

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE HEJAZ AND EGYPT COMMITTEES THAT WERE INVITED TO THE PARIS PEACE CONFERENCE AFTER THE WORLD WAR I

Resul YAVUZ*

Öz

Hicaz ve Mısır Heyetlerinin Paris Barış Konferansı'ndaki Faaliyetleri

Paris Barış Konferansı, Birinci Dünya Savaşı sonrasında büyük umutlarla toplandığında, Faysal başkanlığındaki Hicaz Heyeti ile Saad Zağlul başkanlığındaki Mısır Heyeti, farklı ülkeleri temsil etmelerine rağmen, biri yeni bir devlet kurmak, diğeri ise bağımsızlığını İngiltere'den elde etmek amacıyla Paris'e gitmeyi umuyordu. Ocak 1919'da konferans toplanıp, Müttefikler Paris'e gittiğinde Hicaz Heyeti İngiltere'nin özel gayret ve teşviki ile konferansa davet edilirken, Mısır delegeleri ise sırf taleplerinden dolayı Malta'ya sürgün ediliyordu. Faysal'ın talepleri büyük bir dikkatle barış konferansında dinlenirken; Mısır, Heyet Başkanları Saad Zağlul ve arkadaşlarının tutuklanmasının sarsıcı etkisini yaşamaya başlayarak, büyük sosyal patlamalara sahne olmuştu. Olayların büyük bir boyuta dönmesini engellemek amacıyla Zağlul ve arkadaşları serbest bırakılıp, Paris'e gitmelerine izin verilirken; haklı talepleri olan Mısır'ın bağımsızlığını duyurma çabaları, İngiltere'nin blokajı ile karşılaşmış ve heyet elleri boş bir şekilde Mısır'a geri dönmüştür. Faysal başkanlığındaki Hicaz Heyeti ise Paris'te ilgi ile dinlenmelerine rağmen, sonraki süreçte onlara da vaat edilen pek çok şey Müttefikler tarafından gerçekleştirilmeyecekti.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Mısır, Saad Zağlul, İngiltere, Hicaz, Faysal, Paris Barış Konferansı*

Abstract

When the Paris Peace Conference convened with great hopes after World War I, though the Hejaz delegation headed by Faisal and the Egypt delegation headed by Saad al Zaghlul represented different states, one of them hoped to establish a new state, while the other hoped to go to Paris to get its independence from Britain. The conference was held in January 1919, and when the Allies went to Paris, they invited the Hejaz delegation to the conference with the special effort and incentive of the Britain, while the Egyptian delegates were deported to Malta solely because of their demands. Peace conference attendees carefully listened to Faisal's demands. Egypt was the scene of major social outbursts, beginning with the shocking effect of the arrest of their heads of

* Dr. Öğt. Üyesi, Bandırma 17 Eylül Üniversitesi, İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Fakültesi, Bandırma. E-mail: resulyavuz@hotmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7705-1020>
(Makale Gönderim Tarihi: 04.10.2018 - Makale Kabul Tarihi: 23.05.2019)

the committee Saad al Zaghlul and his colleagues. While Zaghlul and other nationalists were allowed to be released and go to Paris to prevent the events from going back to a great extent; the attempts to declare Egypt's independence, with justifiable claims, met with the blockade of Britain and the delegation returned to Egypt with empty hands. Although the Hejaz delegation under the leadership of Faisal listened with interest in Paris, the Allies wouldn't follow through on many things they promised.

Keywords: *Egypt, Saad al Zaghlul, Britain, Hejaz, Faisal, Paris Peace Conference*

Introduction

Developments in the Middle East have been dominated by the Ottoman Empire since the end of the 19th century and had the ability to whet the appetite of the imperial powers, which had regional goals on the turn of the new century. With the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 due to the increase in the importance of the Red Sea, Britain used Urabi Pasha Rebellion¹ as an excuse and established its dominance in Egypt by renting it from the Ottoman Empire. This was a harbinger of how an approaching world war could change the balances in the Middle East. After these developments, the Ottoman State's pursuit of a policy of equilibrium with Germany would also open the door to developments that would pull the region into a colonial and sharing competition.²

On the one hand, the Middle East prepared for such conflicts that might be the stage of the new plans of the imperial powers, while on the other hand, the Arab provinces notably Hejaz, which were connected to the Ottoman Empire for centuries, had entered into a new but painful transformation of a participatory process beginning with the Constitutional Monarchy II. While in many states, according to the course of developments in the capital Istanbul, associations under various names were established; in the new newspapers and magazines that were published in the free environment brought by the constitutional administration, the writers started to able to write their nationalist ideas. In a stage of new century, this situation would lead to a transformation that would deeply affect the fate of the Middle East and moves that give acceleration to change. In fact, the proliferation of the associations in such a way that they couldn't be controlled by the central government, and gradually starting of the demands expressed in newspapers and magazines to be politically characterized by a separatist air, caused the Ottoman Government to be alarmed.³ The Unionist Government in its blossom, intending to control the

¹ For more information on the Urabi Pasha Rebellion in Egypt, see. İrtem 1999, pp. 56-76; See also. Tandoğan 2013, pp. 42-45

² Yorulmaz 2018, pp. 96-97.

³ Kurşun 1992, pp. 41-44.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

central authority, sent local administrators in the Arab States to taste the blessings of the constitutional monarchy, but to avoid any secessionist secret organizations, as far as they can with the activities of intelligence - even if they were an official association - it strove to intensify such societies. Despite all these efforts, secessionist secret organizations had been established in many cities including Istanbul, Damascus, Beirut, Aleppo, Baghdad and Mosul, despite all the pressures, they continued their activities of organization and expansion.⁴

In the meantime, when the experience of the Constitutional Administration began to take place, the empire had to deal with many uprisings based on Syria and the Arabian Peninsula. Riots started to be seen where the nomadic tribes lived, in the fortified areas of the mountains and in areas far from the central government's influence. For these regions, local conflicts and riots were not new developments for the people of the region. However, especially in 1910 and 1911, at the same time, in several places, the uprising had erupted and the government had made great efforts to suppress these uprisings. As a matter of fact, in these two years central government had to deal with rebellions in East Jordan, Havran, Assyria, and Najd.⁵

Although the Ottoman government dominated in the regions where riots took place, it gave special importance to the region of Hejaz at the heart of the Arabian Peninsula. The Hejaz's commitment to the central government was of great importance at a time when the effects of the constitutional administration only just began to appear. Sherif Hussein, the new commander of the Hejaz, was appointed upon the death of Sherif Abdullah, who had been appointed Hejaz Amir Sherif Ali, refused to recite the proclamation of the constitutional administration in Mecca, and openly opposed the constitutional rule after the removal by the new government in 1908.⁶ This assignment also meant that Sherif and his family, who had never been tried and held in Istanbul, started a new process that would deeply affect the fate of the Arabian Peninsula and, consequently, the Arabs. Indeed, the appointment of Sherif Hussein in

⁴ Kurşun, 1992, pp. 82-83; The first of the secret Arab societies during the Young Turk period was al- Fattat (Its full original name was Jam'iyyat al- Umma al- Arabiyya al- Fattat). The purpose of the society was to protect the natural rights of the Arab nation and to place it in the ranks of living nations. Its most significant action in the period before the World War I was its organization in June 1913 of the Paris Congress in which representatives of the Arab societies existing at the participated. After the Paris Congress the center of al- Fattat moved to Beirut. The second secret society during this period was al- Qahtaniyya which was formed in late 1909 in Istanbul. For more information about the secret Arab societies, see. Tauber 1993, pp.2-9

⁵ Kayalı, p. 81.

⁶ Allawi 2014, pp. 23-24. See also for more information about Sherif Hussein, Uzunçarşılı 1984, pp. 141-144.

November 1908 precipitated a new period in the Istanbul- Hejaz line, which began with a revolt in 1916. A tense relationship diplomatically made sure the parties could never trust each other.

With the new order being appointed, the Ottoman Government first asked him to ensure the central authority of the state in the Hejaz, Najd, and Basra regions.⁷ It also requested the support of Sheriff Hussein for its railway that was under construction and for the delivery of the railway to different centers. Pilgrims could secure pilgrimage during the pilgrimage season. The government also wanted additional duties from the Sheriff Hussein, especially against Ibn Saud and the rebellious Bedouins. On the one hand, he could have fulfilled these demands, and on the other hand, Sheriff Hussein abstained from or opposed some of the government's practices and demands. Especially with the coming of the Unionist Government, he opposed some practices in the Hejaz that could reduce his powers. Nevertheless, Sheriff Hussein was careful to comply with the central government to continue his post in Hejaz and to feel the support of the state against many tribes' chiefs, especially Ibn Saud and Ibn al-Rashid. Therefore, on the eve of World War I, in an atmosphere of intense British activity, the Unionist Central Administration supported the political efforts of Sheriff Hussein to be the established authority in the Hejaz and Arabian Peninsula, to be in the shadow of the Ottoman Government with the governor and other officials.⁸ Despite all cautious approaches and warnings, the government saw it as a requirement of its current policy to trust Sheriff Hussein. However, Sheriff Hussein contacted the British High Commissioner Lord Kitchener by sending his son Abdullah to Cairo in 1912 before World War I broke out to lift the ropes with the central government and raise doubts about him.⁹

While this was the general situation in the Arabian Peninsula, especially in Hejaz, the situation was in a different sight in Egypt which acceded to British administration. Britain occupied the Suez Canal to secure the political and financial stability of Egypt and to keep the strategically located country from the French. Despite this situation, it was unable to fully define its relationship with Egypt until the beginning of World War I. As a matter of fact, it allowed the Ottoman Empire to appoint khedive to Egypt.¹⁰ However, from the beginning of British rule, the British Government had built quite a cumbersome government in Egypt. Although Egyptian personnel, ministers and bureaucrats

⁷ For more information, see. Kurşun 1998, pp. 195-208.

⁸ Kurşun 1998, pp. 199-204.

⁹ Yılmaz 2017, p. 69.

¹⁰ Cleveland- Bunton 2009, p. 104.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

guarded the country's government structure, Egyptian rulers in the country's decision-making mechanisms over the years were not permitted. The government decided on the management policy in consultation with the British Consul General with a British consultant attached to each ministry.¹¹ At the turn of the century, many British officials, officers, engineers, and teachers, insufficient in education and experience, were placed in all important decision-makers of the country. This ruling group received wages from the Government of Egypt, gained the upper hand in social, economic, and cultural life, and caused increasing tension among Egyptian-educated groups.¹² Britain had in fact implemented a series of reforms for the social and economic development of Egypt in this period. An effort was made to open a university in Cairo. Likewise, some practices aimed at increasing the welfare of the agricultural workers were carried out, and customs revenues also were to be increased.¹³ However, the unrest in the political area was disturbing and disturbing the British rulers in Egypt at all points. As a matter of fact, the British, who wanted to shift their sovereignty over Sudan to Egypt,¹⁴ the Ottoman Empire, the re-establishment of the constitutional administration and increased freedom environment in Egypt didn't affect the intellectual environment was intense efforts. However, Egyptian intellectuals fleeing the repressive administration of second Abdul Hamid's return to the country to give importance to the press and broadcasting life, a serious nationalist opposition appeared in time in Egypt increased repressive and discriminatory practices against the British administration and increased repressive and discriminatory practices.¹⁵ Especially in June 1906, in the wake of World War I in Egypt, the British government was in a difficult position as Dinshaway Affair¹⁶ turned into a great protest against British leaders and soldiers throughout the country. By this time, Egyptian Nationalists, however, seemed pleased with the provision of an environment supported by regular governance, stability, and low taxes to the country, with the British, even though they didn't like to be ruled themselves by British. However, the Dinshaway Affair caused the ordinary citizen, who was less than satisfied with the course in Egypt or who never cared about the events, reacted violently to the British.¹⁷ The response to British rulers started to beg in London. In fact, the pressure and penalties imposed on the public during the

¹¹ Murat 2013, p. 160.

¹² Cleveland- Buntun 2009, p. 105.

¹³ Bey 1947, pp. 227-229.

¹⁴ İrtem 1999, p. 94.

¹⁵ Emin 2017, p. 24.

¹⁶ Rogan 2009, p.162.

¹⁷ Rogan 2009, p. 162.

calming of the incident led to criticism of the government in the House of Commons.¹⁸ Although many talented executives, such as Sir Eldon Gorst and Lord Kitchener, who came after British manager Cromer, had serious practices to reduce the impact of the Dinshaway incident, Egypt would never fully resist the nationalist reaction. To the contrary, there have been three major opposition organizations in Egypt since 1907, and they started many harsh protests with being organized against British domination and Egypt Government. The reactions were moved to such a degree that Mustafa Kamil, one of the opposition parties head of the Al-Hizbul Wataniya Party, took his reaction to the point that the British demanded that they leave the country immediately.¹⁹ There were also Saad al Zaghlul, who was a young jurist in these opposition organizations, who, in the early years of his tenure, served as a minister and minister of justice in the Egyptian Government but disliked the government's policy and left, which would have marked the recent history of Egypt. The studies of Al-Hizbul Wataniya Party, in which he was a member during the first years of his office, disturbed the British and the Khedive, and its hard opposition was reflected in the press.²⁰

1. Egypt and the Hejaz during World War I

Reactionary events that have made British rulers harder in Egypt were cut off with the start of World War I. But the start of the war in Egypt, the situation of the British inserted an abnormal condition. In the new situation, the British began to be afraid of all the intrigues of Turks and Germans.²¹ Many activists like Mustafa Kamil and Mohammad Ferid wanted to get the British out of their country and tried to organize both in Egypt and outside of Egypt as they continued their studies. British rulers constantly resorted to London to develop a policy of appeasement, with great concern over the rising tension in Egypt before the war broke out. In June 1914, Lord Kitchener returning to London for his annual leave, left from Cairo in a relatively quiet weather. However, with the outbreak of the war again in Egypt, with the concern of the emergence of

¹⁸ Goldschmidt 1988, p. 50.

¹⁹ Cleveland -Bunton 2009, p. 109: For detailed information on Nationalist organizations in Egypt prior to World War I, see. Koloğlu 2017, pp.260-267; See also. Okutan 2001, p.161-167.

²⁰ In fact, in these years, British intelligence was following the increasing nationalist formations in Egypt. In fact, they had reported to London that the nationalists in the center of Cairo had determined their connections with the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP), administration in Istanbul. The information obtained included information about who the Egyptian nationalists, such as Mohammad Ferid, Sheikh Cavish and Niyazi Beg, had been in contact with, including Saad al Zaghlul. Ferid 2017, p. 91.

²¹ Weigall 1915, p. 266.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

confusion again in Cairo, although he wanted to return, because of his mission in the war office, he couldn't be realized.²² However, the London Government would put in place a series of measures in a timely manner not to put the British rulers in Cairo on their feet.²³

Because two German ships, which caused the Ottoman Empire to enter the war, opened the Black Sea and bombed the Russian harbors, British governors who waited in Egypt very restlessly, acted. In an article sent to London by the British High Commissioner Cheetham on October 31, 1914; he stated that the bombing of the Russian harbors provided evidence that the Ottoman Empire entered the war, and that a possible Turkish attack could be expected to come to Egypt at that time and demanded the proclamation of martial law without wasting time in Egypt. In the martial law declaration issued on November 3, 1914 and prepared in a very diplomatic manner and with a careful attitude, he referred to the use of such measures in Egypt using statements to all nationalist or non-nationalist groups.²⁴ The statement didn't refrain from addressing the feelings of the Egyptian people and underlined that Britain had placed a serious and heavy burden on the security of the Egyptian people. The issues raised in the declaration aimed entirely at influencing the psychological feelings of the people and the firm acceptance of martial law to the public. After the proclamation of martial law, the British followed the developments closely, following the attitude of both the people and the Egyptian administrators towards the martial law.²⁵ They had intense concerns that a possible social protest or infantry might happen. But a few days after the proclamation, as General Maxwell stated, the failure of a public reaction was interpreted as a sign that the Egyptian people welcomed martial law, British authorities announced patronage of British (Protectorate) in Egypt in December 18, 1914 with the start of the war. This move indicated the sovereignty of British dominance in Egypt. After a while, Abbas Hilmi, appointed as the Khedive by the Ottoman Government as part of patronage politics, was subsequently dismissed, stating that there was no link between him with Ottoman government. "*Sultan*" Abbas Hilmi Pasha's uncle, Hussein Kamil, was appointed administrator of Egypt in trust in the British.²⁶

²² Weigall 1915, p. 279.

²³ Weigall 1915, p. 280.

²⁴ Polat 2015, p. 55.

²⁵ Goldschmidt 1988, p. 53; Polat 2015, p. 57.

²⁶ Polat 2015, p. 58: The British didn't want the Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha, who was appointed by the Ottoman Empire, because he was against the British rule. Moreover, if the khedive in Istanbul was allowed to return to Egypt, they had taken an insurrection under their presidency

With the start of the war, the biggest concern for Egypt in the British rulers in London and Cairo was the attack of the Ottoman Army against Egypt in a possible Canal Operation. Although martial law and the proclamation of protection intended to intimidate the Egyptian opposition, the main concern was to take more comfortable measures against the possible attacks of the Ottoman Empire and to keep domestic politics under control according to that²⁷.

Since the beginning of 1915, the British Consulate in Cairo had been transformed into a High Commissioner and all actions were taken towards the establishment of the occupation administration²⁸. During the war years, the British administration paid special attention to the use of British officials in public administration. The British also started special propaganda activities for villages to recruit voluntary troops from Egyptian young people and in some situations, they demanded with obligation²⁹.

These measures, which came with the pressure of Britain, would hit peak with a secret society member in Egypt in the spring of 1915 when they attempted to assassinate Sultan Hussein Kamil³⁰. Hussein Kamil survived and the attacker was caught in this attempt by a young nationalist from Mansurah. After a brief interrogation, the British government immediately acted to investigate the forces and organizations behind the incident after the assailant was executed promptly on April 26, 1915. But the event attracted the attention of the world public. The comments of most of the global press emphasized that the assassination attempt was carried out by the forces opposed to Egyptian rule and British sovereignty and that its connections could relate to Istanbul.³¹ Cairo was shocked by the assassination attempt on Sultan Hussein Kamil and by the assassination attempts on Prime Minister Hussein Rushdi Pasha on August 10 and the Ministry of Foundations on September 4.³² Nationalist groups in Cairo planned to make administration difficult for the British by announcing their voices in this way. The British High Commissioner naturally increased security measures with successive assassination attempts. While questioning the commissariat in Cairo continues, threatening letters were sent to Egyptian consulate officials in various European cities.³³

and received serious intelligence that they would take over the administration with the help of the Turkish. Ferid 2017, p. 10.

²⁷ Polat 2015, p. 70.

²⁸ Lutskiy, 1969, p. 378.

²⁹ Goldschmidt 1988, pp. 53-54.

³⁰ *Tanin*, April 11, 1915; *İkdam*, April 12, 1915.

³¹ *The Manchester Guardian*, April 26, 1915.

³² Lutskiy 1969, p. 382; *İkdam*, September 6, 1915.

³³ Ferid 2017, p. 229.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

The British government, trying to rule the Egyptian people who were not satisfied with the proclamation of martial law and protection, had found themselves in a corner with assassination attempts. Moreover, the defeat of the Allies against the Turks in the war that took place in Gallipoli increased the displeasure of the people against the British in Egypt towards the end of 1915. High Commissioner McMahon, who wrote this situation from Cairo, “*Assassination attempt on the Egyptian sultan*” and the situation created by the situation in Gallipoli made the people's situation in Egypt less appealing than before. Therefore, McMahon stated that it would be appropriate to take certain measures and that it would be appropriate to expel certain suspected Turkish and nationalist sympathizers for the suppression of political crimes³⁴. High Commissioner McMahon's proposal to reduce the tension against them in Egypt would be put into effect without delay, and London would contact local authorities to exile adversaries to places such as Malta, St Helena, Sri Lanka and Gibraltar. The numerous colonial ministers of Britain continued to run the meetings until the end of 1916, but the process of the war brought against the Turks in time and because the anticipation of an expected uprising in Egypt was not happened, exile executions were abandoned.³⁵

The years of the ongoing war saw strong anti-British opposition in Egypt, from every secondary school to university. While students had been waiting for years to be rewarded with independence because of their loyalty to Britain, they had begun to qualify a strict patronage as betrayal.³⁶

In Egypt, the struggle of the nationalists against British imperialism continued, so on December 9, 1917, the British appointed Sultan Hussein Kamil passed away at the age of 64.³⁷ All officials, especially Reginald Wingate was appointed British High Commissioner in Cairo immediately after McMahon. At this stage, they began to spend a lot of time trying to elect the new sultan without any authority gap or turmoil. As a result, in a rather disturbed and digested environment, the British High Commissioner, in accordance with the authority and direction they received from London, appointed Prince Ahmet

³⁴ Polat 2015, p. 230.

³⁵ Polat 2015, p. 232.

³⁶ Lutskiy 1969, p. 382.

³⁷ Times, October 10, 1917; In fact, there was no clear consensus about how to follow the path to ensure the independence of Egypt among the opposition groups to British outside the country. In general, the opposition intellectual sector was divided into three groups as; with slogan of “*Egypt belongs to the Muslims*” and those who wanted to make Said Halim Pasha come to Egypt as khedive; who wanted to reach out to Khedive Abbas Hilmi Pasha, who hated Turks and reached independence by signing a treaty with the British; with slogan of “*Egypt belongs to the Egyptians*”, people who wanted to achieve independence by ending of British sovereignty and focused on Muhammet Ferid. Ferid, 2017, p. 17.

Fuad as the new sultan of Egypt and met the consequences of World War in Egypt with the new King Fuad.³⁸

Sources suggest that Hejaz Amir Sheriff Hussein took World War I restlessly. The tension between the Unionist administrations was deteriorating. Although the two sides didn't feel very confident, they experienced a painful process brought on by a seemingly obligatory union. The Ottoman Government, in any case, was looking to assert its authority over the rebellious Bedouins in the Arabian Peninsula with the commander of the loyal tribe, such as Sheriff Hussein and Ibn al-Rashid. In an atmosphere where the British tried to dominate the region through the Basra and the Red Sea, the Ottoman government strove to provide all kinds of assistance for the loyal tribal leaders as much as it could. With the beginning of the World War, the Ottoman government wanted to give the Holy Jihad, which he had declared against the Allies and announced to the entire Islamic World, and to be supported by Sheriff Hussein absolutely. Moreover, many senior executives, especially Enver Pasha and Cemal Pasha, hoped that Sheriff Hussein would support with his sons in a military operation against the Canal District for the British³⁹. However, just a few months before the start of the war, Sheriff Hussein sent his son Abdullah in February 1914 to meet with Lord Kitchener, chief of the Arab office in Cairo. In the meeting between the dual, Abdullah on behalf of his father said that the work in the Hejaz didn't go well for them in favor of the Union and wanted to dismiss Sheriff Hussein and asked that whether Britain helped to them in this situation or not to the British Government.⁴⁰ Although the British administration had written a statement to the people of Hejaz and all Arabs at the start of the war,⁴¹ Lord Kitchener approached from a distance the request for help at a time when they considered being too early. After politely rejecting the Sheriff's offer, he reported the developments to London. However, Sheriff Hussein persevered. In April 1914, again in Cairo to meet with the Secretary-General of the East Affairs Ronald Storrs, he sent his son, Abdullah once again to meet. In the second meeting, Abdullah stated that the Arabs would not be silent on these pressures by mentioning the heavy pressure of Turks on the Hejaz, especially the construction of the railway. Following the statement of Abdullah, the British Government would reiterate their request for assistance by expressing their readiness to do so if they helped them.⁴²

³⁸ C.W.R. 2005, p. 91.

³⁹ İskit 2017, p. 80.

⁴⁰ FO, 371/2130, No: E 3451, Cairo, February , 1914.

⁴¹ For the full text of the notice, see. Özdemir and Irkıçatal 2011, p. 16.

⁴² IOR, L/PS/10/523, No: 4532, April 19, 1914.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

Although British government didn't respond positively to Sheriff Hussein's demands with a two-month break, they tried to make a situation assessment by considering the connections with other Arab chiefs, especially Ibn Saud. However, the British's apparently indifferent to Sheriff Hussein's demanding demands would be completely altered by the beginning of the war. Lord Kitchener himself, with the Ottoman Empire entering the war; sent notice to the British High Commissioner in Cairo, without any delay, to instruct Sheriff Hussein to contact him⁴³. Therefore, after a clandestine traffic of more than one year, a correspondence diplomacy between Sheriff Hussein and the British High Commissioner McMahon in Cairo was to be initiated⁴⁴. In the first letter he wrote to McMahon in July 1915, Sheriff Hussein outlined his demands for the Arabs. These demands, which were initially quite coldly approached by McMahon and the British authorities in Cairo, were to be put on the line in the ongoing traffic of correspondence, and the British would put Sheriff Hussein's demands on the table on a real ground in the event of an insurrection⁴⁵. As a result, the diplomacy between Sheriff Hussein and McMahon, which began in the summer of 1915 and continued until June 1916 and which aims to plan an Arab uprising against the Ottoman Empire, will bear fruit. On June 9, 1916, Sheriff Hussein went to rebel in the Hejaz to the Ottoman government for Cemal Pasha's Canal Operation the second when he wanted to be helped by him.⁴⁶

Immediately after Sheriff Hussein's rebellion against the Ottoman State, some secret Arab League members in Damascus, Baghdad and Cairo announced that they would immediately support the rebellion as they expected such development⁴⁷. Especially in Damascus, despite all the pressures of Cemal Pasha⁴⁸, members of the Al-Ahd Society, who continued their work, continued

⁴³ Özdemir and Irkçatal 2011, p. 36.

⁴⁴ Tauber 1993, p. 68.

⁴⁵ Özdemir and Irkçatal, 2011, p. 37; Sheriff Hussein's aim was to elicit British support for Arab independence in all the Arab Provinces of the Ottoman Empire From Mersin in the north, the Persian frontier in the east, the Mediterranean in the west and the Red Sea and Indian Ocean in the south. Sorby 2006, p. 45.

⁴⁶ For more information on the content of the correspondence between Sheriff Hussein and McMahon, see. Hurewitz 1956, pp. 13-17; Köse 2014, pp. 51-150; Özdemir and Irkçatal 2011, p. 47-116.

⁴⁷ Kılınçkaya 2015, p. 82.

⁴⁸ Cemal Pasha's first policy in Syria had been to try to secure the whole-hearted support of the Muslim majority of the population for the Turkish war effort. But after the failure of his first attempts to invade Egypt across the Suez Canal his intelligence services made him aware of the great scale of underground Arab anti-Turkish activities. Antonius, 1962, p. 186; For more information about measures of Cemal Pasha during the Arab revolt, see. Tauber, 1993, pp. 45-56.

their contact with Faisal⁴⁹. As a matter of fact, the process of rebellion accelerated after the society presented to Faisal the general demands of the Arabs in the event of a rebellion⁵⁰.

Sheriff Hussein knew that he had to act, especially as a large Turco-German force was about to arrive in the Hejaz on its way to Yemen. After recalling his son Faisal from Damascus, where he had been urgently summoned by Cemal Pasha, Sheriff Hussein raised the flag of the Arab revolt on June 10, 1916 in Hejaz⁵¹. In a short time, the revolt was expanded with attacks on the Turkish Garrisons in Medina, Tayf and Jeddah. Sheriff Hussein; in this process, gave instructions to his sons Abdullah, Faisal and Ali, where they should be located and how to behave in the way⁵². After the fall of Tayf into hands of Sheriff Hussein the first stage of the Arab revolt ended. And during the following months all the forces of the Arab revolt were concentrated in the region of Medina. They were divided at this stage into three main armies: "The Army of Ali, The Army of Abdullah and The Army of Faisal."⁵³ Ali and Faisal, while cutting the rail link north of Mecca, Sheriff Hussein attacked Mecca and seized the city after three days of siege to the Ottoman Garrisons. In Jeddah, clashes began with the Turkish Forces and the city was in the hands of the rebels with the support of the British Royal Navy.

By the end of July 1916, the rebels had captured almost all regions of the Hejaz⁵⁴. However, Sheriff Hussein failed because of Fahrettin Pasha's timely measures and necessary interventions at the point of spreading the rebellion to Medina and seizing Medina. Medina could then be captured only months after the Ottoman Government surrendered during the armistice period⁵⁵.

When Sheriff Hussein took the flag of the rebellion, the British always contacted him through Cairo. For this purpose, an Arab Bureau was established in Cairo⁵⁶ and very well-known David Honagh was appointed head of the

⁴⁹ For detailed information about the works of the secret Arab societies in this period including Al-Ahd Society and the measures taken by Cemal Pasha, see. Kayra 2008.

⁵⁰ The leaders of al- Ahd members met for a number of secret discussions and at the end formulated the protocol which contained the territorial and other demands that Sheriff Hussein was to present to the British. Antonius 1962, 157; For detailed information on the claims that the al-Ahd members have presented to Faisal and called the Damascus Protocol, see. Umar 2004, p. 221; Allawi 2014, pp.51-54.

⁵¹ Sorby 2006, p. 48

⁵² Shaw 2008, p. 1752.

⁵³ Tauber 1993, p.122.

⁵⁴ Bayur 1983, p. 273.

⁵⁵ For more information about the Defense of Medina see: Kandemir 2007, pp. 160-165.

⁵⁶ Cairo was in a very important position in the Arab revolt. For detailed information about Arab Bureau in Cairo, see. Tauber 1993, pp. 157-164.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

Arabian Peninsula. Given the British practices and pressures against the Egyptian people in Cairo during the war years, it was easy to understand how anxious they were to coordinate a revolt in the Hejaz. At the start of the war, Sheriff Hussein strongly opposed the idea of the demands of the meeting, especially the British rulers in India that such a move would involve Cairo. However, in oncoming process, the concerns of the British authorities, which were concerned that the links with the Arabs would have dangerous consequences, were in vain, and the rebellion had been successful -moreover, in that turmoil came with the war, though Cairo felt a jumpy tension- Egyptian public didn't attempt a mass rebellion⁵⁷.

2. Winds of Change in Egypt

In early autumn 1918, when the Allies ended World War I and the signed a truce with the defeated states, the Egyptian and the Hejaz rulers, who had acted with the British as the political rulers of the defeated states, entered a worried wait. While Egypt was under the repressive patronage of Britain during the war years, it was the largest British military and political and intelligence base in winning the war in the Middle East.

Two days after the official end of the war, as head of the Legislative Assembly in Egypt, Saad al Zaghlul and a group of friends, despite their distress during the war years, in return for their support for the British, demanded the British administration to listen to them, in line with the principles laid out by US President Wilson. They were extremely optimistic, believing that they would welcome the British demands⁵⁸. Sir Reginald Wingate, the British High Commissioner in Cairo accepted Saad al Zaghlul, Abd al Aziz Fahmi and Ali Sha'rawi⁵⁹ on November 13th. Zaghlul at the meeting presented report called "*List of the rightful demands of the Egyptian people*" to Wingate. In the report, with the end of the war, Britain's Suez Canal and Public Debts were to be under British supervision,⁶⁰ he demanded an end to the regime of martyrdom and patronage over Egypt and the fulfillment of the promise to the people of Egypt that Britain would recognize its independence. In his political report, Zaghlul demanded that they be allowed to go to London and Paris to convey the demands of the Egyptian people and to discuss the political situation of the country and to announce their voices to the world public. High Commissioner Wingate received the report and listened to all the views and wishes of the

⁵⁷ İskit 2007, pp. 87-88.

⁵⁸ Richmond 1977, p. 177.

⁵⁹ Rogan 2009, p. 183.

⁶⁰ Emin 2017, p. 38.

group that came with Zaghlul, ruled in rejection with thought of “...*These suggestions and demands will not bring any benefit to Egypt...*” with points of report⁶¹. The high commissioner's refusal to answer was a big disappointment between Zaghlul and other nationalists. After a short interview, Zaghlul made a meeting with directors of al- Wafd Party⁶² on the same day, a formal delegation called et al-Wafi al-Misr was established and held intensive meetings with the members of the delegation to decide what steps to take next⁶³. In fact, the British High Commissioner advised Zaghlul and other nationalists due to intensive work in Paris, to go to London and to express their thoughts to the authorities here, although he didn't look at this idea and had insisted on Paris⁶⁴. The first aim of the delegation was to participate in the Paris Peace Conference. The members of the delegation were determined not to back down and believed that a new world order would be established when the equilibrium emerged at the end of World War I, and that Egypt would necessarily be an independent state in this order. While Zaghlul and other nationalists discussed how to proceed with the rejection response, on November 17th, Wingate cabled the British foreign affairs that Zaghlul and other nationalists (Egyptian politicians) were calling for a programme of complete autonomy. In addition, Wingate conveyed in his telegram that neither they nor the sultan could stand firmly against such nationalist aspirations in Egypt.⁶⁵ These statements of the High Commissioner Wingate were in fact a confession. It was a serious warning that the nationalist wave that had kept the UK vigilant during the war in Egypt could undermine the prestige of the British in the Middle East and Egypt in the case of re-rising after the war.

Prime Minister Hussein Rushdie, who knows the dialogue of Zaghlul and other nationalists with the high commissioner and supports their views, to draw attention to the urgency and importance of the situation and to draw attention to the fact that this rejection was a blow not only to Zaghlul and his supporters, but to the honor and demands of all the people of Egypt as a strike, transferred it to King Fuad with a letter. In a letter written on December 23 1918 directly to the sultan, in November 13, Zaghlul and his accompanying delegation also informed the High Commissioner Wingate of the report they presented, if the

⁶¹ Fromkin 2001, pp. 417-418; In addition, Wintage's accusations against Zaghlul and other nationalists for not being the real representatives of the people of Egypt in the meeting also led to the launching of support campaigns for Zaghlul and other nationalists in the country in a short time. Deeb 1979, p. 40.

⁶² Cleveland – Bunton 2009, p. 195.

⁶³ Emin 2017, p. 39.

⁶⁴ Polat 2013, p. 53.

⁶⁵ Fromkin 2001, p. 418.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

Egypt Committee didn't accept their demands, he wanted his resignation by stating that he couldn't continue his premiership mission more⁶⁶. In fact, Hussein Rushdi wanted to go to London with the Minister of Education, Adli Pasha to explain the situation of Egypt to the British Government immediately after the signing of a ceasefire with Germany and to sign a treaty with Egypt in the interests of Egypt. Therefore, there was no such thing as the arrival of Zaghlul and the representatives of al- Wafd Party in the first place. The British responded to this request from the prime minister by saying that the British government was busy with the conference and that it wasn't possible to argue with the delegation from Egypt and to give them time to attend therefore they can give an appointment to the minister only in March 1919. Hussein Rushdi and Adli Bey, who thought that their demands were not met, presented their resignations to King Fuad on December 6, 1918. But when King Fuad refused to accept the resignations on the pressure of the British, Hussein Rushdi wrote the letter to the King insistently for accepting his resignation.⁶⁷ However, when the first letter was not received, Hussein Rushdi Pasha wrote a new letter to King Fuad to accept his resignation on December 30th.⁶⁸ In the meantime, Saad al Zaghlul repeated his demands in a letter to Wingate on November 29, expressing that by the end of December they should have been in London, therefore the military authorities would have their passports returned to them and the barriers to their departure would be lifted⁶⁹. Although he couldn't get the answer that he wanted from High Commissioner Wingate, he sent a telegram to British Prime Minister Lloyd George on December 4th, he expressed anger and sadness of the Egyptian people because of the developments and complained about Wingate. Zaghlul in his telegram to Lloyd

⁶⁶ "Letter Addressed to His Highness The Sultan", Cairo, December 23, 1918, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), Egypt, Egyptian Delegation to The Peace Conference, Collection of Official Correspondence From November 11, 1918. To July 14, 1919, Twelve Appendices Containing Verbatim Transcriptions of Official Egyptian Reports, Correspondence, Depositions of Victims., Cornell University Library, Published by Delegation, Paris, 1919, pp. 3-4.

⁶⁷ According to Muhammad Ferid, When King Fuad couldn't abandon Hussein Rushdi's decision to resign, he and his deputy allowed him to go to London with Minister of Education Mr. Adli. However, after Mr. Hussein Rushdi stated that he would not allow the British to do so when they insisted on the arrival of Saad al Zaghlul and representatives of al- Wafd Party in London, the resignations of the Prime Minister and the Education Minister were accepted. Ferid 2017, p. 498.

⁶⁸ However, despite minister's constant demands, his resignation would not be accepted until March 2, 1919. "Letter Addressed to His Highness The Sultan", Cairo, December 30, 1918, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), p. 6.

⁶⁹ "To Sir F. Reginald Wingate", Cairo, November 29, 1918, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 19-20.

George: *“With the liberal democracy that you are leading in Egypt, there are developments that directly address the justice and free future of England”* telegram he started *“Can you accept the existence of a country that doesn't hear the voice of a country crying for freedom and being together?”* he asked. In the telegram where the Egyptian delegation received complaints of treatment by the High Commissioner to enlighten the British public opinion on Egypt's future and national desires, Zaghlul demanded help from Lloyd George to remove obstacles placed for them.⁷⁰ However, despite his persistent actions and attempts to find a way out, Zaghlul couldn't get the answer he wanted. Lloyd George even received the telegram but didn't answer to Zaghlul. In these emotions, Zaghlul sent a letter to the diplomatic representatives of the Allied States on December 6 showing a full letter of diplomacy and to the peace process after the war sent a note in which he complained and protested about what Britain wanted to maintain in Egypt. In the note, Zaghlul emphasized that the Egyptian people didn't accept the restrictions imposed on them by the British Government and stated the reasons for which Egypt deserved independence. In Zaghlul note which he expressed his wishes regarding the future of Egypt by giving examples from history, he wanted Allied States to help them about that topic.⁷¹

When the answers of the Allied representatives didn't reach any points, Zaghlul decided to elaborate on all the developments in a persistent manner to American President Wilson. In a letter written on December 14, 1914: *“...no one felt the birth of a new age more than the Egyptian people. This age came about because of your strong determination and raised the hope of bringing peace and harmony to every place. It is Egyptian people's wishes to defend the high and noble desires of humanity and appreciate your work in this moment when you step into Europe with this hope.”* with using these expressions” *If the Egyptian delegation was allowed, he would personally like to offer you the respect and admiration of the Egyptian people”* expressed their feelings with phrases. In his letter; Zaghlul asked for help from Wilson by expressing that Britain had not given them permission, their passports had been confiscated, and they had not even tolerated to listen their right demands. In his letter, in which he declared that the British didn't respect the great hopes of the oppressed nations of that *“the principles of national self-determination of nations ”* in such a manner, the people of Egypt wanted to announce their

⁷⁰ *“Telegram to M. Lloyd George”*, Cairo, December 4, 1918, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 24-25.

⁷¹ *“Appeal to The Representatives of the Nations that Diplomatic Relations With Egypt”*, December 6, 1918, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), p. 9.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

voices in the Paris Peace Conference to the world and thus to their allies, asked "...Giving them a chance..."⁷².

Saad al Zaghlul didn't receive any response to his letter. He wrote four more letters to Wilson on December 27, January 3, January 13, and April 22. He eventually received a short response to his persistent letters and demands on April 24, 1919 from the American Embassy in Paris: "*Your letter will be received and brought to the attention of the president.*"⁷³

Saad al Zaghlul continued his persistent letters in January 1919 with the aim of influencing the Peace Conference in Paris, which convened to create a new world order after World War I and to determine the peace treaties to be signed with the renewed states. In a short letter to Clemenceau on January 11, he demanded that the Egyptian delegation be invited to the conference for the sake of freedom, justice and humanity and that they should be listened once before the council⁷⁴.

The unilateral letter diplomacy, which Saad al Zaghlul continues to insist on, would have disturbed the British administration; therefore, the British High Commissioner in Cairo had to resort to certain methods to prevent him. In fact, according to the instructions sent from London to the high commission, the commander of the British troops in Cairo, Major General Sir Harry Watson, warned that the martial law in Egypt was still in effect and that the work he carried out caused confusion in the country⁷⁵. Already from these warnings and interventions, he would not be able to use letter diplomacy effectively from January 1919 until the end of March.

The wavering of the government by resignations in Egypt and the fact that Zaghlul and the members of al- Wafd Party, especially in Cairo and Alexandria, directly communicated with student and popular groups in the country's major cities and were very concerned about the British rule in Egypt. The British, on the one hand to prevent the arrival of the Egyptian delegation to Paris, on the other hand to monitor the activities of the country soon seemed to raise the tension in the country. As a matter of fact, watching the developments in Cairo with concern, London couldn't continue this tense situation by sending more instructions, so Saad al Zaghlul and other nationalists would want to be warned once again. In this direction, Major General Sir Harry Watson on March 6th; called Zaghlul, İsmail Sidki Pasha, Mohammad Mahmud Pasha and Hamad

⁷² "A Telegram, by His Excellency, President Woodrow Wilson, American Embassy, Paris", Cairo, December 14, 1918. Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 47-49.

⁷³ For detailed information about the letters, see: Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 50-60.

⁷⁴ "*To Monsieur Georges Clemenceau, Paris*", Cairo, January 11, 1919, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 67-68.

⁷⁵ Grainger 2013, p. 210.

Basil Pasha to his office, he voiced his discontent with the work they had done and accused them of obstructing government reform efforts and threatened them with judging in a military court⁷⁶. In accordance with the instructions, the Major General was unable to slow down, the two days later, decided to be arrested especially Saad Zaghlul, including the senior executives of the Party of the al-Wafd and conducted to the Kasr-el-Nil Barracks. On the following morning they were sent to Alexandria and placed on board a British destroyer, which conveyed them to Malta⁷⁷. The next day, arrests led to events and protests by nationalist student groups in the big cities of country headed by Cairo, Tanta and Alexandria with creating a domino effect. On March 9, when the shows began, a group of students began to destroy everything about the British administration, such as trains, trams, telephone poles and street lamps. Al-Azhar University and the Mosque became a center for events⁷⁸. Because the British soldiers in the first place couldn't intervene very much because of religious sensitivities⁷⁹. On the 13th of March, when the incidents continued to increase, the British soldiers started to arrest some teachers and students by entering Al-Azhar University while increasing the dose of violence. Egyptian State Railways paralyzed the social life in Egypt after the strike⁸⁰.

Chief of Police McPherson was in charge of soothing the events in Cairo and characterized everyone from school children to scavengers participating in the rebellion with increasing anger as: *howling lunatics in the streets, women emancipated for the occasion making stump orations, children and raps callions of all sorts shouting ribald doggerels in contempt of the fallen tyrants*⁸¹ For the first time in Egypt, women also came out to the streets with men in black and white letters written in Arabic and French on their hands and revolted. When British police intervened in this group who wanted to march to the American Embassy, events became violence.⁸²

In Egypt, the unsettled events made the British very anxious. After the great strikes and sabotages arranged on the railway lines, news of the encirclement of foreign colonies in the Delta and Upper Egypt regions reached

⁷⁶ Ferid 2017, p. 498.

⁷⁷ Chirol 1921, p. 149; Mohammad Mahmud, Ismail Sidki and Hammad al-Basil Pashas were arrested and exiled to Malta together with Zaghlul. Emin 2017, p. 39.

⁷⁸ Its thousands of turbaned students became as ardent champions of complete independence as the pupils, past and present, of the Government schools and colleges who had imbibed from their European education a crude belief in Western ideals of liberty and in the saving virtue of democratic institutions. Chirol 1921, p. 150.

⁷⁹ Cantori 1966, pp. 193-194.

⁸⁰ Cantori 1966, p. 194; Rogan 2009, p. 185.

⁸¹ Rogan 2009, p. 185.

⁸² Rogan 2009, p. 187.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

the capital. British troops and civilian personnel were killed on a train that went from Aswan to Cairo on March 18 and the British government decided to intervene this event very hard. However, the reports sent to the high commissioner warned that the events in Upper Egypt became uncontrollable. In fact, some British representatives watching the events reported that the incidents had gained a dimension in the Eastern Empire unprecedented since the Indian Revolt.⁸³ British soldiers and police officers assigned to cities to intervene in the events were instructed to be wary of the trappings of the people and to confront them directly with guns if they faced any traps. British soldiers began to increase street patrols with fearful gazes when the news broke that the Armenian and Greek shops were looted from along the streets of Cairo.⁸⁴ Cities were shaken with events of the demonstration, marching, rioting and looting, while in rural areas the events were up to the size of the uprising. People in the countryside understood what was really going on. Usually, those involved in the events were unarmed. But the rebels had a terrible impact. Cairo was largely disconnected from other parts of the country when it was approached towards the end of March.⁸⁵ The workers of High Commissariat in Cairo had never estimated that the events would reach these dimensions. The size of the events from the capital and other parts of the country reported that the damage in the report was terrible, as the result of the ambushes of those who tried to placate the events, there were dead and injured in British soldiers, the unauthorized access of British soldiers to the house by making unauthorized calls to the innocent and reported that the public used to force, wanted the attempts to stop the events as soon as possible.⁸⁶

The principle of self-determination of the nations declared by the Wilson Principles had significant influence over the fact that this nationalist uprising that had emerged in the immediate aftermath of the war was previously concealed and was accepted by the educated segment. But there were other reasons why the revolt was so widely accepted in Egypt.⁸⁷ Especially among the urban middle class, petty bourgeoisie, and workers existed a deepening economic reason for the acceptance of this movement and discontent with the British Government. Therefore, the fact that this growing nationalist wave in

⁸³ Fromkin 2001, p. 419.

⁸⁴ Grainger 2013, p. 212.

⁸⁵ Grainger 2013, p. 214.

⁸⁶ "To the Members of the Legislative Assembly and to the Provincial Council of Guizhou", Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 114-118.

⁸⁷ Polat 2013, p. 53.

Egypt was not only organized by the Nationalist al-Wafd Party but also a spontaneous rebellion emerged.⁸⁸

When in Egypt, the events were uncontrollable and the British Government immediately announced it had dismissed High Commissioner Reginald Wingate as part of the immediate measure, and instead appointed General Edmund Allenby as a Special High Commissioner of Egypt in Paris with full authority⁸⁹. As soon as he arrived in Egypt on March 25, Allenby published a program to restore order and end uneasiness. He tried to win the trust of some Egyptian council members whom he gathered at his residence, saying that his aim was to ensure tranquility firstly⁹⁰. General Allenby, who shared the developments with Lord Curzon, a member of the War Cabinet in London, reported that the reason for the incidents was the rejection of demands for independence by the British Government. However, despite the arrival of Allenby and the first important measures taken by him, the events were not settled especially in rural areas. Allenby announced that the soldiers getting involved in the crime would be tried immediately after the news that British soldiers burned some villages reached the capital.⁹¹ In such an environment, being heard of Lord Curzon's statement that a group of marauders made the events in Egypt caused a great resentment and reaction. The demonstration also led to a great strike⁹².

In his telegram to London, General Allenby suggested that Saad al Zaghul and the members of al- Wafd Party, who had been forced to go Malta for settling, were released as soon as possible, listing the reasons for the events. The British Government, based on this call from Allenby, reluctantly, issued a circular on April 6, allowing Zaghul and his returnees to be released on condition that they didn't return to Egypt, to attend the Peace Conference.⁹³ Thus, thirty days after their arrest, Saad al Zaghul and the members of al- Wafd Party, who struggled for Egypt's independence, was released. Hussein Rushdi was appointed prime minister. This event was welcomed with enthusiasm when heard all over the country, especially in the streets of Cairo.⁹⁴ In the following

⁸⁸ Polat 2013, p. 54.

⁸⁹ Ferid 2017, p. 499; Fromkin 2001, p. 420; Richmond 1977, p. 181.

⁹⁰ Wavell 1943, p. 38.

⁹¹ Grainger 2013, p. 220.

⁹² Wavell 1943, p. 39.

⁹³ Emin 2017, p. 42; The British Foreign Ministry didn't lean towards this proposal in the first place. In fact, the Ministry had to accept Allenby's suggestion, despite the negative opinion of Wintage, who claimed that they wanted to receive this permit before the events began, but this would be a sign of great weakness. Wavell 1943, p. 41.

⁹⁴ Grainger 2013, p. 221.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

days, the protest movements and the arrests and violent interventions of British troops against them continued for some time, albeit for some time⁹⁵. The government's intimidation policy of these incidents and extremism led to the government's resignation again on April 22.⁹⁶ A day later, Allenby calmed the events relatively by publishing another hard statement.⁹⁷ However, as a result, Allenby's six-year term in Egypt unabated and the British government's policy of vigilance continued. Interventions to nationalist incidents and subsequent pressure management led to an understanding of the fact that Britain couldn't dominate Egypt in the long run.⁹⁸

3. Studies of the Hejaz Delegation under the Presidency of Faisal in Europe and Hosted by the Paris Peace Conference

In November 1918, when Saad al Zaghul, in Cairo, went to meet with the British High Commissioner Wingate to attend the Paris Peace Conference on behalf of Egypt; the minister of foreign affairs in London, General Allenby sent a telegram to Wingate and Clayton asking whether would be suitable to be invited Sheriff Hussein to represent the views of the Arabs at the peace conference⁹⁹. This meant that in the British government in London, the French didn't want it, even if they were to be strongly opposed to it and approving of Britain that a committee from Hejaz would be allowed to go to Paris. Lawrence had already traveled to London long before the conference started and tried to make the necessary discussions and arrangements for the sake of representing Sheriff Hussein in the conference. Responding to General Allenby he stated his support for going Faisal saying that it would be good to have a representative in Paris on behalf of the Hejaz, if this representative would be Hussein's son Faisal, this led Faisal to becoming more famous. Lawrence requested the British, French, and Italian governments be informed through telegram of Sheriff Hussein as Faisal was to be a representative of the Hejaz and Arabs in early November. Faisal, who was instructed that he should go to Paris at the time when he was in Aleppo, and who should not trust anybody but Britain

⁹⁵ Emin 2017, p. 43.

⁹⁶ Goldschmidt 1988, p. 57.

⁹⁷ Wavell 1943, p. 41.

⁹⁸ Wavell 1943, p. 43; While Egypt witnessed such an uprising after the war, the Turkish people were fighting for freedom under the leadership of Mustafa Kemal Pasha in Anatolia in the same time. Zaghul and his supporters in particular followed the struggle closely and sympathized with the movement. Egyptian Press began to pay attention to announce the developments in Anatolia to the public. Naturally, this situation caused British Government officials to worry. For more information, see. Polat 2013, pp. 56-68.

⁹⁹ Allawi 2014, p. 170.

during the negotiations after receiving his father's instructions, started his journey to Europe via Beirut.¹⁰⁰ Faisal, who faced frustrating and unkind behavior of the French authorities when he was in Beirut, had begun to anticipate what awaited him, especially on French soil. As a matter of fact, when the ship carrying himself to Europe on November 26, approached the Port of Marseille, the French Government welcomed the French Delegation to treat Faisal as a distinguished military leader and son of a friendly sovereign king and ally.¹⁰¹

France had been suspicious of Sheriff Hussein's plans since the spring of 1916, when the Sykes-Picot Agreement was signed. He also stated that he had ambitions on Syria with the secret treaties signed and he had the British accepted it. Nevertheless, the British even invited Faisal and his delegation to negotiate the future of the Arab lands with knowing that Faisal and French officers came across, in conferences of the Arab authorities and French ambitions, in every ground where plans of sharing were negotiated. Indeed, Lloyd George would ensure that the Hejaz, whom they now see as kingdom, would be represented by two seats in the framework of the promises made to the Arabs, even at the peace conference, despite all the objections of the French.¹⁰² This was the British Government's tactic to corner the French in the Middle East and to help them in all grounds. The British also had promised the Arabs, the French, and the Jews in their shared policies in the Middle East. Now, when going the conference call for the fate of the Middle East will be determined, each of the parties will try to achieve success with diplomatic maneuvers at the point of obtaining the approval of the major states, especially Britain, to establish and validate its own thesis on an international platform. Paris, at this point, would never again be involved in such sharing talks.¹⁰³

In December, Faisal set foot in London after his troublesome days in France. All officials in government, especially Lawrence, were aware of his coming. But when Faisal and his entourage arrived in London, London hosted a mysterious conversation between Clemenceau and Lloyd George, who came together to make plans for resharing on the Middle East and hence on Arab lands.¹⁰⁴ In the talks, the two leaders tried to agree on the revision of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, signed between the two countries in 1916 and based on the sharing of the Middle East territories, based on changing interests,¹⁰⁵ According

¹⁰⁰ Lawrence 1970, p. 451.

¹⁰¹ Allawi 2014, pp. 174- 175.

¹⁰² Yavuz 2016, p. 300.

¹⁰³ MacMillan 2001, pp. 390-391.

¹⁰⁴ Öke 2011, p. 314.

¹⁰⁵ For revision, see. Hurewitz 1956, pp.50-58.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

to the agreement signed in 1916; Adana, Antakya Region, Syrian coast and Lebanon would be left to France; except Mosul, Iraq would be left to Britain. A large Arab kingdom was to be established under the auspices of British and French, including Mosul and Jordan and other regions of Syria. An international administration was to be established in Palestine, agreed by Russia and other Allies and Sheriff Hussein¹⁰⁶. However, in December of 1918, two leaders in London decided to revise this agreement without the knowledge of Sheriff Hussein, regions of Mosul and Syria were left to Britain, Syria and Lebanon were left to French. The British, however, agreed on the establishment of an Arab state in a treaty exchanged because of correspondences between Sheriff Hussein and McMahon in 1915, including the territories of Syria and Lebanon¹⁰⁷. Soon afterwards, the negotiation of the promises given by the parties to the Arabs in these meetings in London would have bothered Faisal and the Hejaz delegation that came with him. Although Faisal was not informed of this meeting when he first came to London, he would be aware of the secret talks between the French and the British from the press and political lobbying circles in the following days. Faisal met with British Foreign Minister Lord Balfour in this depression and talked about the treaties between McMahon and Sheriff Hussein and the British commitments expressed in the British government's statement of the Declaration and tried to tell causes of changing politics of Britain in Middle East¹⁰⁸. In fact, Faisal didn't know his father's correspondence with McMahon during the war when he toured Europe. When he learned about the existence of documents, he would immediately ask his father to write about the correspondences to justify his case, but he would get the answer from Sheriff Hussein that the necessary information could be given to him by the British Foreign Ministry. Faisal would then send one of his advisors to the foreign affairs office to reach correspondence between Sheriff Hussein and McMahon. As a matter of fact, Faisal was aware of the existence of documents and would be regretful, considering that his father didn't inform him before about these documents.¹⁰⁹ In spite of the absence of the vital documents of the Hussein- McMahon correspondence, Faisal had to evolve a negotiating strategy in dealing with the Allies¹¹⁰.

¹⁰⁶ Uçarol 1995, p. 495.

¹⁰⁷ Köse 2014, p. 143.

¹⁰⁸ It is a statement that the British Government issued to seven Arab leaders in June 1918. The British government was considered the leader of the Arabs as which is independent before the war or during the war, living in the areas liberated from Turkey "*has sovereignty and independence*". Helmreich 1974, p. 8.

¹⁰⁹ Allawi 2014, p. 194.

¹¹⁰ Allawi 2014, p. 194.

Faisal received great interest from the British authorities in contrast to the days in Paris at the time of his days in London. Of course, the effect of Lawrence in this interest was enormous. He held talks with British government officials and all those who were experts on the Middle East for not being victimized Arabs to the passions of French and prepared the press for the Arabs' thesis.¹¹¹

Faisal didn't leave the meeting with Lord Balfour with a very good impression and was in talks with the George V of United Kingdom, Lord Curzon and Lloyd George in the following days, but, although he hoped in these meetings, he had a serious concern over the negotiations with the French in sharing the Syrian and Arab lands¹¹².

When Faisal informed his father about these negotiations, which took place a few weeks before the Paris Peace Conference, he also tried to learn how to position himself against this situation. Father Sheriff Hussein closely followed Faisal's European contacts. In a moral telegram he sent to Faisal before the conference started, he wanted his basic policies to be based on cooperation with Britain, to meet with British statesmen in conference calls and to act according to the instructions they gave him¹¹³.

On January 18, 1919, the peace conference officially opened at the splendid Salle d' Horloge at the Quai d'Orsay in Paris, the Hejaz delegation took its place as representatives of all participating states. Faisal was the only Arab representative to attend the conference with Rustem Haidar, who was in the Arab delegation.¹¹⁴

In the meantime, within the bounds of possibility provided for him, Faisal had sent the memorandum he previously presented to the British Foreign Office in a semi-skeptical atmosphere and expressed as the wishes of the Arabs on January 1, 1919, before the peace conference had officially begun for being presented to the Council of Ten. In this memorandum, Faisal demanded that all lands to the south of the Iskenderun line be granted independence. Faisal argued as reason that by pointing out the natural boundaries that constitute the social and economic unit of the region, more than 99% of the people in the regions demanding independence came from the Sami race, they spoke the same language and believed in the same religion. Although he acknowledged that this

¹¹¹ Lawrance 1970, p. 541.

¹¹² During his meetings in London, Faisal was to discuss the situation of Jews in Palestine with Weizmann, one of the Zionist leaders. For details of the interviews see. Allawi 2014, pp. 184-190; for more information about Zionist movement, also see; Sorby 2006, pp. 52-53.

¹¹³ Evans 1965, p. 117.

¹¹⁴ Allawi 2014, p. 195.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

was unlikely due to some economic and social differences, Faisal stressed that he personally favored an Arab unity under the mandate of a single state. Although he wanted to see Lebanon as independent, he was aware that some Lebanese would want French protection. Thus, Faisal wanted not only a connection between France to remaining of Lebanon in the future of the Arab Confederation in this topic. Faisal said that he wanted to have an independent status without any external control over Syria, but underlined that it would be an appropriate decision to send an international commission to Syria to fully understand the will of the Syrian people. He pointed the establishment of a separate state under the political guidance for Mesopotamia, and the organization of tribes for the Hejaz region to the establishment of an independent state here. In Palestine, he said that he would accept the power of a European power in the region, considering the Zionist interests¹¹⁵.

In February 6, namely in the days when Saad al Zaghlul bombarded the representatives of the Allied Powers to join the peace conference with the intention of announcing Egypt's voice to the international community, Faisal went to peace conference received invitation to defend his case within the framework of the memorandum he presented earlier in the Council of Ten. This was a historic moment both for him and for the future of the Arabs. Because after the world war, the new order will be established and the representatives of many nations applied to participate and to express their cases, but the Allies accepted a very limited number of applications. At this point, as mentioned above, the condition of Faisal and, therefore, of the Hejaz delegation was very different, but with a special privilege. Faisal, although aware of this, was excited and anxious in front of the council. He would defend his cause against the victors of the last world war, who would look friendly to him, but instead look out for the enemy; he would answer questions of this direction. In the Quai d'Orsay, where the Council gathered, Faisal entered the interviews hall with the introduction of Clemenceau, dressed in the traditional Arab attire, as Lawrence had asked him to. After he was promised, he started to address the Allied leaders who came there after the gunfire and the silence of the guns to resurrect the world by standing up heavily¹¹⁶.

Faisal, who based his speech mainly on the Wilson Principles, *started by saying, "I am pleased to be in this company that includes the great leaders of the world and I believe that this higher forum will treat the Arab nation equitably, as they seek to defend their natural rights."*¹¹⁷ and then he delivered

¹¹⁵ Yavuz 2016, p. 302.

¹¹⁶ MacMillan 2001, p. 391; Allawi 2014, p. 199.

¹¹⁷ Allawi 2014, p. 199.

the main body of his speech. He then proceeded to impress people across by passing main sections of his conversation, with the sound parts of the Arabic language, the melodic tone of his voice, by obeying the basic parts of his speech and observing the accented sentences and the speech¹¹⁸.

Faisal asked for permission to complete his discourse without interruptions while the deadline for granting him the expiration. While Faisal spoke, an assistant sitting next to Clemenceau translated his words into French. Lawrence also translated speech into English at regular intervals while Faisal gave his speech. Wilson shook his head as he nodded while speaking at the main points of the conversation, and Lloyd George smiled. Orlando nodded as he agreed. Just Clemenceau and Pichon's brows furrowed. This was a sign that Faisal's speech and the evidence he presented disturbed the French. Faisal spoke that remained loyal to the text of the Arab memorandum previously presented to the British foreign affairs. According to this; he demanded the route from Iskenderun and Diyarbakir in the North and the geography of the Asian continent extending to the Indian Ocean in the south that the Arab population be recognized as a sovereign people and that the League of Nations confirmed this right. Faisal's speech, "*The Allies promised the Arab Nation its freedom and independence at the end of the war. Now they have emerged from the war victorious, it is necessary that they abide by their promises. I am confident that the great powers will be interested in the welfare of the Arab people, than in their own material interests in the Arab countries... Arab National demands conform completely to the principles enunciated by President Wilson and which were agreed to by all the states of the world*"¹¹⁹ looking at the representatives of the Allied States who came to listen with great care, "...we will express our gratitude to you in exchange for helping us to contribute to your experience, not by imposing civilization on us."¹²⁰ he finished his words.

After the speech, President Wilson and Lloyd George asked Faisal some questions to learn more about the general nature of his claims. While Lloyd George asked questions about what kind of assistance Arabs offered to the Allies in the war; Wilson prefers questions like that a single mandate government on Arab lands, or more than one mandate government¹²¹.

Faisal made an effective speech in front of the council. Looking back at the echoes of the speech, both the content of the speech and the Arab questions,

¹¹⁸ Later, there were the ones who criticized Faisal's speech, who only read verses from the Qur'an and said that Lawrence, who was in charge of translating it, spoke in English. MacMillan 2004, p. 391.

¹¹⁹ Allawi 2014, p. 200.

¹²⁰ FO, 608/92, No: 1551, January 29, 1919.

¹²¹ MacMillan 2001, p. 391.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

detailed with the questions asked later, disturbed the delegation of the French delegation who tried to dismiss the Hejaz delegation under all conditions. However, since the French had already calculated that Faisal could be attracted attention in advance of the conference, they would take themselves the Syrian Central Committee Chairman Sukru Ganem, who had been in France for several years, especially about Syria, to speak in front of the Council for mentioning French demands. Although Ganem's speech was soon understood as a struggle for French prejudice against Faisal,¹²² the French didn't want to tolerate the Hejaz Committee about places which were made terms in Sykes-Picot Agreement, which had been revised with the British, especially Syria. So much so that the effects of his speech at the conference found in the Paris press echo in the following days; heavy insults would be made with mocking words like that Faisal was a British puppet. Although Lawrence had warned him in advance of such attacks, Faisal was extremely disturbed by the severe insults when the heavy insults started to be more. Faisal, however, wrote a letter to his brother Zaid who was left behalf in Damascus, after this move of the French, and asked those who had come from Syria, notables, to send telegrams to the conference to inform him that they had chosen him as the representative of the Syrian people. In this direction, support telegrams from various parts of Syria began to come to Faisal¹²³.

Faisal's speech in front of the council began to spread out in a short time. To celebrate himself on February 10, Sheriff Hussein pulled a telegram to Faisal, "*He did the right job for his country at the right time...*"¹²⁴, congratulated him on the grounds.

As the repercussions of Faisal's influence on the peace conference continued, Faisal decided to stay in Paris for a while, albeit in a difficult situation. Council of Ten had not yet decided on the future of the Arab lands. However, from this moment on, Faisal would try to make the desired decision for the Syrian and Arab lands through various discussions, especially with British and US diplomats and delegates. As a matter of fact, Faisal and his delegation joined Lloyd George's office on March 20, including Lloyd George, Wilson and Clemenceau. Although the main issue was the future of Syria, it essentially gathered to give direction to the wishes of the Arabs. British and French tensions on Syria marked in the meeting; Faisal looked for ways to benefit the most from this tension. According to him, this problem would be resolved according to Wilson's decision. Therefore, in topic of the future of the

¹²² Allawi 2014, p. 202.

¹²³ FO, 608/92, No: 6816, March 5, 1919.

¹²⁴ FO, 608/92, No: 2235, February 10, 1919.

Arab lands, Wilson brought the issue of sending an international commission to the disputed areas, especially in Syria, in the same meeting, to learn the wishes of the people of region by while the Syrian issue two allies dragged this way into the deadlock.¹²⁵ This was an invaluable opportunity for the Faisal and Hejaz Delegation. Hence, from the end of March, it was decided that an international commission, consisting of US experts, would be created and sent to the region, which would be named the King-Crane Commission and which the French didn't give delegate.¹²⁶

During nearly five months of carrying out diplomacy between London and Paris, Faisal spent considerable time trying to explain the Arab cause and gather supporters. However, the only concrete fact he could obtain during this time was the creation of the King Commission, which President Wilson supported, and his transfer to Syria. On an extremely slippery slope, he saw support from the British. In a recent move he left Paris to return to Damascus on April 21, knowing that it was only a matter of time before the French and the British decided to leave Syria under French rule. After this point, the Faisal and Hejaz delegation would prepare for the best way to host the King-Crane Committee in Syria and Lebanon and try to provide international support to the Arab cause with the Syrian people on the Arab lands.

4. Inviting Saad al Zaghul to the Paris Peace Conference and his trying to Influence the Allies Heads of the Conference

After the release of Saad al Zaghul and other nationalists, on April 9, Hussein Rushdi Pasha was convinced to rebuild the government under his own leadership. With the establishment of the government, the normalization of things could be understood from the joyful demonstrations in Cairo. Immediately after their release, Saad al Zaghul and other nationalists arrived in Paris on April 20.¹²⁷

The day after the Egyptian delegation arrived in Paris, Faisal left Paris to go to Damascus to conduct the propaganda activities, to see studies of the King-Crane Commission, which was to be formed after the Paris Peace Conference. Although not exactly mentioned, he was very hopeful for the first round of the interviews in Paris. The establishment of the King-Crane Commission, which would later be called the American Delegation and its work, would be interpreted as the support of the US administration to the Arab cause. During his

¹²⁵ Öke 2011, p. 318.

¹²⁶ Umar 2004, p. 360; In addition, for information on the creation and work of the King- Crane Commission, see: Karakaya 2001.

¹²⁷ Ferid 2017, pp 499-500.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

detention in Malta, Saad al Zaghul and other nationalists followed closely the Faisal work in Paris and London. Even though they were imprisoned, they believed that close attention to Faisal, especially from the British and Americans, would be shown to them. It was this hope that in almost all those who supported Egypt's independence when they arrived in Paris with these feelings.¹²⁸

When Saad al Zaghul and other nationalists arrived in Paris, they had started the studies of peace conference. Regarding Egypt's independence, thousands of petitions were sent to the Council of Ten. But Britain seemed to have decided on the future of Egypt. As a matter of fact, two days after he first arrived in Paris in such an environment, Zaghul stated on April 22 by writing a letter to President Wilson that the British had postponed the decision on the future of Egypt. They came to Paris to defend the rightful cause of the Egyptian people without any discrimination, hereby to tell the importance of his case to the president “...one of my colleagues or the day and hour when you are with me...” they demanded an interview. When Zaghul wrote the letter, the British government had imposed its protection policy on Egypt to the American delegations, primarily Wilson. In this respect, even though the British government didn't seem uncomfortable with Zaghul's arrival in Paris, his efforts to influence Allied delegates, Zaghul was still closely following all his work. But Zaghul didn't want to give up. In a letter to President Wilson on April 29, he spoke extensively about how the Wilson Principles echoed in Egypt, said that” ... *All the hopes of the Egyptian people...*” was President Wilson. Zaghul, “...*Egypt is the cradle of civilization. Therefore, when you say that justice and equality must be ruled, the Egyptian people have full confidence in the high mission you undertake.*”¹²⁹ ending with these sentences his long letter.

Saad al Zaghul on June 6 by writing another letter to President Wilson; said that the American administration had learned that Britain recognized its patronage policy on Egypt and that this news had deeply shaken the belief of the people of Egypt in America and its principles of equality, he talked about applications of” *Revenge taker* “which were made as patronage politics in Egypt by Britain. Zaghul requested an appointment from President Wilson in his attentive letter¹³⁰. Zaghul's insistent remarks to President Wilson were not ultimately answered from the president but from Wilson's special secretary

¹²⁸ Deeb 1979, pp. 46-48.

¹²⁹ “*To President Woodrow Wilson, Grand Hotel Paris, April 29, 1919*”, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 53-54.

¹³⁰ “*To President Woodrow Wilson, Grand Hotel Paris, April 22, 1919*”, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 59-60.

Gilbert F. Close. A letter sent on June 9 stated that “...will not meet you on the grounds that it is not time...” of President Wilson.¹³¹ This letter, addressed to Saad al Zaghlul, was only five lines. No other expression was used. This was the last contact in Paris between Wilson and Zaghlul.

Zaghlul was aware that the doors he had knocked while he was in Paris were closed to his face because of the isolationist policy imposed by Britain. Despite this, he didn't give up his letter diplomacy. The British allowed Zaghlul to come to Paris, and by this method they had helped to settle the events in Egypt. But this time they took Zaghlul as a prisoner in Paris. Even though Zaghlul was aware of this, he would not forget to write long letters in direct order to Clemenceau and to a peace conference after he wrote to Wilson. In a letter written directly to the conference council on April 28, he stated that problem became a serious threat for Middle East and world peace if a permanent solution was not found here for Egypt, mentioning the Egyptian issue for the first time since 1840 had found a suitable solution authority. Zaghlul stated that the unilaterally fait accompli by the international council was unacceptable. “It is a violation of the charter of the Treaty of 1840 when a new status was reached in the Egyptian problem without resorting to the demands of the Egyptian people” he mentions. In his letter he emphasized how important the issue is, by questioning “Europeans are not interested in detailing this treaty, which has been in existence since 19. centuries; in contrast, isn't it surprising that even small nations of the 20th century are involved in an interest that concerns their interests?” he expressed that Egypt didn't deserve such an unfair approach.¹³²

Saad al Zaghlul continue to write the letter to Clemenceau in May, after not receiving a reply from his letter diplomacy. In this letter, which criticized Britain's patronage policy, Zaghlul emphasized that the Egyptian people condemned the failure to giving this right, although the Hejaz was, who didn't strive as hard as Egypt in the war, with a delegation at the conference. And to Clemenceau,” How can you explain that a primitive and resource-poor population like the Hejaz can overcome a country like Egypt?” he questioned. The practices to Greece and Hejaz which he described as tribe states “...in this environment where the strong is right...” he stated that this decision would never satisfy them.¹³³

¹³¹ “American Commission to Negotiate Peace, Mr. Saad al Zaghlul Chairman of the Egyptian Delegation”, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), p. 61.

¹³² “To Paris Peace Conference, Grand Hotel, Paris April 28, 1919”, Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 69-72.

¹³³ “To President of the Peace Conference Monsieur George Clemenceau, Paris, May 12, 1919,” Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 74-76.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

In May and June, he would write two more letters addressed one to American Senator Borah and one to the American Senate, with all hopes tied to the letters he wrote from Paris. In the letter written to the Senate, Zaghlul wanted to protest the treatments and the decisions taken in Paris, with this decision Zaghlul stated that the United States of America's postwar reputation in the world public opinion was damaged.¹³⁴

While Saad al Zaghlul continued his unilateral letter diplomacy in Paris, things were not going well in Egypt. The Cabinet of Hussein Rushdi Pasha, which was established on April 7, would decide to resign immediately after he took office. Undoubtedly, behind this decision were the developments in Paris and the UK's adoption of Egypt's patronage policy to the Allied Powers in April.¹³⁵

Saad al Zaghlul and other nationalists, who had been trying to influence the Allies' presidents for months in Paris, decided to return to Egypt empty-handedly at the end of July. The struggle for diplomacy in Paris was stuck in the harsh boycott of Britain, and the Egyptian case couldn't be brought to the agenda of the peace conference. This meant the beginning of a new era in Egypt. Britain wanted to conduct dialogue with high-level circles in Cairo with canal of King Fuad. With this aim, he would seek ways to sign a treaty with the Egyptian government in July. But in Egypt, the waters would not settle on Britain¹³⁶.

Meanwhile, in July, Britain tried to accelerate diplomacy in Cairo and to find solutions to the Egyptian issue in this way; in Damascus, Faisal prepared to gather strength in Maysulon to fight against the French, who he accused of occupying their country. This was the beginning of the end in Syria for Faisal. As a matter of fact, when Egypt, led by Saad al Zaghlul, entered the new year with new hopes, Faisal and his father Sheriff Hussein were welcomed with applause at the Paris Peace Conference, geography of Arab was brought up, instead of The Great Arab Empire which they hoped, its borders were crumbled according to Allies and left to the mercy of mandate governments of minified big states.

Conclusion

The Paris Peace Conference, which took place in January 1919, lasted approximately ten months. However, very important decisions were taken

¹³⁴ "A Telegram to Senator Borah, Washington, June 29, 1919; A Telegram to American Senate, Washington June 8, 1919, "Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), pp. 101-102.

¹³⁵ Ferid 2017, p. 503.

¹³⁶ Emin 2017, p. 45.

within the first six months. Considering the promises given during the war, the secret treaties signed, and the declarations published, the expectation that the world would be reshaped, especially in the Middle East, had embraced all the nations that prepared to demand land and independence first from the victor states and then from the defeated states. The promises and treaties the UK provided after the war immersed Sheriff Hussein and some Arab soldiers, civilians and intellectuals who had been acting with him in a rage of excitement.

When Faisal and Hejaz Committee returned to Damascus by not taking what they wanted, they knew that they would fight France for a single Arab Empire, including Syria. However, neither the British nor the French wanted to turn Sheriff Hussein and his supporters out who they fought against the Turks with them. While they prepared to recognize Sheriff Hussein as a king of Hejaz, in a designated area, they were ready to make their sons to establish and to rule themselves in the ministerial princes under their mandate.

In July 1920, Faisal declared that he would not accept it, and when he was defeated in the short time against the French forces with a small number of the mighty forces he had barely gathered in Maysulon, he realized that a large and broad Arab Kingdom would no longer be possible. When Faisal had been expelled from Syria after this war and sought shelter by the British, the British government had begun to think about where he was and how he would rule in a state. The spring and summer of 1921 were the months in which British authorities conducted intense diplomatic negotiations to make Faisal and his brother Abdullah a king in a state to be established in the Middle East¹³⁷. As a result, after all these endeavors, they led Sheriff Hussein to become king of Hejaz, as the British promised. They appointed his son Faisal to Iraq and the other son Abdullah to Jordan, which they had just established¹³⁸. Palestine which Sheriff Hussein and his sons waited for the Arab Empire, never connected to the Hejaz, it was left to the administration of the British under an international administration. As a result, three years after the end of the war, the Middle East gained its new design, while in Paris many of the elements expressed by Faisal were not realized and the Arab lands were fragmented.

It is not known whether Sheriff Hussein and his sons regret it, but the British saw the Hejaz Kingdom as more for Sheriff Hussein from 1924, and they were going to pressure Sheriff Hussein to be transferred to the Ibn Saud family they had previously contacted.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Gilbert 2000, pp. 432-434.

¹³⁸ For more information on the Cairo Conference, which provides for the division of the Middle East in this way, see. Yüce 2016, pp. 267-292.

¹³⁹ Rogan 2009, p. 202.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

In the late 1920s, when a new Arab State was established under the Saudis administration in the Arabian Peninsula, Sheriff Hussein's common struggle with the British during the war would never come to mind.

As Faisal went to Paris with great hopes, Saad al Zaghul, who never crossed their paths, would ask countless times to the British gates that had closed his face to be invited to the conference of Hejaz delegation. The British authorities in Cairo warned London that the Hejaz delegation must have in Paris, while Saad al Zaghul and other nationalists demanded the same request, *“they cause confusion in the country “they were exiled to Malta on the grounds.* But perhaps the underestimated Egyptian demand for independence caused a major social explosion in Egypt immediately after their deportation, and thirty days after the British authorities were arrested, they had to release Zaghul and other nationalists let them come to Paris. However, the decision of the British administration was certain. Egypt would not be included in the Paris Peace Conference, which gathered immediately after the war, and its demands would not be heard. For now, they didn't want to be engaged in Egyptian case. In Egypt, however, there was a community of people who didn't wait and became increasingly boiling. As Saad al Zaghul said, Egypt only wanted this right to be recognized from Allied states, even though it had already deserved its independence.

When they came to Paris, Saad al Zaghul and other nationalists, they had perhaps met a British blockade, which they didn't expect. No effective door opened to their faces, moreover, they were not even answered to political letters. In addition to all of this, they were devastated when they learned that the US administration, which they trusted, had accepted the patronage policy of Britain over Egypt, but they didn't give up the struggle. All they had left to do was write a letter to the Allied representative, and they did so. However, they returned from Paris to Egypt at the end of July 1919, before the issue of the independence of Egypt could be raised in an international meeting.

Egypt was unable to achieve its independence at the Paris Peace Conference. But with an exuberant crowd they showed that, when they wanted, they had shown not only to the British, to the whole world, they would paralyze life in Egypt. As a matter of fact, when Britain sought in search of new dormitories for Sheriff Hussein and his sons, he would take his steps in the consciousness of the possibility of a social explosion in Egypt with the demand of independence. The process of emancipation of Egypt, which had begun under the leadership of Saad al Zaghul in November 1918, was successful in 1922 and London would recognize Egypt's independence. However, Britain would

still see as a need to act like a cunning diplomat.¹⁴⁰ When they gave Egypt its independence in February 1922, it was never forgetting the geographical location and historical importance of Egypt, in agreement of pull-out, they didn't neglect to place "*Based on the protection of British interests*" four main elements.¹⁴¹

When Egypt achieved independence; Faisal who was applauded in London in 1919 and attracted great attention at the Paris Peace Conference and Sheriff Hussein, who sent him to this conference, tried to get to know their country and the people of that country within the framework of their treaties with the British in a country where they were appointed king. But that wouldn't be so easy. In these countries, new chaos would emerge.

As a matter of fact, Egypt took its place on history pages as the first country to obtain independence in Arab lands after World War I; states such as Palestine, Syria, Iraq would enter into a new process with public settlements who rebel against administrations founded. The British and French who established mandate governments in these countries would never be able to establish security in these countries and would not succeed in loving themselves to the peoples of the region.

¹⁴⁰ Emin 2017, p. 44-51.

¹⁴¹ Deeb 1979, p. 51.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

BIBLIOGRAPHY

a. Archive Resources

- FO, 371/2130, No: E 3451.
IOR. L/PS/10/523, No: 4532.
FO, 608/92, No: 1551.
FO, 608/92, No: 6816.
FO, 608/92, No: 2235.

b. Published Archive Resources

Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920), Egypt, Egyptian Delegation to The Peace Conference, Collection of Official Correspondence from November 11, 1918, to July 14, 1919, Twelve Appendices Containing Verbatim Transcriptions of Official Egyptian Reports, Correspondence, Depositions of Victims, Cornell University Library, Published by Delegation, Paris, 1919.

c. Periodicals

- İkdam
The Manchester Guardian
Tanin
Times

d. Books

- Allawi 2014 A. Ali Allawi, *Faisal I of Iraq*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Antonius 1962 George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening: The Story of the Arab National Movement*, Beirut.
- Bayur 1983 Yusuf Hikmet Bayur, *Türk İnkılabı Tarihi* (1914-1918 Genel Savaşı), C.III, K.3 TTK Yay., Ankara.
- C.W.R. 2005 C.W.R., *British Pro-Consuls in Egypt 1914-1929 The Challenge of Nationalism*, Routledge Curzon Studies in Middle Eastern History, Oxon.
- Chirol 1921 Sir Valetine Chirol, *The Egyptian Problem*, Macmillan and Co., Limited, London.
- Cleveland - Bunton 2009 W. L. Cleveland- Martin Bunton, *A History of the Modern Middle East*, 4th edition, Westview Press, Philadelphia.
- Deeb 1979 Marius Deeb, *Party Politics in Egypt: Wafd & its Rivals: 1919-1939*, The Middle East Centre St Antony's College Oxford, London.
- Evans 1965 Laurance Evans, *United States Policy and The Partition of Turkey, 1914-1924*, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore.

Resul YAVUZ

- Ferid 2017 Muhammed Ferid, *Mısır Mısırlılarıdır, İngiliz İşgali Karşı Osmanlı Hilafeti*, Trans. Ali Benli, Macit Karagözoğlu, Klasik Press, İstanbul.
- Fromkin 2001 David Fromkin, *A Peace to End All Peace*, Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Gilbert 2000 Martin Gilbert, *Churchill, a Life*, Published by Pimlico, London.
- Goldschmidt 1988 Arthur Goldschmidt, *Modern Egypt, The Formation of a National State*, Hutchinson Press, London.
- Grainger 2013 John D. Grainger, *The Battle for Syria 1918-1920*, The Boydell Press, Woodbridge.
- Helmreich 1974 Paul C. Helmreich, *From Paris To Sevres*, Ohio State University Press, Columbus.
- Hurewitz 1956 J.C Hurewitz, *Diplomacy in the Near and Middle East, a Documentary Record: 1914-1956*, D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. New York.
- İrtem 1999 Süleyman Kani İrtem, *Osmanlı Devleti'nin Mısır, Yemen, Hicaz Meselesi*, Prepared by Osman Selim Kocahanoğlu, Temel Press, İstanbul.
- İskit 2017 Temel İskit, *Diplomasinin Gücü Modern Ortadoğu'nun Şekillenmesi*, İstanbul Bilgi University Press, İstanbul.
- Kandemir 2007 Feridun Kandemir, *Fahrettin Paşa'nın Medine Müdafası*, İstanbul.
- Karakaya 2001 Ali Karakaya, *Milli Mücadele'de Manda Sorunu ve Harbold ve King-Crane Heyetleri*, Başkent Press, Ankara.
- Kayalı 1997 Hasan Kayalı, *Arabs and Young Turks, Ottomanism, Arabism, and Islamism in the Ottoman Empire 1908-1918*, University of California Press, Los Angeles.
- Kayra 2008 Cahit Kayra, *Arap İhtilali ve Şam Mahkemesi*, Yeditepe Press., İstanbul.
- Kılınçkaya 2015 M. Derviş Kılınçkaya, *Osmanlı Yönetimindeki Topraklarda Arap Milliyetçiliğinin Doğuşu ve Suriye*, III. Edition, AAM Press, Ankara.
- Koloğlu 2017 Orhan Koloğlu, *Türk-Arap İlişkileri*, II. Edition, Tarihçi Booksote, İstanbul.
- Köse 2014 İsmail Köse, *İngiliz Arşiv Belgelerinde Hicaz İsyanı*, Selis Press, İstanbul.
- Kurşun 1998 Zekeriye Kurşun, *Necid ve Ahsa'da Osmanlı Hakimiyeti, Vehhabi Hareketi ve Suud Devleti'nin Ortaya Çıkışı*, TTK Press, Ankara.
- Kurşun 1992 Zekeriya Kurşun, *Yol Ayrımında Türk- Arap İlişkileri*, İrfan Press, İstanbul.

The Activities of the Hejaz and Egypt Committees that were Invited to The Paris Peace Conference after the World War I

- Lawrance 1970 T.E. Lawrance, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*, Penguin Books, London.
- Lutskiy 1969 V. Lutskiy, *Modern History of the Arab Countries*, U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences Institute of the Peoples of Asia, Moscow.
- MacMillan 2001 Margaret MacMillan, *Paris 1919, Six Months that Changed the World*, Random House Inc., New York.
- Nicolson 1967 Harold Nicolson, *King George V*, Pan Books Ltd, London.
- Öke 2011 Mim Kemal Öke, *Siyonizm ve Filistin Sorunu (1880-1932)*, 2nd. Edition, Kırmızıkeci Press, İstanbul.
- Özdemir and Irkışatal 2011 Bülent Özdemir, Eftal Irkışatal, *İngiliz Arap Büro Raporlarında Arap Ayaklanması, Bir İsyanın Kodları*, Yitik Hazine Press, İzmir.
- Polat 2015 Ü. Gülsüm Polat, *Osmanlı Devleti ve İngiltere Ekseninde I. Dünya Savaşı Yıllarında Mısır*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Press, Ankara.
- Richmond 1977 J.C.B. Richmond, "Egypt 1798-1953", Columbia University Press, New York.
- Rifaat Bey 1947 M. Rifaat Bey, *The Awakening of Modern Egypt*, Longmans, Green and com, London.
- Rogan 2009 Eugene Rogan, *The Arabs*, Perseus Books Group, New York.
- Shaw 2008 Standford Shaw, *The Ottoman Empire in World War I*, Vol. 2 Turkish Historical Society Pub. Ankara.
- Tandoğan 2013 Muhammed Tandoğan, *Afrika'da Sömürgecilik ve Osmanlı Siyaseti (1800-1922)*, Turkish Historical Society Pub., Ankara.
- Tauber 1993 Eliezer Tauber, *The Arab Movements in World War I*, Frank Cass and Co. Ltd., London.
- Uçarol 1995 Rıfat Uçarol, *Siyasi Tarih (1789-1994)*, I. Edition, Filiz Bookstore, İstanbul.
- Umar 2004 Ömer Osman Umar, *Osmanlı Yönetimi ve Fransız Manda İdaresi Altında Suriye (1908-1938)*, Atatürk Araştırma Merkezi Press, Ankara.
- Uzunçarşılı 1984 İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Mekke-i Mükerrerme Emirleri*, Turkish Historical Society Pub., Ankara.
- Wavell 1943 Viscount Wavel, *Allenby in Egypt*, George G. Harrap Com& Ltd., London.
- Weigall 1915 Arthur E.P. Brome Weigal, *A History of Events in Egypt From 1798 to 1914*, William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburg and London.
- Yılmaz 2017 Sait Yılmaz, *Türk-İngiliz İstihbarat Savaşları 1914-1918*, Kripto Press, İstanbul.

Resul YAVUZ

- Yorulmaz 2018 Naci Yorulmaz, *Büyük Savaşın Kara Kutusu*, Kronik Press, 2. Edition, İstanbul.
- Yüce 2016 Samet Yüce, *Britanya'nın Ortadoğu Politikası ve Gertrude Bell*, Nizamiye Akademi Press, İstanbul.

e. Articles

- Murat 2013 Turgay Murat, "Kuruluşundan İkinci Dünya Savaşı Sonuna Kadar Mısır Siyasetinde Vafd Partisi", *Fırat Üniversitesi Ortadoğu Araştırmaları Dergisi*, IX/ I, Elazığ, pp. 159-173.
- Okutan 2001 Çağatay Okutan, "Arap Milliyetçiliği", *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 56/2, Ankara, pp. 157-172.
- Polat 2013 Ü. Gülsüm Polat, "Milli Mücadele Sürecinde Mısır ile Kurulan Bağ ve Kemalist Propaganda Algısı", *Akademik Ortadoğu*, V. 8/1, 2013, pp.51-70.
- Sorby 2006 Karol Sorby, "The Arab National Movement in World War I", *Asian and African Studies* Vol. I/15, Institute of Oriental Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, pp. 40-54.

f. Thesis

- Cantori 1966 Lois Cantori, *The Organizational Basis of an Elite Political Party: Egyptian Wafd*, University of Chicago, Unpublished Phd Thesis, Chicago.
- Emin 2017 Asuman Emin, *Mısır Siyasetinde Vefd Partisi*, Fatih Sultan Mehmet Foundation University, Alliance of Civilizations Institute, Civilizations Research Department, (Unpublished Master's Thesis), İstanbul.
- Yavuz 2016 Resul Yavuz, *Mondros Ateşkes Antlaşması'ndan Sevr Barış Antlaşması'na Giden Süreçte Türk Diplomasisi*, Dokuz Eylül University, Institute of Atatürk Principles and Revolutions, (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), İzmir.