reasonable government.

**Panacea of Industrialization.** Recall the vision of Margaret Bourke White (ca. 1947): *A machine cares nothing about a man's ancestors. It does not feel polluted by his touch, knows no prejudice.* For a significant fraction of the human the industrial revolution has changed the man's view of himself. Has industrialization taken care of social ills that affect more than half of the world population? Definitely no. Insidious forces from the far and away and acting behind the scenes replace some local ills. Such liberations have shut off many too many for too few and for too long from any meaningful pursuits while means of exploitation reach their village boundaries,

**It is economics, stupid.** Globalization is not about global citizenship. Just as socialism is not an economic policy, capitalism is not a social policy. Democracy is neither. An ideal can equally well support the wide ranging social alternatives. Calls for human rights, Globalization, Free markets are rather vague dead-end ideological buzz words. There is a disconnect between what is connoted and what is delivered. Like omniscience, they have to

be backed up with force and wars to further the imperialist grand designs of few. Such institutions do not offer, and they often bypass, fair and equitable solutions to conflicts and aspirations.

Controls offered by pluralistic societies, diverse economies, and multipolar geopolitics have become largely irrelevant in the context of unipolar interests and whims. Sustained war requires building myths to harvest sympathies of diverse populations. Internal democratic controls are often bypassed through blatant propaganda that appeals to and finds support among the populations with otherwise meaningless lives. The process is facilitated if the war is prosecuted with the support of dictators and despots. Imperialistic powers can rarely self-sustain. Therefore, antidote to encroachment is stalemate. More insidious encroachments will have to be confronted through massive non-cooperation with the economic engines and propaganda machines. Otherwise *an eye for eye leaves everybody blind*.

In the guise of imperialism and globalization, the unholy trinity of colonialism, racism and violence undermines sanctity (sustainability, justice) of common man. On the other hand, as Gandhi noted *we can not be dominated unless we cooperate with our dominators*. As a means of change, targets of non-cooperation are to be carefully chosen. Individual and collective assault is needed though the orthogonality of labor and capital that feeds on the polarity of poverty and wealth.

In our emulation of qualities people worship the rising Sun. Consider the hall marks of the American model of open market and globalization:

- It benefits some (oligarchs and other pockets of wealth) with no interest or loyalty to the societies that contributed to their success. The smart-money moves across the borders with impunity without any regard for the sustainability with diversity and

plurality that created and preserved the local resources (food, culture, language and ingenuity). The cost of disconnect is a loss of niches and diversity that encourage pockets of creativity.

- It encourages culture of homogenization indifferent to craft and creativity.
- It sacrifices subtleties of happiness for the (stingy or generous) materialism.
- It develops depression without ability to deal with the vicissitudes of life.
- Its objective is to be less accurate and discriminating.
- It is politically progressive but individual is marginalized.
- It describes and exploits knee-jerk reactions to advance propaganda that is less accepting of the states of subtlety, ambiguity, and imaginations.
- It justifies pragmatism as the reason to support dictators, despots, social polarization, and class warfare.
- It blurs the boundary between public and private for the legal, economic and power gains with little concern and discrimination for pluralistic empathy and judgments.
- It is concerned with where you want to be rather than where you have been and where you are.
- It privatizes the profit and socializes the risk.

In effect, the mentality of seize imposed by the alien forces of globalization are justified as occupation for the “greater good of the occupied.” We have seen many variations on this theme over the last few millennia.

Finally, it is the beginning of the end when virtually all the resources are consigned to maintaining a status quo (grab). Readers may be wondering why should we worry about the forces of war and for that matter about what disrupts the dynamics of peace? At the very least it is an exercise in

consequence evaluation of complex situations from which we cannot run away. For another such forces come in all guises of know-all. Besides the survival issues, such forces impinge with the development of what we know and represent in usable motifs. As ridiculous as many of the arguments used to justify such encroachments are, in an environment of haze they begin to influence our perceptions as well as the common sense.

Chua, Amy (2003). *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*. Doubleday, New York. Pp. 340.

<http://www.consumers-against-war.de/>

# Against Gods and Humbug

## Preface

1. Paradox of Choices
2. Representation for Potential
3. Feedback from Interactions
4. What Is Rationality?
5. Meaning to a Speck of Dust
6. The Unknown and the Doubtful
7. Actions Have Consequences
8. Beginning of a Decision
9. Tools for Thought Search
10. Living with Doubt
11. Who to Trust?
12. Living with Incomplete Knowledge
13. Do People Tell Lies?
14. Social Influences of Non-violence
15. Greed and Grab
16. Conduct with Consistency
17. An Activist Perspective
18. Causality: End or Means to Reality
19. Negate the Wishful
20. Man is Capable of Being Rational
21. Making Decisions
22. Keeping Viable Options Open
23. Inference and Successful Behavior
24. Genesis of Syad: The Logical Doubt
25. Science-based Conduct?
26. Philosophy and Logic for Action
27. Actions That Matter
28. Tragic versus Tragedy
29. Representation of Order with Room for Doubt
30. War Promises Meaning to the Otherwise Meaningless Lives
31. A Peace to End All Peace
32. Knowledge: Been There
33. Equation for Potential
34. Why I Am Not Moral
35. Unleashing Thought: Taming Brawn, Grunt, and Smarts