

8603

AcN ~~92475~~ 8603

**SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S LIBRARY
PUNE 411 004
FOR INTERNAL CIRCULATION**

To be returned on or before the last date stamped below.

- 8 JUN 2007

8603

8603

**THE DETHRONEMENT
OF THE KHEDIVE**

Dhananjayrao Gadgil Library



GIPE-PUNE-008603



BEAMAN IN ARAB HEADDRESS

8603
The
Dethronement of the Khedive

By ARDERN HULME BEAMAN
late C.J.O. in Egypt

Edited, with an Introduction, by
The Rt. Hon. J. M. Robertson

LONDON
George Allen & Unwin Ltd
MUSEUM STREET

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1929

V671.N2

F9

8603

All rights reserved

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
UNWIN BROTHERS LTD., WOKING

8603
AUTHOR'S FOREWORD

SINCE the War so much has been written on Egypt that it may seem superfluous to add to the bibliography. "Another book on Egypt! Who on earth wants to hear any more about that infernal country just now?" will be the common greeting for this belated outsider.

My excuse is that, either purposely or in ignorance, no adequate or accurate account has ever been given of the circumstances attending the deposition of the Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha. Not only so, but entirely erroneous versions have been published officially and by the most usually recognized authorities on Egypt.

The Ex-Khedive's dethronement and exile had a great influence on the subsequent course of events, and it is for this reason that I have been tempted to endeavour to arrive at the truth, and to discover if possible the authors and motives that led to the extinction of his name and existence in Egypt.

Nothing specific has ever publicly transpired to explain a proceeding which seems to require justification; and should the following pages lead to the revelation of a carefully guarded mystery, they will not have been written in vain.

The question is an academical and historical one, that should not be difficult of proof.

The point is whether Abbas Hilmi Pasha, as every official and non-official version has it, did or did not

Dethronement of the Khedive

“desert his country”, and “as soon as the War broke out, adhere to the enemy”. It was for guiltiness of these definitely alleged crimes that he was exiled, and according to his own complaint, despoiled of two-thirds of his fortune.

Incidentally I have been led into hazarding some opinions and comments on the relations that have developed between England and Egypt, but this was almost unavoidable. Such as they are, they come from an almost life-long acquaintance with the country, its language, and its people.

I was attached to the British Consulate-General in 1879, as first Arabic Student Interpreter, and lived in Cairo for about ten years, seeing the Occupation effected and the birth of British control under Lord Cromer. For the last few years before I left I was in daily contact with Sir Evelyn Baring, as he was then called, and with all the prominent British, foreign, and Egyptian personalities of that day. Since then I have frequently visited the country, going through the Dongola Campaign with Kitchener, whom I first knew as a junior officer in the Egyptian Cavalry under Colonel Taylor of the 20th Hussars—and for the last time in 1926, to see my old friends.

I was fortunate enough, amongst others, to find the Grand Mufti, Ismail Pasha Abâza, and Saad Zaghloul, both the latter of whom have since died. During the War I spent several years in Contre-Espionnage, and

Dethronement of the Khedive

other Secret Service jobs, as head of various sections in S.S. and G.S.I., and I remained there till 1920. I mention my motley experiences in the Nile Lands to account for the miscellaneous and wide knowledge I had unrivalled opportunities of acquiring from the best sources at first hand, without having recourse to Blue or White Books, which, though they sometimes tell the truth as far as they go, seldom tell the whole truth. Naturally, the best of all sources would be Abbas Hilmi Pasha himself, but it is not easy to get him to talk or give information about himself. For several years, whenever I have had the pleasure of meeting His Highness, I have urged him to write his Memoirs, but he does not appear to have either the time or inclination.

A. H. B.

CONTENTS

AUTHOR'S FOREWORD	PAGE
	5
INTRODUCTION	15

CHAPTER I	23
-----------	----

Egypt before and under Lord Cromer. Arâbi Pasha. His honesty and his initiative. Cromer's beginnings. Material successes. Neglect of education. Retardation of political life. The problem created for posterity. The new Nationalism. Cromer. Gorst. Kitchener. The treatment accorded to the Khedive. Cromer's final attack.

CHAPTER II	45
------------	----

The advent of Kitchener. Resumption of repressive policy. Kitchener's capacities. His political strategies. English criticism. Value of the Five Feddan Law. Imperialistic ideal and policy. The incident of the Mariut Railway. Kitchener ignores an offer of sale; later charges treasonable dealings with aliens; is ordered to purchase the railway as it had been offered. Kitchener and the Wakfa. Disingenuous procedure. Egyptian criticism of his régime. His characteristics.

CHAPTER III	61
-------------	----

The drama of the deposition. The Khedive at Constantinople in July, 1914. Turkish attempt to assassinate him. His dangerous condition. Desire to return to Cairo on convalescence. Refused permission by the British Ambassador. Ordered to proceed to Naples. Deposed *de facto* in September, 1914; *de jure* in December. Falsely accused of deserting his country, and of adhering to the enemy. Residence in Switzerland, and strict neutrality. Equal injustice and unwisdom of the official British course. The Khedive's popularity in Egypt. Summary of the facts and arguments. Total absence of any counter-case. Empty charges of unspecified "intrigue". Transition to the later régime.

Dethronement of the Khedive

CHAPTER IV

PAGE
77

Abbas Pasha in Switzerland. British offers of pecuniary arrangement as price of abdication. Offers refused. Counter-proposal ignored. Scandalous treatment of the Khedivial property by British and Egyptian authorities. Refusal of justice and of accounting. Farcical sales at low prices. Indefensible legislation. Overriding of all legal procedure aiming at rectification. "Decree Laws" passed by King Fuad. Proceedings of the Public Custodian. Policy of eliminating Abbas II.

CHAPTER V

103

The Ex-Khedive at Lausanne. His Petition of Right to the British Crown. Its rejection. His process before the Anglo-Turkish Arbitral Tribunal. Its technical stultification. Policy of the British Foreign Office. Refusal to permit the Ex-Khedive to visit England.

CHAPTER VI

112

Later British policy in Egypt. Nominal abolition of the Protectorate. The Zaghoul movement. New Nationalism, in reaction against new imposition of British officialdom. Attitude of Sir R. Wingate. Zaghoul's policy and influence. Supersession of Wingate by General Allenby. Allenby's difficulties. Zaghoul's mission. Strikes of Government workers. Period of disorder. The murders at Deirut. Allenby's measures. The Treaty of Versailles. Changes of Egyptian ministers. Nationalist persistence. Allenby's views. The Milner Mission. Zaghoul's response. Fresh unrest, and deportation of Zaghoul. The Declaration of 1922. Egyptian dissatisfaction. King Fuad and Taoufik Nessim Pasha. Return of Zaghoul.

CHAPTER VII

132

Zaghoul's Ministry. Policy of the British Labour Ministry of 1924. Zaghoul's persistence. Assassination of Sir Lee Stack. Penal measures of Allenby.

Dethronement of the Khedive

	PAGE
Zaghloul's resignation. Protest to League of Nations. Policy of King Fuad. Nashat Pasha. Attitude of the British authority. Egyptian resentment against King Fuad. The advent of Lord Lloyd. His tactics. Sagacity of Ziver Pasha. Arrangement with Zaghloul. Resignation of Judge Kershaw. Situation in 1927. Lord Lloyd's policy of predominance. Concordat with the Palace. The resulting Egyptian situation. Prospects of King Fuad.	
CHAPTER VIII	148
The Treaty to be desired between Great Britain and Egypt. Difficulties of the problem. Need to protect popular rights as well as State independence. The situation in 1927. King Fuad's visit to London. The Wafd and the Coalition Cabinet. The Anglo-Egyptian situation considered. The Soudan. Approximations on both sides. The Reserved Points. The Capitulations. Military occupation. Negligible risk of foreign invasion. The parallel case of Iraq. Stronger claims of Egypt. The King's Speech at prorogation of Parliament in 1927.	
POSTSCRIPTUM.—The situation in 1928. Mohamed Mahmoud Pasha. Progress in prosperity in Egypt and the Soudan. Lord Lloyd's success.	162
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX I	169
Egyptian native Petition to the Sultan of Turkey in 1882. The Khedive Taoufik Pasha and Arâbi Pasha.	
APPENDIX II	172
Text of Decree-Law No. 28 of 1922.	
APPENDIX III	175
Text of Decree-Law of 1924, Interpretative of Law 28 of 1922.	

Dethronement of the Khedive

APPENDIX IV

PAGE

180

Text of sentence of Mixed Arbitral Tribunal of Constantinople in claim of Abbas Hilmi Pasha against the British Government in June, 1927.

APPENDIX V

187

King Hussein of Arabia. His strange story.

ILLUSTRATIONS

THE AUTHOR IN ARAB HEADRESS	<i>Frontispiece</i>
REPRODUCTION OF LETTER FROM ARÂBI PASHA	29
ABBAS II	<i>Facing page</i> 104

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

THE respective positions of the Khedive, Arâbi Pasha, and the Nationalists in the Assembly were not very clear for some time before the Bombardment—and changed from time to time. Both the Khedive and the Assembly occasionally leaned towards the Turks, as the other Parties seemed to be getting too much power, and the Khedive often seemed to be agreed with Arâbi, when he was secretly negotiating with the British and the French. In the trial of Arâbi,¹ it was evident that the Khedive had approved his action—though perhaps through fear more than wish—up to the very end. But he frequently showed his dislike of all the Military movement, by his several attempts to keep Arâbi out of the Cabinet and even to send him out of Egypt. Up to the bombardment nobody really appeared to know on which side he was, though none approved the hot-and-cold attitude of Taoufik Pasha.

The following is the translation of a petition sent to the Sultan when the Khedive had tried to dismiss the Arâbi Ministry, and deport him and his trusty Colonels. I have never seen this document quoted (though, of course, it may have escaped me), and it is interesting as showing how entirely the country was with the Army, even to the Princes of the Royal Family. I found the original by accident when I was in Cairo in 1926.

¹ In which I was watching the case for the British Government with Sir Ch. Wilson.

Dethronement of the Khedive

13th Ramadan, 1882.

[June.]

*To H.E. Bessim Bey, Grand Chamberlain to
H.J.M. Abdul Hamid.*

Referring to our previous petition of the 4th Ramadan, protesting against the order of the Khedive dismissing Arâbi Pasha, Minister of War and Marine:—

To-day we called a great meeting of the Egyptian Nation at the Ministry of Interior (Kasr en Nil) to examine this question.

Those present included all the Nobles, both Civil and Military, the Grand Kâdi (Turkish), all the Sheikhs of the Azhar and the 'Ulema, the Patriarchs, the Omdehs of Upper and Lower Egypt, the Members of the Khedivial Family, and all the Merchants and Notables now in Cairo:

And they unanimously decided to delegate the undersigned to present to your Excellency the following resolution bearing the signatures and seals of the most famous of the two thousand present.

(Signatures of Under-Secretaries, dated 13th Ramadan.)

ALI ROUBI PASHA,
Soudan Government.

ARABAN BEY,
Finance.

ISMAIL MOHAMED,
Public Works.

ALI FEHMY,
Public Instruction.

HASSAN FEHMY,
Wakfs.

BOUTROS GHALI,
Justice.

YACOB SAMI,
War.

MOHAMED PASHA DARAMÂLI,
Interior.

Dethronement of the Khedive

RESOLUTION

Having read the orders and decrees of the Khedive, notably the Decree dismissing Arâbi Pasha,—and after reading the communiqué of Arâbi, and listening to the Under-Secretary for War, as such, and as President of this meeting which directs all the administration of the country, We, the undersigned, resolve—

Are we to carry out the orders of the Khedive, who with all his Ministers remains at Alexandria under the protection of the British?

If he orders us are we to execute his orders when we see the British troops and Fleet on the shores of Egypt, and Arâbi Pasha resisting in defence of Egypt?

We are compelled to consider him as still Minister of War, and Chief of the Army.

And we resolve no longer to carry out the orders of the Khedive and his Ministers at Alexandria in any Ministry or Administration:

Because the Khedive has transgressed the rules and laws of Egypt, we have decided as above, in order that the Under-Secretaries may present our decision to Your Excellency.

Here follow a hundred or so of signatures, amongst which may be noticed those of Prince Ibrahim, father of Prince Seif-eddin, Prince Hamid, brother of Princess Nazli, and Prince Kemâl, father of Prince Youssef Kemâl.

APPENDIX II

LAW 28

TRANSLATION FROM THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE
EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT DATED 19TH JULY 1922

Law No. 28 of 1922 regulating the Liquidation of the
properties of the ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha and
restricting his Rights.

WE, KING OF EGYPT,

In view of Our Rescript dated 15 Chaaban 1340
(13th April 1922) establishing the order of Succession
to the Throne:

Considering on the one part that there should be a
Liquidation of the Properties of Abbas Hilmi Pasha,
deposed from the Khedivate of Egypt, which was agreed
upon by the British Military Authority under the powers
of Martial Law.

Considering, on the other part, that it is necessary in
order to preserve the Order established for the Succession
to the Throne to restrain the rights which the said Abbas
Hilmi Pasha could exercise in the future in this Country:

On the advice of Our Council of Ministers

WE DECREE as follows:—

Article 1.—All acts relating to the properties liquidated
as belonging to the ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha in
Egypt, including the sales, assignments, transfers and any
other measures referring to the Liquidation of these
properties are by the present Law confirmed and recognized

Dethronement of the Khedive

as valid, regular, and final as against Abbas Hilmi Pasha as well as all other persons whatever.

As a result, no action, either actually pending and not decided, or to be brought later on the part of the above-mentioned or of any quite other person with the object of causing either directly or indirectly the annulment, retraction or modification of any one of the said acts or measures, will be admissible before any Jurisdiction of the Country and must be rejected as of right and finally.

Article 2.—Egyptian Territory is forbidden to the Ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha. In case of any contravention, he will immediately be re-conducted to the Frontier by the Executive Power.

He shall not either personally or through an intermediary exercise there any political right, possess or acquire either subject to payment or gratuitously except through legal succession or through rights acquired, any property movable or immovable; be named a Beneficiary of a Wakf to be made, encash any sum of money, exercise the functions of Nazir of Wakfs, Guardian, Curator, Mandatory or any analogous Office, nor plead before any Jurisdiction except through the Intermediary designated in Article 4.

Article 3.—Any movable or immovable property, sum or credit acquired in contravention of the enactment contained in the second paragraph of the preceding Article, shall be confiscated to the profit of the State.

All other property, movable or immovable, sum or credit legally coming to Abbas Hilmi Pasha shall be seized administratively by the Administration designated in the article following. The real or personal property shall be sold by Auction.

Dethronement of the Khedive

The nett proceeds of the management and liquidation of the said properties, sums, or credits shall be carried annually to the credit of Abbas Hilmi Pasha or any other person having his rights and the total shall be published by notice in the Official Journal.

Any amounts not claimed by the above-mentioned persons within one year from the publication of such Notice shall be forfeited to the State Treasury.

Article 4.—The Council of Ministers shall appoint the Administration of the State charged with the provision of the measures indicated in the preceding Articles and in general with the management, administration and Legal representation of the interests active and passive of Abbas Hilmi Pasha within the Limits and dispositions of the present Law.

Article 5.—Our Ministers are charged, each so far as concerns him, with the execution of the present Law, and Our Ministers of the Interior and Finance are particularly authorized to take any necessary measure by Decree for the said execution thereof.

The present Law comes into force from its publication in the Official Journal.

Done at the Palace of Ras Et Tin,

22 Zilkadah 1340 (17 July 1922).

By the King.

FOUAD

(Signatures of Ministers appended.)

APPENDIX III

TRANSLATION. OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT

Decree-Law, interpretative of Law No. 28 of 1922 governing the liquidation of the properties of the Ex-Khedive, Abbas Hilmi Pasha, and restricting his rights.

STATEMENT OF THE MOTIVES

The disposition of Article 2 of Law No. 28 governing the liquidation of the properties of the Ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha, and restricting his rights, has not always been interpreted in the sense desired by those who drew up the law. Although the above-mentioned Article 2 distinctly states that the Ex-Khedive cannot plead in law before any Court except through the Administration described in Article 4, it has been argued that this interdiction was not absolute, and that a distinction must be made between the active and passive interests arising out of the rights recognized by Law No. 28 of 1922 and the so-called personal actions: that this deprivation of rights should be limited to the limits of the object aimed at by the Law, i.e. in view of ensuring the maintenance of the order established for the succession to the Throne; that the Commission constituted in virtue of Article 4 of the Law had but a very restricted competence; and that, outside that competence, the Ex-Khedive could plead either personally, or through his Daira, or through any representative he chose.

In a question which touches so closely the maintenance of public order and dynastic interests, the Government has decided that it was its duty to define by legislation the

Dethronement of the Khedive

sense that should be given to the disposition of Article 2 of Law 28 of 1922, and it is for this reason that the hereto annexed draft of a law had been prepared by the preceding Ministry with the intention of securing an interpretation of this disposition in conformity with the intentions of the legislator.

And whereas it is urgent to promulgate this interpretative law in view of cases now pending before the Tribunals, it is proposed forthwith to embody it in a Decree-Law, to be submitted ulteriorly to the Parliament according to Article 41 of the Constitution.

The circumstances under which Law 28 of 1922 was drawn up confirm the formal text of Article 2 in this sense that the Ex-Khedive cannot plead in Egypt in any capacity, or before any Court whatsoever.

He is necessarily represented in any case by the State Administrator appointed for that purpose, and it is for the latter to plead the whole case, and raise questions of competence or others that it may be necessary to raise in the defence of the Ex-Khedive. It is likewise the duty of this Administration to bring any actions it may be required to enter to protect the interests of the Ex-Khedive in Egypt.

The interpretative character of the law now proposed explains the effect that it necessarily must have on suits now pending, and which were not brought in conformity with Law 28 of 1922. Suits wrongly brought must in all circumstances be declared inadmissible, and thrown out by right and *ex-officio*, saving always the right of the parties concerned to renew their suit according to the requirements of Law 28 as it is above interpreted, i.e. against or through the intermediary of the State Adminis-

Dethronement of the Khedive

tration especially appointed to represent the interests of the ex-Khedive before the Courts, and in Egypt.

(Signed) President of the Council,

AHMED ZIWER

WE, FOUAD I, KING OF EGYPT,

Considering Article 41 of the Constitution :

Considering Law No. 28 of 1922, governing the liquidation of the properties of the ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha, and restricting his rights.

Considering that Article 2 of the said Law 28 of 1922 provides that the ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha cannot plead before any jurisdiction except through the Administration described in Article 4

And that this text has given rise to doubts of interpretation, and that it is necessary and urgent to put an end to these doubts by legislation :

On the advice of our Council of Ministers :—

DECREE

Article 1.—The disposition of Article 2 of Law 28 of 1922 which states that the Ex-Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha cannot plead before any jurisdiction save through the Administration appointed in Article 4 of the said Law, must be taken in the sense that the above-mentioned Administration alone is qualified to represent all the rights and interests, both patrimonial and personal, of the Ex-Khedive in every lawsuit or action of any nature whatsoever, and before no matter which jurisdiction of the country,—and that in no case can the Ex-Khedive appear in Court, *either in his own name, or by his Daira, or any*

*Dethronement of the Khedive
sequestrator, liquidator, administrator, or other person what-
ever, either as Plaintiff or Defendant, or in any other
capacity.*¹

Wherefore:—

- (1) Every suit or action, brought or pending, by or against the ex-Khedive, whether in his own name, or by his Daïra or any sequestrator, liquidator, administrator, or other person whatsoever shall be, under all circumstances, declared inadmissible, and thrown out *ex-officio* as of right, saving always the right of the parties concerned to renew their suits or actions against or through the above-mentioned Administration.
- (2) *Every summons, or generally, any act of procedure in the interests of or against him shall not be accepted, notified, or executed unless it be done at the request of or against the above-mentioned Administration.*

Article 2.—Our Ministers of Interior, Finance, and Justice, each in as far as he is concerned, are charged with executing the present law, which will come into force as soon as it is published in the Official Journal.

The present law will be submitted to Parliament at its first sitting.

Done at Abdin Palace the 3rd Gamad Tani 1343
(29 December 1924).

(Signed) FOUAD

And countersigned by Ziwer and the three Ministers concerned.

¹ The italics are the author's.

Dethronement of the Khedive

This law was not presented to Parliament until 1927, when it was not ratified, and consequently is no longer valid. It served its purpose, nevertheless, during the year that it had the temporary force of law.

APPENDIX IV

SENTENCE OF THE MIXED ANGLO-TURKISH ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL OF CONSTANTINOPLE

[*Translation.*]

ABBAS HILMI PASHA *v.* THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT

The Mixed Anglo-Turkish Arbitral Tribunal composed of M. K. Hemmerich, President; Memdouh Bey, Turkish Arbitrator; H. D. K. Grimston, British Arbitrator, with his Clerk, M. F. Grandchamp,—sitting at Constantinople.

CONSIDERING the Memorial presented by His Highness Abbas Hilmi, former Khedive of Egypt, requiring the condemning of the British Government to the payment of £2,823,102 11s. 3d. on account of the liquidation of the properties hereafter mentioned, plus interest and costs:—

CONSIDERING the Special Memorial presented by the British Government to the effect that the Tribunal should declare itself incompetent, and condemn the Plaintiff in costs:—

CONSIDERING the other documents in the case, namely,—

- (a) The letter of the 12th June 1926, put in by the Plaintiff, together with the Counter Memorial, and the Counter reply of the Plaintiff;
- (b) The reply of the Defendant;
- (c) The conclusions presented by the General Agent of the British Government, and after hearing Sir Maurice Amos for the British Government on the

Dethronement of the Khedive

10-11th May 1927, Maître Tahir Bey, M.M. Gaston Bergery and Jacques Kayser for the Plaintiff,—as also Wasfy Reshid Bey Turkish Agent, and Mr. Owen-Wells, British Agent:—

IN FACT:—

Whereas, the Plaintiff, who since 1892 occupied the throne of Egypt, and who at the outbreak of the world-war was out of Egypt, was, whilst he was living in Constantinople deposed from the Khedivate by the British Authorities:

The properties, right, and interests that the Plaintiff possessed in Egypt were sequestered by order of the Commander-in-Chief of the British forces, and subsequently sold and liquidated, likewise by the act of the British Authorities:

The latter paid to the Plaintiff the produce of the liquidation—namely the sum of £605,000, notwithstanding which the Plaintiff claims that the liquidation was not effected in a way to ensure the obtention of a fair price, and consequently he asks the Tribunal to increase the produce of the liquidation by an equitable sum which he estimates at £2,825,102 11s. 3d.

IN LAW:—

Whereas the Plaintiff, who claims to be a Turkish national, and as such to benefit by the provisions of the Treaty of Lausanne, bases himself on Articles 65 and 66 of the Treaty to maintain that the properties in question were situated in Egypt, and that this country is detached from the Ottoman Empire in virtue of the Treaty of Lausanne, and further that on the 29th October 1914, it was under the *de facto* protectorate of Great Britain,

Dethronement of the Khedive

and in consequence that the territorial conditions required by Article 65, paragraph 2 of the Treaty are fulfilled, and that, on the other hand, the provisions of Article 19 of the Treaty cannot prevent the competence of the Tribunal:—this latter article, instead of being included amongst the economic clauses is to be found in the part of the Treaty devoted to political clauses, and only relates to claims brought against the Egyptian State, without excluding actions brought against any other Power.

Whereas, nevertheless this thesis—that the Treaty reserved to all whom it might concern the right to attack the British Government as far as the liquidation of properties lying in Egypt goes,—is of a nature to give rise to serious doubts: first of all it must be taken into consideration the fact that Egypt even before the signature of the Treaty of Lausanne had been proclaimed an independent State,—that Article 19 of the Treaty in this connection reads—“Subsequent stipulations will govern questions that arise from the recognition of the Egyptian State to which the provisions of the present Treaty relative to territories detached from Turkey by virtue of the said Treaty, do not apply,” this text is drawn up in very wide terms, and its literal tenor comprises not only actions *against* Egypt as a political organism, but also every action touching the territory of that country:—

the interpretation in the sense that Article 19 relates exclusively to actions brought against the Egyptian State does not seem very natural if we remember that the Egyptian Government was not represented as such at the Lausanne Conference, and does not figure amongst the signatories of the Treaty,—so that it would have been completely superfluous to insert in it a special provision

Dethronement of the Khedive

in order to declare that the Treaty cannot be used to bring actions *against* the Egyptian Government:

the argument drawn from the position of the Article loses its importance when we think that this article was inserted in one of the fundamental chapters of the Treaty that defines, in a general fashion, its whole application, and thus including also economic clauses, such as Article 18—and moreover, the mere position of the article is not enough to restrict its meaning, unless such a restrictive interpretation is not justified by other considerations.

Whereas, on the other hand the argument of the Plaintiff seems irreconcilable with the system of Section I of the economic clauses of the Treaty, more especially with the principles on which Articles 65 and 66 are based; as a matter of fact Article 68 of the Treaty eliminates in principle all money claims against the contracting Powers for loss and damage sustained through the great war: and the various dispositions of Article 65 presuppose that, the contracting Powers cannot be held responsible for restoring sequestered property unless the territories in which these properties are situated are “to-day”, i.e. at the date of the signature of the Treaty, under their sovereignty or authority,—a condition that Article 65 repeats wherever necessary, reiterating it even up to three times in its paras. 2 and 3.

Whereas the same applies to the liability to pay, in cases provided for by Article 66, an additional sum over and above the product of the liquidation:—this last liability must not be taken as implying an indemnity granted outside the principle consecrated in Article 58,—it is nothing but an equivalent to restitution of the actual

Dethronement of the Khedive

property and subject to the same rules: according to the formal laws of Article 66 it can only take place in the case of property "whose restitution is provided for by Article 65," and when it is also supposed that the liquidated properties can be made the object of a restitution, and that they are situated on the above-indicated territories.

Whereas, it thus results from the dispositions of Articles 65 and 66, that the interested Powers did not desire, after the signature of the Treaty to assume any responsibility for the restitution of property situated on territories that at that time were no longer subject to their authority or placed under their protectorate:—that nothing shows that Article 19 intended to depart from this principle, but, on the contrary the tenor of this Article appears only to contain the confirmation of the application of this principle to property situated in Egypt, which already, since the 22nd February 1922 formed an independent State.

And whereas the Labours preparatory to the Lausanne Treaty which the Plaintiff has likewise invoked in his favour in no way confirm the admissibility of his claim, and he is wrong in maintaining that the negotiations at the time of the Lausanne Conference show that Articles 65 and 66 were drawn up with the intention of making them applicable to Egypt:—

Whereas, on this point, it appears from the Minutes of the Conference that a discussion took place between the British and Turkish delegations on the measure taken regarding the property of the Plaintiff, and that when Articles 72 and 72 *bis* (now 65 and 66) came up for consideration the first Turkish Delegate declared that he could not accept the text proposed for the said Articles, save

Dethronement of the Khedive

under reserve of a settlement of the question relative to the properties of Turkish Nationals in Egypt—the British Delegate, on the 3rd July 1923 made a declaration for the settlement of the question, adding that the properties claimed by Abbas Hilmi Pasha, which had been made the object of special arrangements, did not come under the head of the properties referred to in his declaration:—and thereupon the first Turkish Delegate withdrew his reserve, to re-assert it on the 22nd July, 1923, by stating that the Turkish Government was “in the position of having taken no engagement” regarding the British declaration in the matter of Abbas Hilmi Pasha:—to which the British Delegate replied on the 27th July 1923 that the “arrangements he referred to could give rise to no question between the British and Turkish Governments”, and that it was for this reason that he had thought fit formally to except the case of Abbas Hilmi Pasha from those coming under his declaration of the 3rd July.

Whereas it appears from this discussion that both parties started from the supposition that the disposition of Articles 65 and 66 were of a nature to exclude the claims of the Plaintiff, since if it were not so there would be no ground for making reservations,—

Whereas these reservations did not bring about any modification of the text of Articles 65 and 66 which, notwithstanding, were signed as they stood,—that it is this signature which determines the engagements of the High Contracting Parties, and that the above-mentioned declaration of the 22nd July, made by the Turkish Delegation outside the Treaty cannot be taken to saddle the British Government with a responsibility which is not implied in the signed text, and which the British Delegate, before

Dethronement of the Khedive

the signature, had formally declined by the above-quoted declaration.

Whereas, to sum up, the retro-active interpretation put by the Plaintiff on Article 19 cannot be maintained, and, on the other hand, the text of Article 19, or the system on which the Articles 65 and following ones are based, or the preparatory labours for the Treaty,—all show that Articles 65 and 66 are not applicable to properties situated in Egypt—therefore we must accept the objection raised by the British Government, the competence of the Tribunal not having been established to the satisfaction of the law—without there being ground to pronounce on the merits of the arguments advanced by the Defendant concerning the nationality of the Plaintiff, or the character of the measures taken in the matter of his properties.

WHEREFORE—The Tribunal declares itself incompetent.

Puts the costs and expenses of the procedure, fixed at £T.250 to be paid by the Plaintiff who has deposited them.

Condemns the Plaintiff to pay to the British Government the sum of £T.500 for its costs.

Constantinople, 29 June 1927.

Turkish Member.	The President.	British Member.
(Signed)	(Signed)	
MEMDOUH.	K. HEMMERICH.	H D. K. GRIMSTON.

True copy.

The President.	The Clerk of the Tribunal.
(Signed)	(Signed)

APPENDIX V

KING HUSSEIN, Shereef of Mecca, the man selected by Colonel Lawrence to act as our ally in the War from amongst all the powerful and influential Emirs of Arabia, had a chequered career. For at least fifteen years he lived at Stenia, a small village below Therapia on the Bosphorus, where he brought up his numerous family with no small difficulty. He had little or no money beyond the very problematical and irregular pay he could extract from the Privy Purse of the Sultan, and the pickings he could glean from his position as Councillor of State. This was but an empty dignity, as the Council was never consulted by Abdul Hamid, but it was supposed to carry with it a mysterious influence occasionally worth paying for.

After the revolution in Turkey, however, something else had to be discovered, and Councillor Hussein thought that he might get some post abroad if one fell vacant. It happened that after a short while Abdullah Pasha was named to the Shereefian dignity, and died within three weeks of taking up the place.

Arabia had never been an envied appointment, and for a while nobody offered himself to replace the defunct. Hussein, however, did not scruple to assert that he was in a position to render great services to Turkey if he were sent to the Holy City, and that he possessed the necessary qualifications of birth by connection with the Koreish family. Finding, nevertheless, that these talents and qualities were not sufficiently highly prized, he applied to the son of the Grand Vizier, whom he knew, to whom it was said that he paid about four thousand pounds, which he contrived to borrow from a confiding official on

Dethronement of the Khedive

the promise of repayment within a year. The story was well known to everyone at Constantinople in official circles at that time, and it is also said, though I can only repeat the tale, that the debt is still owing. At any rate, he started off with all his family and belongings, little dreaming probably of the high destinies in store for them all.

The British Consuls-General at Jeddah can best tell what they and others have suffered from the vagaries of the newly imported Shereef. It was this extraordinary potentate that Colonel Lawrence chose to pelt with sacks of golden sovereigns, and whose sons have since risen to be Kings in their turn of Irak and Transjordan.

The ignorance and eccentricity of Hussein could be illustrated by a hundred anecdotes of his actions, and I cannot refrain from relating one which I heard from another reverend Sheikh, who was a great crony of Hussein's and of mine. He always claimed that he was a much closer relative of the Prophet than Hussein, who knew this and had a deep respect for him. I have certainly seen a lengthy pedigree to this effect certified by the Sheikh ul Islam, and he was generally looked up to by the public in Cairo and Egypt generally as a most learned, if not holy, doctor. I had not seen him for some time when he called in 1920 or thereabouts and said he had been on a visit to King Hussein, who had invited him to Mecca and treated him with signal honours, and asked his advice on many subjects. On my asking what advice he had proffered, and on what matter, he laughed slyly and replied:

"When I arrived at Jeddah, I found a lot of Italians there, and as I sat talking to them and all the crowd in the café I was told that they were there to arrange for a motor service from the coast to Mecca, and to other towns

Dethronement of the Khedive

if they could manage it. They had already got influential helpers in Mecca and had spent a good bit of money, so that they expected confidently to pull it off, and shortly sign the concession. I immediately resolved that they should never have it if I could stop them. Imagine England letting Italians run a motor line in Arabia! Well, in Mecca I was put in the best guest villa next door to the Palace and had it all to myself, and my meals alone with the King, with the most noble of the country standing behind our chairs and waiting on us. I did not say anything until Hussein himself said that he wanted to take counsel with me, and repeated the account that I had heard at Jeddah.

"I looked very severely at him and replied: 'O Hussein, Shereef of the Holy Places! verily I am glad that it is yet time. Do you not see that this is all an evil plot of those *shaitans*, the Italians, who are the sons of Machiavel and born to deceive? With their horrible-smelling, shrieking motor-cars they will ruin all the true Arabs who for generations have carried the faithful and their goods from the sea. Will the tribesmen put up with this? Will they not rather grow angry and lie in wait one day and fall upon these Italians, and perhaps kill one or two and destroy their cars? Then what will happen? The Italians will come with ships and troops and begin a war until they have taken all the Hedjâz. That is all these men at Jeddah want. They do not really mean to work, but to provoke the Arabs to attack them, and then you will see that what I have said will surely happen.'

"As I spoke the King grew very hot and excited and broke out: '*Vallâhi!* You are right, and I have been blind. I will give orders at once to break off all talk, and let nobody ever venture to mention this thing to me again.'"

Dethronement of the Khedive

And so it was done. All attempts on the part of Italy to resume negotiations and obtain the concession were fruitless. It had been sufficient for a visitor from Cairo to instil suspicion into the mind of the half-crazy King for a business of almost international importance to be shelved for ever. I have no doubt whatever of the truth of the story, as I never found out my ancient friend telling me deliberate lies, and it is well known that the scheme for a motor service in the Hedjâz was abandoned about that time.



GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
LONDON: 40 MUSEUM STREET, W.C.1
CAPE TOWN: 73 ST. GEORGE'S STREET
SYDNEY, N.S.W.: WYNARD SQUARE
AUCKLAND, N.Z.: 41 ALBERT STREET
WELLINGTON, N.Z.: 4 WILLIS STREET
TORONTO, 77 WELLINGTON STREET WEST