

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

10 February 2016

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Beckerman-Boys, Carly (2014) 'Third parties and the Arab-Israeli conflict : Poliheuristic Decision Theory and British mandate Palestine policy.', *Foreign policy analysis.*, 10 (3). pp. 225-242.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12017>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is a pre-copyedited, author-produced PDF of an article accepted for publication in *Foreign Policy Analysis* following peer review. The version of record Beckerman-Boys, Carly (2014) 'Third parties and the Arab-Israeli conflict : Poliheuristic Decision Theory and British mandate Palestine policy.', *Foreign policy analysis.*, 10 (3): 225-242 is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/fpa.12017>

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

THIRD PARTIES AND THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT: POLIHEURISTIC DECISION THEORY AND BRITISH MANDATE PALESTINE POLICY¹

CARLY BECKERMAN-BOYS

University of Birmingham

When dealing with the importance of third parties in the Arab-Israeli² conflict, the example of United States involvement is most frequently cited. From President Truman's declaration of support for Israel in 1948 to Obama's first term commitment to Israeli-Palestinian talks, the dominant American role as mediator and facilitator in a search for Middle East peace has overshadowed attempts made by other players to alter the trajectory of negotiations. The United States' position as sole superpower assists this singular perspective, but it is not the first great power to dominate third party intervention in the Arab-Israeli conflict, and considering the potential for waning U.S. economic and political importance, it is not likely to be the last. The history of the conflict is beset by broad diplomatic failures, and so third party motives, intentions and constraints must be a crucial element to comprehending it as a whole.

In order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of the international dynamic of third party intervention in the conflict, it is first necessary to understand how policy towards it is formulated. This requires systematizing the relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy in a framework that is not country-specific. The solution must involve a multi-level, multi-disciplinary analysis and a

¹ The author would like to thank Dr Asaf Siniver, University of Birmingham and Dr James D Boys, King's College London for their help and support in writing this article, as well as the blind reviewers, whose insightful comments were extremely helpful and appreciated.

² Although the case study in this paper occurred in 1922 before the creation of Israel, the term "Arab-Israeli" conflict is appropriate considering the continuity of tensions between the two communities before and after 1948. This terminology avoids unnecessary confusion with potentially misleading language such as "Arab-Jewish" or "Arab-Zionist" conflict.

framework that applies decision-making theory to historical case studies in order to distill generalizable analyses without sacrificing realistic complexity. Poliheuristic Decision (Ph) Theory is a useful tool to provide this type of analysis. Using a two-stage decision-making process, the theory provides a capacity for detail coupled with outcome validity as well as the ability to address what otherwise appears to be irrational behavior on the part of third parties. Poliheuristic Decision Theory's fundamental assertion of a two-stage decision-making process operates as follows: in the first stage, alternatives are eliminated from the choice set based on noncompensatory risk presented to the political dimension (Mintz and Geva 1997; Mintz 2002). The second stage of the decision-making process then attempts to bridge the divide between rational choice and cognitive schools by allowing the decision-maker to go through an analytic process of choosing an option that minimizes risk and guarantees rewards (Mintz 2002).

In relation to the study of third party roles in the Arab-Israeli conflict, this is achieved most effectively through a qualitative case study, not least because a traditional quantitative study of multiple nation states' involvement is unlikely to provide the detail necessary to understand this type of decision-making in the early stages of its study. While it is possible to use Poliheuristic Decision Theory in large-N studies (DeRouen and Sprecher 2004; Brulé and Mintz 2006), the nature of shifting and routine third party roles is more problematic to classify than crisis behavior. In addition, a qualitative approach utilizing Ph theory then also allows for an explanation for third party behavior that defies rationality – as defined by the rational choice model as purposive action seeking utility maximization (MacDonald 2003; Allison 1971). Crucially, the Ph approach provides a different but still widely generalizable understanding of rationality, one based primarily on the logic of political survival and

the non-compensatory principle (Mintz 2004). As this principle is excluded from both rational choice and the cybernetic model favored by cognitive theorists (Brulé 2008, 267), Ph theory provides a fundamental reframing of investigations into third party intervention in the Arab-Israeli conflict, from a focus on external to internal variables, the link between domestic political concerns and foreign policy decision-making and providing a rational explanation for otherwise irrational choices.

This paper deals with Britain, as the first great power to invest itself in what became the Arab-Israeli conflict in mandate Palestine. The case under scrutiny is a British cabinet-level decision in 1922 – in the form of the Churchill White Paper – to affirm the policy of building a Jewish national home in Palestine (based on the Balfour Declaration 1917) despite violent Arab opposition. Due to the wealth of archival material available, the use of a British case study is both appropriate and expedient; in applying Ph theory to this case study, the paper seeks to demonstrate the potential efficacy and generalizability of this poliheuristic approach to the study of third party roles in the conflict more generally, as well as to provide an explanation for the British cabinet's lack of utility maximization in 1922.

In October 1917, the British cabinet approved publication of the Balfour Declaration, which pledged support for a Jewish national home in Palestine a month before British troops successfully occupied Jerusalem. This promise was a wartime gamble made in conjunction with other, contradictory pledges to France (the Sykes-Picot Agreement 1916) and the Arabs (promises made by Sir Henry McMahon to Sharif Hussein of Mecca). When the First World War ended the following year, there was seemingly little to prevent Britain renegeing on promises made during the four-year crisis. However, despite violent protests within Palestine, the cabinet affirmed the policy of a Jewish national home in the Churchill White Paper 1922. Between the

declaration and its affirmation, two British commissions of inquiry uncovered fundamental and irresolvable flaws in the national home policy, making a simple cost-benefit analysis incapable of recommending its continuation. Why then, did the British cabinet affirm a commitment to involve itself in the Zionist project and specifically, to support Zionist political aspirations in Palestine rather than the nationalist ambitions of their Arab counterparts? Poliheuristic Decision Theory provides a convincing analysis.

In applying Ph theory's two-stage decision-making framework to Britain's national home policy, it is possible to demonstrate why the cabinet decided to affirm the policy in 1922 and how this very early example of third party intervention in the conflict was concluded entirely without reference to the interests of either community in Palestine. This paper argues that in the first stage of the decision-making process, the British cabinet rejected alternatives that scored too low on the most important, political dimension. Key variables considered reflect criteria outlined by Mintz (2004): threat to dignity, post-war economic decline and inter-party rivalry. Once options were eliminated, the cabinet chose among the remaining alternatives in the second stage of decision-making by seeking to minimize costs on the substantive, strategic dimension. This analysis reveals a third party intervention in the burgeoning Arab-Israeli conflict based primarily on the need to satisfy British domestic political concerns. It concludes that Ph theory provides a cogent explanation and post-diction of this decision as well as the ability to generalize to later and more culturally and politically diverse case studies, making it a highly useful theory of decision-making to assess third party roles in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Poliheuristic Decision Theory

The link between domestic and international politics is methodologically elusive. Although Foreign Policy Analysis (F.P.A.) is a subfield within international relations that focuses on human actors to demonstrate the decision-making processes behind foreign policy, the integration of the domestic into the international has remained a challenge. Within F.P.A., the debate has emerged from a divergence of theoretical perspectives. The two leading paradigms are the rational choice/expected utility model, originally the product of Von Neumann and Morgenstern in the 1940s, and a second based on the cybernetic perspective established by Herbert Simon (1959, 1985) and refined by John Steinbruner (1974) (Ostrom and Job 1986; James and Oneal 1991). Broadly defined, rational choice models apply cost-benefit analyses to the study of international politics (Mintz and Geva 1997). The simplicity of rational choice creates highly effective predictive models, but they lack a descriptive quality that reflects reality and neglect the role of intricate combinations of variables such as domestic politics. This poses not only etymological problems, but it cannot explain instances when a decision-maker fails to choose the option with the most preferred consequence, or rather it cannot systematize the constraints that lead to suboptimal decision-making (Mintz and DeRouen 2010). Such irrational decision-making is not inexplicable, however, it is merely outside of the scope provided by expected utility. This is why rational choice has been challenged by the cognitive approach, which instead focuses on the complex variables that impact decision-making such as personality and culture (Geertz 1973; Mintz 1997; Hermann 2003). However, this second approach champions the minute intricacies of human behaviour at the expense of useful generalizability, so it too is incapable of providing the methodological link between domestic and international politics (Jones 1994; Stein and Welch 1997).

These ostensibly rival models highlight different aspects of decision-making and possess various strengths and weaknesses. In an attempt to bridge the divide between them and attain both the descriptive accuracy of cognitivists, necessary to evaluate domestic politics, and the predictive success of rational choice models, crucial for applicability in the international environment, Poliheuristic Decision Theory utilizes both paradigms in a two-stage decision-making process (Mintz 1997). Whereas the second stage is governed by a relatively simple rational choice model discussed more below, the first stage is based on a cognitivist approach and is determined by five key characteristics: decision-making is nonholistic, dimension-based, noncompensatory, satisficing and order-sensitive (Mintz and Geva 1997).

First, the nonholistic or nonexhaustive nature of decision-making differentiates the poliheuristic approach from other F.P.A. models based on utility, which demand that a decision-maker conducts an exhaustive search of alternatives in order to compare costs versus benefits between them (Mintz and Geva 1997). Instead, Ph theory assumes the decision-maker “adopts heuristic decision rules that do not require detailed and complicated comparisons of relevant alternatives, and adopts or rejects undesirable alternatives on the basis of one or a few criteria” (Mintz and Geva 1997, 85). This nonholistic approach means that the choice set is defined by a dimension-based rather than an alternative-based search; decision-makers compare alternatives to a cluster of variables within the same organizing theme rather than assessing alternatives in a vacuum (Ostrom et al. 1980). For example, the political dimension might include elements such as public opinion polls, the leader’s popularity, the state of the economy and domestic opposition – variables used to evaluate the consequences of a chosen alternative on the political dimension. As the search is nonholistic, how many criteria and variables are used for any dimension is

likely to vary as the decision-maker considers different alternatives along each organizing theme (Mintz and Geva 1997). This means that any alternative that fails to meet a certain threshold on the most important dimension will be discarded (Mintz 1993).

Assuming political actors operate under self-interested motivations, politicians see gains and losses in political terms; the most important dimension, therefore, is the political dimension (DeRouen 2002). How a leader perceives the political consequences of his or her actions plays a crucial role in the decision-making process (Mintz 2004). Loss-aversion overrules all other considerations, and so decision-making is driven by the desire to avoid failure rather than to achieve success (Anderson 1983). Consequently, “a low score in the political dimension cannot be compensated for by a high score in some other dimensions” (Mintz and Geva 1997, 84). This is the noncompensatory principle, and this loss-aversion variable can be operationalized in several ways:

Threat to a leader’s survival; Significant drop in public support for a policy; Significant drop in popularity; The prospects of an electoral defeat; Domestic opposition; Threat to regime survival; Inter-party rivalry and competition; Internal or external challenge to the regime; Potential collapse of the coalition government or regime; Threat to political power, dignity, honor, or legitimacy of a leader; Demonstrations, riots, and so forth; The existence of veto players (e.g., pivotal parties in parliamentary government (Mintz 2004, 9).

Consequently, this model represents a process in which alternatives are selected or rejected based on a satisficing rather than maximizing rule. The

poliheuristic approach seeks acceptable options rather than maximizing alternatives because it is likely that some dimensions will remain unconsidered even after a decision is made (Mintz and Geva 1997, 87). Rejecting the invariance assumption that “two alternative formulations of the same problem should yield the same choice” (Quattrone and Tversky 1988, 727), this stage also considers that the order in which variables are considered may impact the elimination of options from the choice set (Mintz and Geva 1997).

After options are eliminated in the first stage, a second stage based on a cost-benefit analysis selects a final alternative that becomes the choice. Although DeRouen and Sprecher (2002; 2004) argue that the second stage utilizes either E.B.A. or LEX. Processes, the Poliheuristic model does not specify the conditions under which either strategy is selected (Astorino-Courtois and Trusty 2002, 32). Cognitive psychology suggests this depends on the structural complexity of remaining choices (Hansen and Helgeson 1996; Payne, Bettman and Luce 1996; Payne 1976), but the selection of E.B.A. or LEX. creates a further problem. E.B.A. is simply “a sequential elimination decision heuristic” (DeRouen 2002, 16), and the LEX. decision rule involves the selection of an alternative that provides the greatest utility for the most important substantive dimension (Payne, Bettman and Johnson 1988). Both of these rules undermine the premise of rationality as defined by the rational choice model (MacDonald 2003; Allison 1971) and so contravene the original ethos of a poliheuristic theory as bridge-builder between cognitive and rational approaches. The difference is negligible to outcome validity – as the key assumption in stage two is that a decision-maker seeks to minimize costs and maximize rewards (Mintz 2002) – but this remains an unclear procedural element in the theory.

These characteristics form the cognitivist foundation of Ph theory's first stage and the rational choice basis for stage two. Options are eliminated from the choice set that do not meet requirements on the political dimension, and then the remaining alternatives are assessed with a cost-benefit analysis. Determining the cut off point, however, is one crucial element of Ph application that is potentially problematic. Mintz and Geva developed a decision board (Mintz and Geva 1997) in which numerical values are assigned to variables within the political dimension, but this process involves the same level of educated estimation required in any purely qualitative analysis. Assigning numerical values on a decision board allows for clarification in research design, but it does not solve the underlying problem of context specificity and the dangers of selection bias. Politicians' levels of sensitivity to the political dimension, which variables are included in the political dimension, and the other dimensions under consideration are unique to each case study and demand a certain amount of specialist knowledge. This poses no fundamental obstacle to the successful application of Ph theory to either historical case studies or contemporary analyses, but it should be recognized that the theory cannot be applied without a certain amount of prerequisite research needed to appreciate the domestic political environment under consideration. Just as the widely accepted rational choice model ranks preferences according to expected utility, the first stage of Ph theory essentially if not methodologically ranks options according to their expected utility on the variables of the political dimension. Rather than selecting a winning option, however, this process simply eliminates the losers. As this case study deals with a cabinet rather than a presidential system, however, the exact process of eliminating options in a group setting is somewhat elusive.

Although Redd has addressed case studies in which a single decision-maker is influenced by bureaucratic advice (2002; 2005; Christensen and Redd 2004), this is not the same as group decision-making. Conversely, Brummer directly applies Ph theory to the bureaucratic politics model, but rather than integrating bureaucratic politics into the poliheuristic theory, Brummer utilizes Ph to facilitate bureaucratic politics' process validity. Having specifically chosen a case study in which party politics was unlikely to play a role due to a large government majority, Brummer replaces the noncompensatory loss aversion variable with a "noncompensatory organizational loss aversion variable" in which the key dimension is not domestic politics but organizational interests (Brummer 2012, 2-6). While useful to Bureaucratic Politics, this approach must assume the existence of multiple causal paths and so it sacrifices the predictable outcome validity needed to maintain the central function of Ph theory. Instead, the best argument for group decision-making within a poliheuristic approach can be found in Brulé (2008). Brulé argues that decisions made in group settings can be addressed "as an n-actor, m-dimensional bargaining scenario in which preferences are aggregated according to the two-stage process Poliheuristic theory describes" (Brulé 2008, 283). This is based on the assumption that all members of the group possess "an effective veto on any decision," so "the aggregation of group preferences into a single choice would, in the first stage, involve the elimination of all alternatives that are noncompensatory to any member of the group" (Brulé 2008, 283). Rather than every member of the British cabinet possessing an effective veto, however, this case study assumes a narrowing of the group to only the key actors associated with Palestine in the interwar period – principally though not limited to, the Prime Minister, Colonial Secretary, Foreign Secretary and Chiefs of Staff. These figures dominated cabinet discussions on

Palestine and carried the entire group, making Brulé's characterization of group decision-making through member-veto most appropriate. This, however, is an area of Polyheuristic Decision Theory that remains procedurally undeveloped.

In providing a post-diction of the British decision in 1922 to affirm the policy of a Jewish national home despite violent Arab opposition, the variables considered within the political dimension have been selected based on the long list of criteria provided by Mintz (2004), out of which archival research pinpointed only three key variables considered by the British cabinet. In a study designed to provide prediction rather than post-diction, the specific variables would need to be highlighted by intelligence or open source analysts. After defining the choice set, the relevant variables within the political dimension for Britain's 1922 decision emerged as threat to dignity, post-war economic decline and inter-party rivalry. Then in stage two, the remaining option was assessed according to LEX. processes on the strategic dimension.

Stage One

When advocating the use of Ph theory to explain the British decision to affirm the national home policy in 1922, it is first necessary to acknowledge that several factors make this decision irrational according to the rational choice model, as it failed to demonstrate purposive action seeking utility maximization (MacDonald 2003; Allison 1971). A simple cost-benefit analysis based on information available to decision-makers at the time would have predicted a renunciation of the national home policy. This is evident from the reports submitted in 1920 and 1921 by two commissions of inquiry. Following the Nebi Musa riots of April 1920, the Palin Commission pinpointed fundamental flaws in the national home policy, and following

the Jaffa riots of May 1921, the Haycraft Commission independently reiterated many of the same concerns.

The first riots under British rule occurred roughly two and a half years after the Balfour Declaration was first issued, but the Palin Commission found it was “undoubtedly the starting point of the whole trouble” (WO 32/9614). Major-General Palin and his fellow commissioners warned the British cabinet “[t]hat the situation at present obtaining in Palestine is exceedingly dangerous” (WO 32/9614). The fears and tensions highlighted in the report might have been inconsequential if another riot on a worse scale had not erupted the following year in Jaffa. These disturbances were also the subject of an investigation, headed by Chief Justice of Palestine, Sir Thomas Haycraft. The report concluded that “the fundamental cause of the Jaffa riots and the subsequent acts of violence was a feeling among the Arabs of discontent with, and hostility to, the Jews, due to political and economic causes, and connected with Jewish immigration” (Cmd 1540). Politically, the main fear was “that the Jews when they had sufficiently increased in numbers would become so highly organized and so well armed as to be able to overcome the Arabs, and rule over and oppress them” (Cmd 1540). Economically, the influx of skilled Jewish laborers and artisans was seen as a threat to Arab livelihoods (Cmd 1540).

In light of the tensions highlighted by these commission reports, the cabinet in London was presented with three options: continue supporting the creation of a Jewish national home in Palestine – imposing it with the threat or use of force – limiting the national home policy in a manner acceptable to its critics, or repudiating the policy altogether. The General Staff articulated these options in practical terms: “(a.) An alteration of policy as regards Jewish immigration; (b.) An increase in the British garrison; or (c.) The acceptance of serious danger to the Jewish population”

(CAB 24/126 July 13, 1921). The cabinet agreed their courses were to “withdraw from their Declaration, refer the Mandate back to the League of Nations, set up an Arab National Government and slow down or stop the immigration of Jews: or they could carry out the present policy with greater vigour and encourage the arming of the Jews” (CAB 23/26). It was obvious to the cabinet that “peace was impossible on the lines of the Balfour Declaration” (CAB 23/26). The situation required some form of action, not least to protect the British officials administering Palestine. These concerns suggest that the national home policy provided very little comparative utility and would likely have been discarded, making the 1922 decision to reaffirm the policy irrational. Applying Ph theory to the decision-making process, however, allows a more nuanced analysis of the nature of this early third party role in the developing Arab-Israeli conflict.

According to the poliheuristic theory, the first stage of decision-making is presumed to be based on political survival rather than a complete assessment of costs and benefits (DeRouen and Sprecher 2004, 61). A decision-maker is first concerned with the political implications of a decision, so variables like public opinion, the economy and domestic opposition “may be used to evaluate the consequence of a chosen alternative on this organizing theme” (Mintz 1993, 600). Using the list of variables to be considered as part of the political dimension provided by Mintz (2004), this section demonstrates how the noncompensatory loss aversion variable was operationalized in British decision-making regarding Palestine through threat to dignity, post-war economic decline and inter-party rivalry; options were eliminated from the choice set by discarding those that failed to meet requirements on the political dimension.

Variable: Threat to Dignity (C Head)

The threat to dignity is one of the variables outlined by Mintz (2004) that can be considered on the political dimension because of its inherent danger to political survival. In the context of British decision-making in the early 1920s, the threat to dignity emanated from stature within the international community. Although British policy on the Jewish national home was officially made in Westminster, it acquired an international element first as a wartime promise approved by the Entente, then in the draft mandate assigned to Britain by the Principled Allied Powers in 1920 (Britain, France, Italy and Japan with a U.S. representative present) and finally in negotiations with the League of Nations and the United States for the mandate's approval (CAB 24/159). A complex international framework was built upon a fundamentally flawed policy, but reversing the process would have been far too damaging to the political dimension. Concerns for dignity on the international diplomatic stage led the British cabinet to eliminate the option of repudiating the national home policy in the first stage of decision-making.

Palestine's retention by the British Empire was not a foregone conclusion, but became more likely after the First World War ended. Ultimately for Britain, the problem of Palestine's trusteeship was less an issue of imperial expansionism and more about avoiding unwelcome intrusions. British military, strategic and energy interests in Egypt, Arabia and Mesopotamia made the prospect of a rival power in Palestine immediately following a world war decidedly unattractive. British Prime Minister Lloyd George and French Prime Minister Clemenceau agreed in secret that Britain would annex Palestine and oil-rich Mosul in Mesopotamia in exchange for an exclusively French Syria and share of the Mosul oil (Lowe and Dockrill 1972, 359). Through this bargaining and a pledge of good faith towards the published Balfour

Declaration that allowed more general League of Nations approval, the principle of a British Palestine became diplomatically entrenched very early, and before British officials had time to appreciate the potential difficulties this entailed.

A further complication was the Treaty of Sèvres with Turkey, signed in August 1920. Article 95 of the Turkish peace treaty reinforced the draft mandate in committing Britain to supporting a Jewish national home in Palestine (CAB 24/125, June 2, 1921). Since the document carried signatures from Britain and the Dominions (including India), France, Italy, Japan, Armenia, Belgium, Greece, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Czechoslovakia and Turkey, the scale of international agreement essentially prevented repudiation of the national home without creating a legal quagmire (CAB 24/159). The Balfour Declaration had rapidly become the entire public basis of a British Palestine, and the length of negotiations with the French and other powers made it less and less likely the national home could be reversed without substantial international humiliation, if the necessary agreements from League members could be achieved at all (FO 608/98/588).

By June 1921, the power of this international body to inflict humiliation on the British Empire became readily apparent. There was “serious risk” that when the Council of the League of Nations next met to vote on the final mandates, they would be rejected on the basis of Italian and American objections (CAB 24/125, June 8, 1921). Italy was raising the concerns of the Vatican regarding guardianship of Christian holy places in Palestine, and the American State Department, despite its position outside of the League, formally objected to their exclusion from the consultation process (CAB 24/126, June 29, 1921; 24/136, May 16, 1922). In light of this diplomatic deadlock and the problems Britain was already facing in Palestine, the option to withdraw from the territory altogether was considered (CAB 24/125, June 8,

1921). On a diplomatic level, the British cabinet considered taking the opportunity to repudiate the terms of the national home policy while the entire mandate was in question by “publicly confessing that they are insecurely based and rebuilding them on a firmer foundation” (CAB 24/125, June 8, 1921). Unfortunately for the policy’s opponents, however, the Council of the League agreed to postpone a final vote from 1921 to July 1922 rather than create a situation in which all prior negotiations were void. This meant that after June 1921, any modifications to the mandate would have required separate approval from the great powers within the prohibitively short period of one year (CAB 24/126, June 29, 1921). American support for the draft mandate was forthcoming on May 3, 1922 – in a joint resolution by the United States Congress – but this meant Britain was merely further entrenched in the national home policy (CAB 24/159).

Between this public American declaration of support and the final League vote on July 22, 1922, the Churchill White paper was published. It not only confirmed the national home policy, but also specifically cited the diplomatic ties preventing its alteration: the “Declaration, reaffirmed by the Conference of the Principle Allied Powers at San Remo and again in the Treaty of Sèvres, is not susceptible of change” (Cmd 1700). Ultimately, the loss of diplomatic dignity associated with reversing the Balfour Declaration policy meant this option failed to meet requirements on the political dimension and was eliminated from the choice set in the first stage of decision-making.

Variable: The Economy (C Head)

The economy may seem more like a substantive dimension in the second stage of decision-making, but in times of hardship it can serve as a variable on the political

dimension. This is because the variable under consideration, though ostensibly dealing with issues related to the economy, is really concerned with strategic political manipulation of perceptions of the economy, and as such, it requires consideration on the political dimension. The post-war coalition under Liberal British Prime Minister David Lloyd George was faced with the major task of reconstruction in a harsh economic climate. As a prolonged economic crisis hit Britain by 1920-21, the entire government was under pressure to spend less abroad and more at home. One of the most expensive elements of Britain's empire was the troop numbers needed to maintain it. This meant that post-war economic decline removed an option from the choice set in the first stage of decision-making. Imposing the national home policy with the threat or use of force – i.e. the stationing of troops sufficient in number to protect a very small Jewish minority from the Arab majority – was far too damaging to the political dimension.

The severe contraction of markets during the war (including the loss of Britain's largest trading partner, Germany) meant Britain slid quickly into its first globalized economic crisis. An industrial recession struck in May 1920, and Britain was facing a high unemployment problem by the end of the year. More than two million were out of work in December 1921, and the average unemployment rate stayed over 10% for several years, higher than anything recorded before the war (Constantine 1984, 89). These economic problems also brought large-scale industrial action. A "triple alliance" of workers from the mining, railway and transport industries provided continual unrest (Amery 1953, 205). As well as the demonstrations, marches and occasional violence of British workers, the government was also trying to deal with complaints from big business and institutions like the Bank of England, all clamoring for cuts (Constantine 1984, 90). However, a

complicating factor was Britain's position at the center of imperial authority combined with communal responsibility as part of the Supreme Allied Council and also the League of Nations.

In terms of the Middle East, this conflict between maintaining an empire and satisfying the domestic need for economies was embodied by Winston Churchill's time at the War and Colonial Offices. Churchill pushed the Colonial Office's new Middle East Department "towards a curtailment of our responsibilities and our expenditure" (CAB 24/106). He was only prepared to invest in fertile territories, such as East and West Africa, where development could contribute rapidly to British coffers (CAB 24/106). For the Middle East, he recommended placing responsibility for maintaining order on the air force; this would be much cheaper than army garrisons or cavalry because as it required only a few airstrips with no earth-bound lines of communication or animals (CAB 24/106). This focus on spending cuts, however, meant considerations of cost came before the safety of Britain's Zionist subjects in Palestine. C.I.G.S Henry Wilson called the cabinet's attention to the weakness of British garrisons in the Middle East in May 1920 (CAB 24/106). The General Staff feared the boundaries of economy would leave them unable to fulfill imperial policy. They pointed to a "real danger" and how the government's pro-Zionist stance was "likely to increase our difficulties with the Arabs, and there are already indications that military action may be necessary, both to maintain the frontier and concurrently to preserve peace internally" (CAB 24/106). On January 26, 1921, Churchill called for the further reduction of troops from Palestine, which the General Staff advised was too low and invited rebellion (CAB 24/118). The Jaffa riots broke out three months later. Nevertheless, in assuming responsibility for Palestine first in

the War Office and then in the Colonial Office, the only relevant issue to Churchill remained spending cuts.

The Jaffa Riots themselves did not alter Churchill's position on this issue of cost. General Congreve submitted a memo to the Colonial Office in June 1921 entitled 'situation in Palestine'; it said Palestine was in "increasing danger" that would require "heavy expenditure" and meet "bitter resentment" from Zionists "for not protecting them better" (CAB 24/125, June 9, 1921). "I do not think," Congreve concluded, things are going to get better in this part of the world, but rather worse" (CAB 24/125, June 9, 1921). Churchill circulated this memo to the cabinet, but only to highlight how he disagreed with it. This was one month after the Jaffa riots, but neither the unrest nor advice from local officials appeared in policy discussions on cuts (CAB 24/131).

As War and then Colonial Secretary, Winston Churchill's singular drive to reduce spending reflected the political situation faced by the entire coalition cabinet. The expense associated with troops meant Palestine could not receive the necessary reinforcements needed to protect the Zionist experiment from violence. In a time of widespread industrial action, high unemployment and general economic downturn, the political cost was too high and this option was removed from the choice set. In this sense, the economy variable was closely connected to the variable of inter-party politics, which is discussed below.

Variable: Inter-party Politics (C Head)

One of the most important aspects of Britain's early Palestine policy was the relationship with inter-party politics. This section argues that criticisms coming mainly from the Conservative Party led to an option being eliminated from the choice

set in the first stage of decision-making. The “coupon” election of December 1918 left the Liberal David Lloyd George Prime Minister at the head of a majority Conservative coalition. Dissension with his leadership grew steadily, and virulent Parliamentary criticism of the government’s Palestine policy meant the coalition was unable to continue the national home as it stood in the Balfour Declaration and draft mandate (which included a commitment to put it into effect) (Cmd 1785).

As the post-war political climate was marked by a significant swing to the right – the main issues of the 1918 election were the fate of Germany and the Kaiser, with many calling for his trial and execution along with the expulsion of Germans from Britain – the atmosphere among the electorate favored a Conservative victory (Wilson 1964, 40-41). This climate placed a great deal of right-wing pressure on Lloyd George at the head of his coalition cabinet.

After violence erupted in Palestine in 1920 and 1921, the cabinet’s handling of Zionism became one of several key issues with which to criticize Lloyd George. Although there had been a substantial amount of backbench support for the Balfour Declaration in 1917, this had merely reflected a need for wartime solidarity that was hardly crucial by 1920 (Defries 2001, 99). The main inter-party dispute surrounded costs. Conservative MPs Sir Frederick Hall, Sir Harry Brittain and Sir Henry Page-Croft raised the issue in July 1920 and again in December that “an enormous amount of money has been expended in this direction for which we are not getting any return” (CS July 15, 1920, Col. 2595; December 2, 1920, Col. 1439). Opposition to the national home then began in earnest in March 1921 and continued in the House of Lords following the Jaffa Riots (CS March 2, 1921, Col. 2030; HLD June 8, 1921, Col. 470-9; CS June 14, 1921, Col. 265-334; HLD June 15, 1921, Col. 559-73). Colonial Secretary Churchill assured that “[w]hile the situation still fills us with a

certain amount of anxiety [...] I believe it is one that we shall be able to shape [...] within the limits of the expense I have mentioned” (CS June 14, 1921, Col. 265-334). Later that month, however, he advised the cabinet to withdraw from Palestine (Makovsky 2007, 103). This was because the Liberal Churchill and the rest of the coalition were feeling a great deal of pressure on the Palestine issue. The criticisms they faced were potent because they reflected political issues masquerading as substantive concerns, and these fell largely under the Conservative banner of “Anti-Waste”.

The coalition cabinet tried to downplay inter-party differences, so many policy debates raged in the press instead (O’Morgan 1979, 169). An overwhelming majority of the 1918-enfranchised population (79.1%) had never voted before and were clamouring for information about politics – enhancing the role of newspapers, especially with regard to foreign affairs, for which the press was one of very few public sources of information (Kinnear 1973, 21-22). Consequently, the press outlets that were highly critical of the Lloyd George government were also quite powerful. This was demonstrated by the Anti-Waste League, a campaign led by Conservative peer and press baron Lord Rothermere, and championed in the House by his son, the M.P. Esmond Harmsworth. Using an axe as its symbol to represent spending-cuts, it was credited with winning two by-elections in Conservative seats (Kinnear 1973, 24). One sign that Lloyd George felt under pressure from this movement was the formation of The Committee on National Expenditure under the chairmanship of Conservative politician and businessman, Sir Eric Campbell Geddes, which, as expected, called for major spending reductions across most departments (Cmd 1581; 1582; 1589). Rothermere’s brother, Lord Northcliffe, was also using his papers *The Times*, the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Mirror* to criticize Palestine based on its cost, as

well as the idea that handing Muslim holy sites to Jews would inflame India. Northcliffe's death in 1922 meant these papers passed to Rothermere, and they too became direct proponents of Anti-Waste.

In the same period, previously supportive Lord Beaverbrook also abandoned Lloyd George and used his *Daily Express* and *Sunday Express* to propagate the myth of a Jewish conspiracy; also included in this press revolt were *The Spectator* and the *Morning Post*, which questioned the loyalty of Jewish Liberal politicians such as Palestine High Commissioner Sir Herbert Samuel and India Secretary Sir Edwin Montagu (Defries 2001, 109-110). This was particularly unsound since Montagu had been one of few politicians adamantly opposed to the Balfour Declaration in 1917, arguing that it placed the status of Jews around the world in jeopardy (CAB 24/24). However, it would be a mistake to view these anti-Semitic attacks outside of their political context. Montagu was a target principally because he opposed the Anti-Waste League and Geddes' spending cuts (CAB 24/127). The sheer virulence of such press attacks made Churchill and many members of the coalition cabinet nervous (CAB 24/134).

Opposition to the national home continued to grow, and there was a controversial debate in the House of Lords in June. Lord Islington introduced a motion against the Palestine mandate on the basis that the national home policy broke promises made to the Arabs and was "inviting subsequent catastrophe" (HLD June 21, 1922, Col. 994-1033). To the government's chagrin, Islington's motion carried 60 votes to 29 (HLD June 21, 1922, Col. 994-1033). This had symbolic more than legal importance and was followed by a Commons debate less than two weeks later. Joynson-Hicks introduced a vote on Palestine on the basis that the mandate had never been approved by the House (CS July 4, 1922, Col. 221-343). It had the opposite

outcome that Joynson-Hicks intended. Churchill secured a vote of confidence 292 to 35 (CS July 4, 1922, Col. 221-343). Crucially, one vital document had been published on July 1, 1922, between the two debates, and this was the Churchill White Paper (Grief 2008).

Although it re-affirmed the policy of British support for a Jewish national home in Palestine, the document placed an important new restriction on the Zionist project, limiting Jewish immigration to economic capacity (Cmd 1700). When the white paper was published, it was accompanied by records of communication between the Colonial Secretary and Arab as well as Zionist leaders, demonstrating how the British government was involved as a third party in what was becoming the Arab-Israeli conflict. This involvement, however, consisted of addressing domestic political challenges. Each term of the white paper answered specific charges leveled by members of the Commons and Lords. The Churchill White Paper answered accusations that Britain was depriving Palestine's Arabs of their own home: 'statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. [...] His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable and have no such aim in view' (Cmd 1700). To demonstrate this, the white paper formally linked Jewish immigration to the Palestine economy (Cmd 1700). It also addressed the charge of broken promises: "The whole of Palestine west of the Jordan was [...] excluded from Sir Henry McMahon's pledge" (Cmd 1700). Answering allegations that the national home would inflame Indian religious sensibilities, the white paper also highlighted how "the present administration has transferred to a Supreme Council elected by the Moslem community of Palestine the entire control of Moslem Religious endowments" (Cmd 1700). Lord Islington had declared in June that the national home policy could not continue unaltered, and he

was correct. Under the pressure of inter-party politics played out in Parliament and in the press, the coalition had been forced to eliminate the option of continuing with a policy of total support for the Balfour Declaration.

Stage Two

After the first stage of decision-making eliminated all options from the choice set that failed to meet requirements on the political dimension, only one alternative remained. In this case study, the British cabinet could neither entirely support nor repudiate the national home, leaving the single option of continuing, but imposing limitations designed to address its substantive weaknesses and political critics. Although the noncompensatory decision-making process does not always continue until only one alternative is left, it is possible that all but one option are eliminated due to their prohibitively high costs on the political dimension (Mintz 1993, 600). On a procedural note, like DeRouen and Sprecher's proposed use of E.B.A. or LEX. decision rules in the second stage, the existence of a sole remaining option undermines the original ethos of Ph theory to some extent. Although intended to bridge between cognitive and rational schools, it struggles to achieve this aim when the second stage of decision-making is denied a cost-benefit analysis between alternatives. Again, this does not impact outcome validity, but it does demonstrate an area where further procedural clarification would be beneficial.

The above analysis of stage one in the decision-making process reveals how only a solitary option remained after those that failed to meet domestic political requirements were eliminated. The British cabinet had no other alternative but to continue with the national home policy by imposing limitations on it. As the poliheuristic approach seeks acceptable options, any single remaining alternative is

compared “to predetermined values along a selected set of dimensions” (Mintz and Geva 1997, 87). In the case of post-war Palestine, one dimension emerged as substantive for decision-makers. Rather than seeking to maximize in this case, the remaining alternative was found to satisfy (Steinbruner 1974; Ostrom and Job 1986; Lui 2002) the sole substantive dimension, which was the military, or strategic dimension.

The Military Dimension (C Head)

In the context of the Jewish national home, the only dimension decision-makers considered outside of those variables constituting the political dimension, was the military, or strategic dimension. This sole dimension has been identified through archival research, but it demonstrates the same issues of process validity discussed in relation to the existence of only a single option after stage one. Rather than maximize rewards, the second stage of decision-making ensured that the remaining option did not incur costs. Palestine was debateable as a military asset, but any options remaining after the first stage of decision-making had to satisfy British military and strategic interests in the region.

During and after the First World War, the British cabinet frequently considered the prospect of another similar conflict. Safeguarding routes to India, including lines of communication through Egypt and the Suez Canal was paramount. These lines of communication became even more important after the war because Britain’s empire had grown in Asia and Africa as well as the Middle East. The importance of Palestine in this geo-political worldview, however, was a matter of opinion. In June 1918, Lloyd George asserted that “if we were to be thrown back as an Empire upon our old traditional policy of utilizing the command of the sea in order

to cut off our enemies from all the sources of supply and from all possible means of expansion, north, east, south, and west, Palestine would be invaluable” (CAB 23/43). It “secured the defence of Egypt” and losing Palestine “would not only involve the interruption of a main artery of our imperial communications, but would react upon our whole situation in the East, and even in India” (CAB 23/44A). Immediately post-war in December 1918, the army agreed with maintaining Palestine as a buffer state, but only ‘so long as it can be created without disturbing Mohammedian sentiment” (FO 609/99/1327).

As British policy supporting a Jewish national home did indeed inflame Arab and Muslim opinion, however, the army and key members of the cabinet began to express doubts regarding its military value. By November 1920, the Chiefs of the Imperial General Staff (C.I.G.S.) advised the Cabinet that Palestine “has no strategical interest for the British Army” but it “constitutes a serious potential drain on its resources” (CAB 24/132). Winston Churchill retained the post of War Secretary at this time, and he agreed: “[s]o far as the security of the Empire is concerned, we are the weaker, rather than the stronger, by the occupation of Palestine” (CAB 24/117). His successor at the War Office, Sir Worthington-Evans espoused the opposing view, that uprisings in Egypt and Mosul increased Palestine’s importance, and the debate continued in Parliament into 1923 (CAB 24/129). Even those such as Churchill who openly questioned Palestine’s strategic value in private, publicly supported the “buffer state” line of reasoning. It provided a simple and convenient explanation for British entanglement in Palestine. Both sides of this debate, however, understood that Palestine could not be allowed to fall to a hostile or potentially challenging power. The tiny country was not necessarily crucial to British strategic defence of the empire, but a foreign obstruction there could be devastating (FO 609/99/1327).

Therefore, as long as Palestine remained in friendly hands, the military dimension was satisfied. The remaining option from stage one was to continue with the national home policy by imposing limitations on it. This alternative left Palestine in British hands, which was acceptable on the military, or strategic dimension, allowing it to become the final choice. This naturally prompts the question, however, what if the single remaining option had not satisfied the military dimension? This would have left the British cabinet with no viable options. In the continuation of a crisis situation, this would likely have resulted in delaying tactics until more options could be introduced into the choice set – which seems to have been evident in Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin’s handling of post-war Palestine before handing the problem to the United Nations in 1947. In the absence of a crisis situation, the result would most likely be inertia. This was later characterized by Whitehall’s general avoidance of Palestinian Arab grievances between the reversal of a critical white paper in 1931 and the beginning of the Arab Revolt in 1936.

Conclusion

The role of third parties in the Arab-Israeli conflict remains an important field of study, and assessing these roles does require an understanding of how policy towards the conflict is formulated. British involvement before 1948, and so prior to what many scholarly works adopt as a useful point of commencement, does not negate its importance. Broad, sweeping British policy during the mandate formed the earliest intervention between Palestine’s two communities, and the wealth of research material available from this era provides an eerie realization of continuity in tensions and violence in the decades that followed. The Churchill White Paper 1922 reflected a British decision to affirm the policy of a Jewish national home in Palestine but with

restrictions designed to satisfy domestic critics, principally demanding the linkage of Jewish immigration to Palestine's economic capacity. The above study demonstrates a concerted effort to alter the flawed policy. This means the final decision cannot be attributed to simpler heuristics like path dependencies. Neither wholehearted support for, nor renunciation of, the British-Zionist relationship were viable options because fundamentally, they fell outside domestic political constraints. Although the white paper was framed as a remedy to tensions in Palestine, therefore, it took no consideration of either community during the decision-making process.

In the first stage, the cabinet rejected alternatives that failed to meet requirements on the most important, political dimension. Taking threat to international or diplomatic dignity into account meant the option to repudiate the national home was eliminated. The political backlash over the post-war economy meant the option to impose the national home with the threat or use of force also failed to meet requirements on the political dimension and was eliminated. Finally, inter-party rivalry left the cabinet unable to continue the national home as it stood in the Balfour Declaration and draft mandate. Consequently, the first stage of the decision-making process left only one alternative in the choice set. This option was then compared to the single substantive dimension to ensure it would not incur costs. The option to continue with the national home with key limitations designed to satisfy domestic critics was found to be acceptable on the military/strategic dimension, allowing it to become the final choice.

By applying Ph theory to a single British case study, the poliheuristic approach allows an appreciation of this early third party role in the Arab-Israeli conflict, but crucially, it demonstrates a coherent application of the decision-making theory for assessing the role of third parties throughout its timeline. Although the Ph

approach must involve some degree of specialist knowledge in order to determine the key domestic political variables at play in any particular case study, as well as the cut-off point at which options become unacceptable on the political dimension, this is a process of merely whittling down Mintz' relatively comprehensive list (2004) and applying an argument to evidence. Rather than negating the applicability of Poliheuristic Decision Theory, this element of the theory champions a more realistic post-Cold War analysis. When bipolarity shared with a mysterious other determined the course of international politics, a model based solely on basic expected utility was appropriate. Even so, it is still possible for one analyst to disagree with another's predictive rankings, and so the Ph approach poses no methodological problems not already inherent in accepted F.P.A. models.

However, as the original ethos of Ph theory was to bridge the divide between cognitive and rational approaches, the above study notes two procedural flaws that undermine this aim. DeRouen and Sprecher's use of E.B.A. or LEX. decision rules in the second stage and the possibility of only a single option remaining after the first stage mean the theory can struggle to achieve its broader aim. This does not, however, pose a critical dilemma for using Poliheuristic Decision Theory as a means to understand third party roles in the Arab-Israeli conflict. In such explorative, archive-based qualitative case studies, the introduction of the political dimension as initial determinant of final choice remains the fundamentally important point.

In the twenty-first century, the opening of archives, the accessibility of decision-makers and open source material more generally does provide a unique opportunity to blend the cognitivist approach with rational choice in order to provide generalizable models. The specific variables on the political dimension will inevitably change between time periods and decision-makers under consideration – the media

and opinion polls may be less important than discontent within the military, tribal alliances or foreign infiltration for example. Regardless of these shifting parameters or indeed the theory's minor procedural flaws, a Ph approach remains applicable because there is always a domestic political dimension that must be satisfied in order for leaders and governments to make decisions. Rather than attempting to provide a panacea decision-making model equally relevant to the laboratory as the world stage, Ph theory is specific to the political environment. Understanding foreign policy decision-making within this methodology is constrained only by the amount of information available to make value judgments regarding variables on the political dimension. It alters the fundamental starting point of analyzing state behavior, from questioning what leaders want, to asking what they wish to avoid. In democracies as well as dictatorships, the common theme remains political survival, making the Ph framework a highly useful tool in the study of policy decision-making. Therefore, just as Ph theory provides a cogent explanation and post-diction of the British decision in 1922 to affirm the policy of the Jewish national home, it possesses the scope needed to address later and culturally and politically diverse case studies, making it a highly useful methodology to assess third party roles in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

References

- Allison, George. 1971. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Amery, Leopold. 1953. *My Political Life: Volume 2 War and Peace 1914-1929*. London: Hutchinson.
- Anderson, Paul A. 1983. Decision Making by Objection in the Cuban Missile Crisis. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28(2) 201–222.
- Astorino-Courtois, Allison. and Trusty, Brittani. 2002. Degrees of Difficulty: The Effect of Israeli Policy Shifts on Syrian Peace Decisions. In: Mintz, A. ed. *Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 29–54.
- Brulé, David. 2008. The Poliheuristic Research Program: An Assessment and Suggestions for Further Progress. *International Studies Review* 10 266–293.
- Brulé, David. and Mintz, Alex. 2006. Blank Check or Marching Orders? Public Opinion and Presidential Use of Force in the United States. In: Starr, H. ed. *Approaches, Levels, and Methods of Analysis in International Politics: Crossing Boundaries*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 157–172.
- Brummer, Klaus. 2012. The Reluctant Peacekeeper: Governmental Politics and Germany's Participation in EUFOR RD Condo. *Foreign Policy Analysis* doi: 10.1111/j.1743-8594.2011.00174.x.
- Christensen, Eben and Redd, Steven. 2004. Bureaucrats Versus the Ballot Box in Foreign Policy Decision Making: An Experimental Analysis of the Bureaucratic Politics Model and the Poliheuristic Theory. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(1) 69–90.
- CAB 23/26. August 18, 1921. Conclusions of a Meeting of the Cabinet Held at 10,

Downing Street, S.W., on Thursday, 18th August, 1921, at 11.30 a.m.

National Archives, Kew.

CAB 23/43. June 11, 1918. *Shorthand Notes of the Fifteenth Meeting of the Imperial War Cabinet, held in London at 10, Downing Street, S.W., on Tuesday, June 11, 1918, at 12 noon.* National Archives, Kew.

CAB 23/44A. June 21, 1918. Note by the Secretary. National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/24. August, 23 1917. The Anti-Semitism of the Present Government.
National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/106. May 20, 1920. Mesopotamia. Note by the Secretary of State for War Covering Four Memoranda. National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/117. December 18, 1920. The Palestine Garrison. Memorandum by The Secretary of State for War. National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/118. Jan 26, 1921. Proposed Reduction in the Garrison in Palestine.
Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War. National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/125. June 2, 1921. League of Nations. "A" Mandates. Note by the Secretary.
National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/125. June 8, 1921. Palestine and Mesopotamia Mandates. Circulated by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/125. June 9, 1921. The Situation in Palestine. Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/126. June 29, 1921. The Recent Meeting of the Council of the League of Nations. Note by Mr. Fisher. National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/126. July 8, 1921. The Military Aspect of the Present Situation in Palestine.
National Archives, Kew.

CAB 24/127. August 4, 1921. The Financial Position. Memorandum by the Secretary

- of State for India. National Archives, Kew.
- CAB 24/129. November 9, 1921. The Situation in the Near East. Memorandum by the Secretary of State for War. National Archives, Kew.
- CAB 24/131. November 1921. Palestine. Memorandum by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. National Archives, Kew.
- CAB 24/132. January 20, 1922. The Interim Report of the Committee on National Expenditure. Army Estimates. National Archives, Kew.
- CAB 24/134. April–May 1922. Cost of Palestine Gendarmerie. National Archives, Kew.
- CAB 24/136. May 16, 1922. League of Nations. Palestine Mandate. Note by the Acting Secretary. National Archives, Kew.
- CAB 24/159. February 17, 1923. Palestine. Memorandum by the Secretary of State For the Colonies. National Archives, Kew.
- Commons Sitting. March 3, 1921. Series 5 Vol. 138.
- Commons Sitting. March 9, 1922. Series 5 Vol. 151.
- Commons Sitting. June 14, 1921. Series 5 Vol. 143.
- Commons Sitting. July 4, 1922. Series 5 Vol. 156.
- Commons Sitting. July 15, 1920. Series 5 Vol. 131.
- Commons Sitting. December 2, 1920. Series 5 Vol. 135.
- Cmd 1540. 1921. *Palestine. Disturbances in May, 1921. Reports of the Commission Of Inquiry with Correspondence Relating Thereto*.
- Cmd 1581. 1922. *Committee on National Expenditure. First Interim Report of Committee on National Expenditure*.
- Cmd 1582. 1922. *Committee on National Expenditure. Second Interim Report of Committee on National Expenditure*.

- Cmd 1589. 1922. *Committee on National Expenditure. Third Report of Committee on National Expenditure.*
- Cmd 1700. 1922. *Palestine. Correspondence with the Palestine Arab Delegation and the Zionist Organisation.*
- Cmd 1785. 1923. *League of Nations. Mandate for Palestine, Together with a Note by the Secretary-General Relating to its Application to the Territory Known as Trans-Jordan, Under the Provisions of Article 25.*
- Constantine, Stephen. 1984. *The Making of British Colonial Development Policy, 1914-1940.* Cambridge: Routledge.
- Defries, Harry. 2001. *Conservative Party Attitudes to Jews, 1900-1950.* London: Frank Cass.
- DeRouen, Karl. 2002. The Decision Not to Use Force at Dien Bien Phu: A Poliheuristic Perspective. In: Mintz, A. ed. *Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 11–28.
- DeRouen, Karl. and Sprecher, Christopher. 2004. Initial Crisis Reaction and Poliheuristic Theory. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(1) 56–68.
- FO 608/98/588. 1919. British Delegation, Correspondence and Papers Relating to Middle East (Political): Peace Congress and Palestine. National Archives, Kew.
- FO 609/99/1327. 1918. Peace Conference: British Delegation, Correspondence and Papers. National Archives, Kew.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic.
- Grief, Howard. 2008. *The Legal Foundation and Border of Israel Under International Law.* Jerusalem: Mazo Publishers.

- Gross Stein, Janice. and Welch, David A. 1997. Rational and Psychological Approaches to the Study of International Conflict: Comparative Strengths and Weaknesses. In: Mintz, Alex. and Geva, Nehemia. eds. *Decisionmaking on War and Peace: The Cognitive-Rational Debate*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 51–80.
- Hansen, D. E. and Helgeson, J. G. 1996. Choice Under Strict Uncertainty: Processes and Preferences. *Organizational Behavior and Decision Processes* 66(2) 153–164.
- Hermann, Margaret. 2003. Assessing Leadership Style: Trait Analysis. In: Post, J. ed. *The Psychological Assessment of Political Leaders*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 178–214.
- House of Lords Debate. June 8, 1921. Series 5 Vol. 45.
- House of Lords Debate. June 15, 1921. Series 5 Vol. 45.
- House of Lords Debate. June 21, 1922. Series 5 Vol. 50.
- James, Patrick. and Oneal, John R. 1991. The Influence of Domestic and International Politics on the President's Use of Force. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35(2) 307–332.
- Jones, Bryan D. 1994. *Reconceiving Decision-making in Democratic Politics: Attention, Choice, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kinnear, Michael. 1973. *The Fall of Lloyd George: The Political Crisis of 1922*. London: Macmillan.
- Lowe, Cedric James. and Dockrill, Michael L. 1972. *The Mirage of Power: British Foreign Policy 1914-1922*. Cambridge: Routledge.
- Lui, Xinsheng. 2002. The Poliheuristic Theory of Decision and the Cybernetic Theory Of Decision: A Comparative Examination. In: Mintz, A. ed. *Integrating*

- Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 159–168.
- MacDonald, Paul K. 2003. Useful Fiction or Miracle Maker: The Competing Epistemological Foundations of Rational Choice Theory. *American Political Science Review* 97(4) 551–565.
- Makovsky, Michael. 2007. Churchill's Promised Land: Zionism and Statecraft. London: Yale University Press.
- Mintz, Alex. 1993. The Decision to Attack Iraq: A Noncompensatory Theory of Decision Making. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37(4) 595–618.
- Mintz, Alex. 1997. Foreign Policy Decisionmaking: Bridging the Gap Between the Cognitive Psychology and Rational Actor "schools". In: Mintz, A. and Geva, N. eds. *Decisionmaking on War and Peace: The Cognitive-Rational Debate*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1–10.
- Mintz, Alex. 2002. Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making: A Poliheuristic Perspective. In: Mintz, A. ed. *Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1–10.
- Mintz, Alex. 2004. How Do Leaders Make Decisions? A Poliheuristic Perspective. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(1) 3–13.
- Mintz, Alex. and DeRouen, Karl. 2010. *Understanding Foreign Policy Decision Making*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mintz, Alex. and Geva, Nehemia. 1997. The Poliheuristic Theory of Foreign Policy Decisionmaking. In: Mintz, A. and Geva, N. eds. *Decisionmaking on War and Peace: The Cognitive-Rational Debate*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 81–102.

- O'Morgan, Kenneth. 1979. *Consensus and Disunity: The Lloyd George Government 1918-1922*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ostrom, Charles W. and Job, Brian L. 1986. The President and the Political Use of Force. *American Political Science Review* 80(2), 541–566.
- Ostrom, T. Lingle, J., Pryor, J. and Geva, N. 1980. Cognitive Organization of Person Impressions. In: Hastie, R. et al eds. *Person Memory: The Cognitive Basis of Social Perception*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 55–88.
- Payne, J. 1976. Heuristic Search Processes in Decision Making. In: Anderson, B. ed. *Advances in Consumer Research*. Volume 3. Cincinnati, Ohio: Association for Consumer Research, 321–327.
- Payne, J., Bettman, J. and Johnson, E. 1988. Adaptive Strategy Selection in Decision-Making. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 14(3) 534–552.
- Payne, J., Bettman, J. and Luce, M. 1996. When Time is Money: Decision Behavior Under Opportunity-Cost Time Pressure. *Organizational Behavior and Decision Processes* 66(2) 131–152.
- Quattrone, George A. and Tversky, Amos. 1988. Contrasting Rational and Psychological Analyses of Political Choice. *American Political Science Review* 82(3) 719–736.
- Redd, Steven. 2002. The Influence of Advisers on Foreign Policy Decision Making: An Experimental Study. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(3) 335–364.
- Redd, Steven. 2005. The Influence of Advisers and Decision Strategies on Foreign Policy Choices: President Clinton's Decision to Use Force in Kosovo. *International Studies Perspectives* 6(1) 129–150.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1959. Theories of Decision making in Economics and Behavioural Science. *American Economic Review* 49 (30) 253–283.

- Simon, Herbert A. 1985. Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science. *American Political Science Review* 79(2) 293–304.
- Steinbruner, John. 1974. *The Cybernetic Theory of Decision*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wilson, T. 1964. The Coupon and the British General Election of 1918. *The Journal of Modern History* 36(1) 28–42.
- WO 32/9614. 1920. Jerusalem riots: Courts of Enquiry. National Archives, Kew.