

strategic, the relation of co-operation between the British and the Zionists requires some explanation.

It is logical to ask why the British would want a partner to share a colony with them? This is not the appropriate place to provide a complete answer to this question, however two important views are relevant in this context. Some authors advance the argument that Jewish settlement in Palestine was economically beneficial to the colonial government. This explanation, which is based on consideration of the short term economic gains of Jewish settlement, argues that this settlement would not only be able to pay its own way, but also would attract Jewish investment. Through tariffs, taxes, land purchases and other measures it could also directly contribute to the colonial revenue (Gozansky, 1986:Owen, 1981: Stein, 1984).

The other view point, while accepting the short term explanation, adds another factor with long term implications. In this view, authors stress the fact that the 'Jewish national home' was no more than a political euphemism for a Jewish state. According to this view the Zionist-imperialist co-operation had far more reaching strategic and political implications. Referring to the Zionist role expected by the British colonial government Stein writes:

The establishment of a Jewish national home was part of the context within which his Majesty's Government (HMG) was attempting to protect its strategic interests in the Middle East. Maintaining its presence in Egypt, assuring access to the Suez Canal and the East, preventing French ambitions in Lebanon and Syria from drifting south, and creating a land bridge from the Mediterranean Sea to the oil fields of Iraq all entered HMG's calculus. (Stein, 1984:7)

The creation of a European Jewish state in the midst of the pre-